

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

LADEAN DANIELS

v.

CASE NO. 3:11CV286(SRU)

BRIAN K. MURPHY, ET AL.

RULING ON MOTION SEEKING INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Pending before the court is the plaintiff's motion seeking injunctive relief in connection with his conditions of confinement at Northern Correctional Institution ("Northern"). The sole claim in the complaint, however, pertains to his inability to exercise since June 2010 because of a requirement that he be handcuffed behind his back during recreation. In the present motion, the plaintiff claims that prison officials at Northern, including the defendants, have denied him access to his law books, copies of his legal work, cleaning solution to sanitize his cell and medical care and have discarded his grievances. In addition, the defendants have threatened to issue him disciplinary reports to keep him at Northern and have placed barking dogs in his housing unit to prevent him from sleeping and going to recreation.

Department of Correction records reflect that the plaintiff has been transferred to MacDougall Correctional Institution and the plaintiff has updated the court file to reflect that he is now confined at MacDougall.¹ Thus, the court concludes the plaintiff's requests for injunctive

¹ The court takes judicial notice of the records of the Connecticut Department of Correction on their website. *See Browdy v. Karpe*, No. 3:00cv1866 (CFD), 2004 WL 2203464, at *2 n.3 (D. Conn. Sept. 20, 2004) (taking judicial notice of correctional records of admission and discharge); *Ligon v. Doherty*, 208 F. Supp. 2d 384, 386 (E.D.N.Y. 2002) (taking judicial notice of records posted on New York Correctional Services website). Records show that Daniels is currently incarcerated at MacDougall Correctional Institution. *See*

relief relating to conditions of confinement at Northern is now moot. *See Martin-Trigona v. Shiff*, 702 F.2d 380, 386 (2d Cir. 1983) (“The hallmark of a moot case or controversy is that the relief sought can no longer be given or is no longer needed.”). The Motion for Injunctive Relief [Doc. No. 5] is **DENIED** as moot.

SO ORDERED this 21st day of October 2011, at Bridgeport, Connecticut.

/s/ Stefan R. Underhill
Stefan R. Underhill
United States District Judge