

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ETUATE SEKONA,

No. 2:16-CV-0517-CMK-P

Plaintiff,

vs.

ORDER

F. CUSTINO, et al.,

Defendants.

_____ /

Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff has consented to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) and no other party has been served or appeared in the action. Pending before the court are plaintiff’s motions for injunctive relief (Docs. 9 and 25).

In both motions, plaintiff complains of prison conditions at Mule Creek State Prison as well as California State Prison – Sacramento. A review of the record, however, reflects that plaintiff has been transferred to Kern Valley State Prison. Where a prisoner is seeking injunctive relief with respect to conditions of confinement, the prisoner’s transfer to another prison renders the request for injunctive relief moot, unless there is some evidence of an expectation of being transferred back. See Prieser v. Newkirk, 422 U.S. 395, 402-03 (1975);

1 Johnson v. Moore, 948 F.3d 517, 519 (9th Cir. 1991) (per curiam).

2 Because plaintiff has not presented evidence of an expectation of being transferred
3 back to either Mule Creek State Prison or California State Prison – Sacramento, plaintiff’s
4 motions for injunctive relief with respect to conditions at those institutions are moot.

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff’s motions for injunctive
6 relief (Docs. 9 and 25) are denied.

7
8 DATED: February 3, 2017

9 
10 **CRAIG M. KELLISON**
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26