GEOFFREY ROBERT LAWSON, SR.,

Plaintiff/s,
v.

DAN PACHOLKE, ELDON VAIL, ISRAEL ROY GONZALES, BRANDON WELLS, MARTHA HAYES, TAMARA AVERY, LORI WONDERS, JOHN DOE 1-10, PAUL BARKER, BONNIE LONGINO, H. FERNANDEZ, LT. D. BUSS, LT. M. MARRY, CC2 JORDAN, BERNARD WARNER, RACHEL SHOOK and TRACY STUENKEL,

Defendants.
BEFORE THE COURT are Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time, ECF No. 24, and his Renewed Emergency Motion for Preliminary Injunction, ECF No.
25. Plaintiff, a prisoner at the Airway Heights Corrections Center, is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis. By separate Order, the Court has directed Plaintiff's

First Amended Complaint, ECF No. 26, received on September 6, 2017 and dated August 30, 2017, be served on Defendants.

Plaintiff's motions were received after the dates on which he requested they be noted for hearing. They were noted for hearing on October 6, 2017, and considered without oral argument on the date signed below. Because the Court had accepted Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, ECF No. 26, and found it sufficient to require a response from Defendants, Plaintiff's request for an extension of time to file it is now moot.

Plaintiff seeks to renew an emergency motion for injunctive relief. The present lawsuit concerns Plaintiff's access to the courts to challenge his criminal conviction and the conditions of his confinement. The substance of his motion concerns newly discovered issues food and water contamination and a requested soy-free diet. The Court notes Plaintiff's request for a soy-free Kosher diet has already been litigated in a separate action, Lawson v. Carney, et. al., 2:15-CV-0184RMP, which is now on appeal before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.
"A court's equitable power lies only over the merits of the case or controversy before it. When a plaintiff seeks injunctive relief based on claims not pled in the complaint, the court does not have the authority to issue an injunction." Pacific Radiation Oncology, LLC v. Queen's Med. Ctr., 810 F.3d 631, 633 (9th Cir. 2015). Therefore, this Court is without authority to enjoin the conduct Plaintiff describes
in his motion. If Plaintiff wishes to challenge the conditions of his confinement and has not already done so, he may file a new and separate action.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time, ECF No. 24, is DENIED as moot.
2. Plaintiff's Renewed Emergency Motion for Preliminary Injunction Based on Imminent Risk to Lawson's Health and Safety Due to Defendants' Continued Denial of Lawson's Access to the Courts, ECF No. 25, is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED. The Clerk's Office is directed to enter this Order and provide a copy to Plaintiff.

DATED this 17th day of October 2017.


United States District Judge

