

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Ronald Eugene James v. Richardson, et al.

James v. Richardson · No. 2:23-CV-0853-DC-DMC-P · Decided March 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The court addressed Ronald Eugene James’s motions concerning access to the Sacramento County Main Jail law library. The court denied relief against non-party jail staff but granted the motions insofar as it confirmed that James is a pro se prisoner proceeding in forma pauperis for purposes of law-library access.

OPINION

(PC) James v. Sacramento County Sheriff Dept.

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 RONALD EUGENE JAMES, No. 2:23-CV-0853-DC-DMC-P

12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER 14 RICHARDSON, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff, a prisoner
proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to 18 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before
the Court are Plaintiff’s motions regarding law library access. 19 See ECF No. 23 and 38. 20 On
November 12, 2024, the District Judge issued an order directing that this action 21 proceed on the
first amended complaint on Plaintiff’s Claim I for retaliation against Defendants 22 Powell and
Almed, and Plaintiff’s Claim IV for medical deliberate indifference against 23 Defendants
Richardson and Banks. See ECF No. 29. All other claims and defendants were 24 dismissed. See
id. Defendants filed their answer on January 7, 2025, see ECF No. 32, and the 25 case has been
scheduled, see ECF No. 34. 26 / / / 27 / / / 28 / / /] In the pending motions, Plaintiff states that
non-party staff at the Sacramento 2 || County Main Jail is not affording him preferred law library
use privileges incident to his status as 3 || a prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis. See
ECF Nos. 23 and 38. While the Court is 4 | unable to grant Plaintiff relief in the form of an order
directing non-party jail staff to grant 5 | Plaintiff law library access, see Zenith Radio Corp. v.
Hazeltine Research, Inc., 395 U.S. 100 6 || (1969), and injunctive relief would otherwise be
inappropriate because Plaintiff has not 7 || demonstrated either the likelihood of irreparable injury
or success on the merits of his underlying 8 | claims, see Stormans, Inc. v. Selecky, 586 F.3d 1109
(9th Cir. 2009), the Court will by this order 9 | grant Plaintiffs motions to the extent the Court

confirms that Plaintiff is a prisoner proceedings 10 || pro se and in forma pauperis. 11 Accordingly,
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's motions, ECF Nos. 23 12 || and 38, are granted insofar
as the Court confirms, for purposes of access to the jail law library, 13 || that Plaintiff a prisoner
proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis. 14 15 | Dated: March 4, 2025 SS GC

16 DENNIS M. COTA

17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28