

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Rayon Jones v. J. Quiring

No. 2:24-cv-1933-TLN-JDP (P), Findings and Recommendations (E.D. Cal. Dec. 4, 2025) · No. 2:24-cv-1933-TLN-JDP (P) · Decided December 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The document is an order and findings and recommendations in a prisoner civil-rights action against J. Quiring. The magistrate judge denies the plaintiff’s request for an in-person settlement conference and recommends denial of preliminary injunctive relief concerning threats by other inmates because the requested relief is unrelated to the complaint, seeks to affect nonparties, and does not satisfy the applicable injunction standards.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jeremy D. Peterson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 4, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-1933-TLN-JDP (P)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A state prisoner moved for a protective order and preliminary injunctive relief based on alleged death threats from unknown inmates, and separately requested an in-person settlement conference. The magistrate judge denied the settlement-conference request and recommended denial of the motion for injunctive relief, subject to objections and review by the assigned district judge.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A preliminary injunction requires a clear showing that the plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits, likely to suffer irreparable harm absent relief, that the balance of equities favors relief, and that an injunction is in the public interest. Mandatory injunctions are subject to a heightened standard. Under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, prospective relief must be narrowly drawn and the least intrusive means necessary to correct the violation. An ex parte temporary restraining order requires a clear showing that immediate and irreparable harm will occur without relief.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished federal district court order and findings and recommendations; not a precedential appellate opinion.
PARTIES	Rayon Jones v. J. Quiring

TOPICS

injunctions prisoners rights civil procedure due process

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure prisoner civil rights injunctive relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Jones was entitled to preliminary injunctive or protective relief based on alleged threats by unknown inmates.
2. Whether the requested injunction was permissible when it was based on allegations separate from those in the complaint and sought relief against nonparties.
3. Whether Jones's request for an in-person settlement conference should be granted after he declined to attend the previously scheduled conference.

HOLDINGS

1. Preliminary injunctive relief should be denied because Jones failed to address or establish the Winter factors.
2. The court should not issue an injunction based on claims not pleaded in the complaint.
3. The court could not issue an injunction determining the rights of unnamed inmates who were not before the court.
4. The request for an in-person settlement conference was denied because Jones declined to attend the previously scheduled settlement conference.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must show: (1) he is likely to succeed on the merits; (2) he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of injunctive relief; (3) the balance of equities tips in his favor; and (4) an injunction is in the public interest.” (Opinion at 2)

“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.” (Opinion at 3)

“A federal court may issue an injunction if it has personal jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter jurisdiction over the claim; it may not attempt to determine the rights of persons not before the court.” (Opinion at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jones is a state inmate proceeding pro se. His complaint concerns an alleged Fourteenth Amendment violation by Quiring during a 2022 disciplinary proceeding at Mule Creek State Prison. His motion for injunctive relief instead sought protection from alleged death threats by unknown inmates at Salinas Valley State Prison. Jones also sought an in-person settlement conference but refused to attend a conference previously scheduled before Judge Dennis M. Cota.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Jones's underlying complaint alleges that defendant Quiring violated his Fourteenth Amendment rights during a 2022 disciplinary proceeding at Mule Creek State Prison. Jones later sought injunctive relief concerning threats allegedly made by unknown inmates at Salinas Valley State Prison and requested an in-person settlement conference. The court denied the settlement-conference request, recommended denying the injunction motion, and advised the parties of the procedure for objecting under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Lopez v. Brewer, 680 F.3d 1068, 1072 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Mazurek v. Armstrong, 520 U.S. 968, 972 (1997) (per curiam)
- Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20, 24 (2008)
- Porretti v. Dzurenda, 11 F.4th 1037, 1047 (9th Cir. 2021)
- Hernandez v. Sessions, 872 F.3d 976, 999 (9th Cir. 2017)
- Marlyn Nutraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos Pharma GmbH & Co., 571 F.3d 873, 879 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Gilmore v. People of the State of California, 220 F.3d 987, 999 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Pacific Radiation Oncology, LLC v. Queen's Medical Center, 810 F.3d 631, 633 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Zepeda v. U.S. I.N.S., 753 F.2d 719, 727 (9th Cir. 1983)
- Turner v. Safley, 482 U.S. 78, 884-85 (1987)
- Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520, 562 (1979)
- Wylie v. Montana Women's Prison, 2014 WL 6685983, at *3 (D. Mont. Nov. 25, 2014)
- Reno Air Racing Ass'n, Inc. v. McCord, 452 F.3d 1126, 1131 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Turner v. Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998)
- Martinez v. Yist, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991)