

noninterference by the courts in the day-to-day operations of prisons, especially when those operations relate to institutional security. *See Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539, 566 (1974); *see also Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520, 547–48 (1979). As such, this Court will not issue an order granting Plaintiff carte blanche to communicate with inmate Houser. Consequently, Plaintiff's motion will be denied without prejudice to Plaintiff filing a motion that explicitly states inmate Houser's involvement in this lawsuit and affirmatively states that inmate Houser will be called as a witness in this lawsuit.¹

So **ORDERED** this 16th day of September, 2014.

s/ Cynthia Reed Eddy
Cynthia Reed Eddy
United States Magistrate Judge

cc: JESSE DERRICK BOND
BZ-2493
Box 244
Graterford, PA 19426-0244
(via First Class Mail)

Robert A. Willig
Office of Attorney General
(via CM/ECF electronic transmission)

¹ If such a motion were to be granted, Plaintiff's correspondence with inmate Houser would be subject to the supervision of the Department of Corrections, pursuant to its established security procedures. Additionally, this Court refers Plaintiff to DC-ADM 803 § 1 ¶ 4, which addresses the issue of correspondence between inmates.