1 2 3 *E-FILED - 6/29/10* 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 GEORGE FLORES, No. C 08-3297 RMW (PR) 12 Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING 13 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING v. 14 ORDER / PRELIMINARY WARDEN EVANS, et al., **INJUNCTION** 15 Defendants. (Docket No. 54) 16 17 18 Plaintiff, an inmate at Kern Valley State Prison, filed a pro se civil rights complaint 19 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On October 3, 2008, plaintiff filed a first amended complaint. 20 After reviewing the amended complaint, the court found that it stated a cognizable Eighth 21 Amendment claim against prison officials for cruel and unusual punishment. On August 7, 22 2009, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss and dismissed the complaint for failure to 23 exhaust. Plaintiff did not file an appeal. On October 16, 2009, plaintiff filed a post-judgment 24 motion for temporary restraining order and/or preliminary injunction. On November 10, 2009, 25 the court denied plaintiff's motion because the case was closed and plaintiff failed to establish 26 that he was likely to succeed on the merits. 27 In plaintiff's present motion, plaintiff raises many of the same allegations as in his 28 October 16, 2009 motion. For the reasons stated in the court's November 10, 2009 order, Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order / Preliminary Injunction P:\PRO-SE\SJ.Rmw\CR.08\Flores297TRO2.wpd

Flores v. Evans et al

Doc. 58

plaintiff's motion is DENIED. Plaintiff is advised that he is not prevented from filing a new civil rights complaint if he can in good faith allege (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) that the alleged deprivation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. nald M. Whyte IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: <u>6/29/10</u> United States District Judge