Doc. 68

1 2 3 4 5 6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

committing physical assault and battery against plaintiff, repeatedly ransacking plaintiff's cell, and illegally confiscating and destroying his property. Plaintiff also requests that those individuals refrain from retaliating against plaintiff. Plaintiff described that on October 13, 2013, Deputies Galvez and Malizia removed plaintiff from his cell while they ransacked his cell and destroyed plaintiff's personal and legal property. As they escorted plaintiff back to his cell, Deputy Malizia hit plaintiff in his right shoulder. The following day, plaintiff attempted several times to file grievances, but Deputy Riley refused to process them.

The decision of whether to grant or deny a motion for preliminary injunction is a matter of the district court's discretion. Am. Trucking Ass'ns, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles, 559 F.3d 1046, 1052 (9th Cir. 2009). Under the traditional test for granting preliminary injunctive relief, a plaintiff must: (1) establish a strong likelihood of success on the merits; (2) show the possibility of irreparable injury to the plaintiff if the preliminary relief is not granted; (3) show a balance of hardships favoring the plaintiff; and (4) show that granting the injunction favors the public interest. Stormans, Inc. v. Selecky, 586 F.3d 1109, 1127 (9th Cir. 2009). As a corollary to this test, the Ninth Circuit has also found a preliminary injunction appropriate if "serious questions going to the merits were raised and the balance of the hardships tips sharply in the plaintiff's favor," thereby allowing preservation of the status quo where complex legal questions require further inspection or deliberation. Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell, 622 F.3d 1045, 1049 (9th Cir. 2010).

It appears that plaintiff is seeking to expand his causes of action by using the request for preliminary injunctive relief as a means to litigate additional claims unrelated to that set forth in his complaint. However, plaintiff cannot seek relief related to events occurring after the filing of the instant lawsuit and which are not related to the incident at issue, nor can he seek relief against non-parties. The purpose of a preliminary injunction is to preserve the relative positions of the parties until a trial on the merits can be held. University of Texas v. Camenisch, 451 U.S. 390, 395 (1981). Here, plaintiff's request for preliminary injunctive relief does not accomplish that goal with respect to the subject matter of this action. To the extent that plaintiff believes he may be in need of, and legally entitled to, the relief from the

Ronald M. Whyte

Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion for a Preliminary Injunction $P:\PRO-SE\RMW\CR.12\Starr400\denpi.wpd$

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SHANNON LEE STARR,	Case Number: CV12-04400 RMW
Plaintiff,	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
v.	
ALAMEDA COUNTY JAIL et al,	
Defendant.	/

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on September 30, 2014, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.

Shannon Lee Starr ALJ 123/2-F-8 Alameda County Santa Rita Jail 5325 Broder Boulevard Dublin, CA 94568

Dated: September 30, 2014

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: Jackie Lynn Garcia, Deputy Clerk