

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
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMSHID S. KASHANNEJAD,

No. C-11-2228 EMC

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER RE PLAINTIFF'S FILING OF
JUNE 24, 2012**UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND
IMMIGRATION SERVICES, *et al.*,**(Docket No. 106)**Defendants.

Per the Court's order of June 22, 2012, Plaintiff has opted to have the new transportation letter (to be addressed to the CBP) to be mailed to him. To the extent Plaintiff has asked for relief in his filing of June 24, 2012, the request is denied. In this current request for relief, Plaintiff simply asks for the same relief as previously requested, essentially ignoring the prior rulings of the Court.


- The Court has already held that it is immaterial whether Plaintiff could use the courtesy copy of the transportation letter to purchase a ticket from the carrier. That is because the sole purpose of the *courtesy copy* is to give *Plaintiff* notice of the contents of the letter. *See* Docket Nos. 88, 102 (orders). Plaintiff is to give the *sealed* transportation letter to the *carrier* (not a travel agency) to purchase the ticket.
- The Court has already approved the contents of the transportation letter. Plaintiff has no evidence that the transportation letter actually issued by Defendants does not have the same content. Indeed, the courtesy copy has the same content.

The Court's prior order of June 22 remains in effect. Now that Plaintiff has elected to have the new transportation letter (to CBP) mailed to him, he must provide a photograph by July 6, 2012.

1 Defendants then have one week from the date that they receive the photograph to mail the new
2 transportation letter (using a delivery tracking method).

3
4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5
6 Dated: June 25, 2012

7
8 
9 _____
10 EDWARD M. CHEN
11 United States District Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28