




1 supplies for a case other than this one. Finally, they argue the court has previously denied his  
2 request for appointed counsel.

3 Preliminary injunctive relief is appropriate where “the intermediate relief [is] of the same  
4 character as that which may be granted finally.” *De Beers Consol. Mines v. United States*, 325  
5 U.S. 212, 220 (1945). But a court cannot issue an injunction that “deals with a matter lying  
6 wholly outside the issues in the suit.” *Id.*

7 Carter’s requested relief is wholly outside the issues in this lawsuit. His lawsuit is for  
8 deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs related to his dental treatment. His request  
9 for injunctive relief relates to an alleged denial of access to the courts. Moreover, Carter has not  
10 shown he has been denied access to the court in this case. He has been able to file a complaint  
11 and application to proceed in forma pauperis, move for appointment of counsel, participate in the  
12 mediation, file the present motions, and move for a scheduling order. ECF Nos. 1; 2; 16; 24; 25;  
13 28. The exhibit he attaches to his motion shows he was denied supplies for a different case. ECF  
14 No. 24-2 at 5. There is no evidence he has been denied access to the court in this case. Finally, I  
15 previously denied his request for appointment of counsel. ECF No. 4 at 7-8. He has not shown a  
16 change in circumstances that would support revisiting that ruling. I therefore deny his motions  
17 for injunctive relief.

18 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff Shannon Carter’s motions for temporary  
19 restraining order and preliminary injunction (**ECF Nos. 24, 25**) are **DENIED**.

20 DATED this 1st day of October, 2019.

21  
22   
23 \_\_\_\_\_  
ANDREW P. GORDON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE