1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	TYSON WILLIAMS,	Case No. 2:19-cv-01595-KJM-JDP (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DISCHARGING THE NOVEMBER
13	v.	10, 2021 ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
14	G. JONES, et al.,	ECF No. 29
15	Defendants.	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS THAT PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF BE DENIED
16		ECF No. 28
17		
18		
19	Plaintiff alleges the defendants Jones and Parham, correctional officials, violated his	
20	Eighth Amendment rights when they attacked him following a classification hearing. Because he	
21	fears that their presence jeopardizes his safety, he has filed a motion for injunctive relief seeking a	
22	transfer to a prison where they do not work. Defendants oppose the motion, arguing that this	
23	court lacks jurisdiction to transfer prisoners to different institutions and that plaintiff has not met	
24	the requirements for a preliminary injunction. ¹ I agree and recommend denying plaintiff's motion	
25	for injunctive relief.	
26	¹ After defendants failed to timely resp	ond to plaintiff's motion, the court ordered them to
27	show cause why sanctions should not be imposed. ECF No. 29. Defendants have since filed an	
28	opposition and a response to the order to show cause. ECF Nos. 30, 31. In light of counsel's representations, ECF No. 31, the November 10, 2021 order to show cause is discharged.	

1 To obtain preliminary injunctive relief a claimant must show that he is likely to succeed 2 on the merits of his case, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of injunctive 3 relief, that the balance of equities is in his favor, and that the injunction is in the public's interest. 4 See Winter v. NRDC, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008). The bar is particularly high in this case because 5 the requested relief encroaches on questions of prison administration. See Bell v. Wolfish, 441 6 U.S. 520, 547 (1970). 7 Plaintiff's motion does not address the *Winter* factors; instead, he contends, without 8 elaboration, that defendants' presence jeopardizes his safety and causes an unsafe environment. 9 That conclusory statement is insufficient to warrant the relief he seeks. See Caribbean Marine 10 Servs. Co. v. Baldrige, 844 F.2d 668, 674 (9th Cir. 1988) ("Speculative injury does not constitute 11 irreparable injury sufficient to warrant granting a preliminary injunction."). 12 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that the November 10, 2021 order to show cause, 13 ECF No. 29, is discharged. 14 Further, it is RECOMMENDED that plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief, ECF No. 28, be denied. 15 16 I submit these findings and recommendations to the district judge under 17 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Rule 304 of the Local Rules of Practice for the United States 18 District Court, Eastern District of California. The parties may, within 14 days of the service of 19 the findings and recommendations, file written objections to the findings and recommendations 20 with the court. Such objections should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings 21 and Recommendations." The district judge will review the findings and recommendations under 22 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). 23 IT IS SO ORDERED. 24 25 Dated: December 8, 2021 26 JERÉMY D. PETERSON UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 27 28

_
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
27
28