

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

JAMES N. BROWN, JR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

ASSOCIATE WARDEN G. COOPER,
KEN HYLE, ASST. DIRECTOR,
SARA REVELL, REGIONAL
DIRECTOR,
KATHLEEN KENNEY, GEN.
COUNSEL,
L. LARIVA, WARDEN,
L. JANSSEN, R.N.,
C. ORUM, UNIT MANAGER,
R. WOLTMAN, CASE MANAGER,
FNU SANSON,
A. COSSETTE, UNIT MANAGER
D. HOLBUS, LIEUTENANT,
C. STROMBERG,
FNU HARE, LIEUTENANT,
PETER ARROYO,
CHARLES SLATER, MD,
SHEILA HADAWAY, MD,
MISBAH BAQIR, M.B.B.S.,
MAYO CLINIC,

Defendants.

Civ. No. 18-219 (DSD/BRT)

ORDER

Pro se Plaintiff James N. Brown, Jr. filed a motion for an order directing the Bureau of Prisons to “release all restriction immediately” on his trust fund account and

that this case be joined with Civil Case No. 18-404 (D. Minn.) “to become one filing fee.” (Doc. No. 30 at 2.) Plaintiff complains that the Bureau of Prisons is taking too much of his money to satisfy the filing fees for his cases, making it more difficult to litigate those cases. (*See id.*)¹

This action cannot be joined with Case No. 18-404. As one court explained:

[A] plaintiff cannot normally seek to join in one lawsuit a multitude of claims against a host of different defendants, relating to events arising out of a series of different occurrences or transactions. In other words, ‘Claim A against Defendant 1 should not be joined with unrelated Claim B against Defendant 2.’ *George v. Smith*, 507 F3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007). ‘Unrelated claims against different defendants belong in different suits, . . . [in part] to ensure that prisoners pay the required filing fees—for the Prison Litigation Reform Act limits to 3 the number of frivolous suits or appeals that any prisoner may file without prepayment of the required fees.’ *Id.*

Taylor v. Miller, No. 4:15-CV-285-RWS, 2015 WL 3476918, at *2 (E.D. Mo. June 2, 2015). This lawsuit raises claims related to the treatment of Plaintiff’s ongoing health issues. Case No. 18-404, on the other hand, is related to the confiscation of photographs, and the defendants are entirely different. Therefore, Plaintiff cannot avoid paying two filing fees by joining these unrelated lawsuits.

Plaintiff’s motion (Doc. No. 30) is **DENIED**.

Dated: June 12, 2018

s/ *Becky R. Thorson*

BECKY R. THORSON

United States Magistrate Judge

¹ Plaintiff labeled this motion a motion for a preliminary injunction. Since this motion does not address the merits of Plaintiff’s claims, the Court will treat it as a non-dispositive motion. Plaintiff previously filed another motion for preliminary injunction (Doc. No. 7) that is still pending and awaiting response from the defendants.