

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

Angel Christopher Abreu v. Salt Lake County Sheriff's Office et al.

Abreu · No. 2:25-CV-349-DAK · Decided March 11, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Utah denied Angel Christopher Abreu's motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction seeking medical examination and shoulder treatment. The court concluded that his transfer from the Salt Lake County Jail to the Utah State Correctional Facility generally mooted his request for injunctive relief against Salt Lake County Jail defendants.

OPINION

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF UTAH ANGEL CHRISTOPHER ABREU, ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S Plaintiff, MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF v. Case No. 2:25-CV-349-DAK SALT LAKE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE et al., District Judge Dale A. Kimball Defendants. Plaintiff moves for "temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction." (ECF No. 15.) At the time he filed the motion, he was held at Salt Lake County Jail (SLCJ).

(Id.) Plaintiff's Amended Complaint names as defendants several SLCJ employees, whom he alleges provided him inadequate medical treatment. (ECF No. 13.) Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunctive relief seeks a court order "requiring the defendants to arrange for an examination and a plan of treatment including surgery for the plaintiff's shoulder." (ECF No. 15.)

Since Plaintiff filed the motion, he has notified the Court of his change of address to Utah State Correctional Facility (USCF). (ECF No. 28.) In their response to Plaintiff's motion, Defendants argue his change of address moots his request for preliminary injunctive relief.¹ (ECF No. 30.) It is true that "[a]n inmate's transfer from a prison facility generally moots claims for... injunctive relief related to conditions of confinement."

Mitchell v. Estrada, 225 F. App'x 737, 1After being warned that no time extensions would be granted, Plaintiff unsuccessfully moved for a time extension to reply to Defendants' response to his motion. (ECF Nos. 31-32.)

Having not received Plaintiff's reply by the deadline of March 9, 2026, the Court follows through on its plan to "decide Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunctive relief based on the documents on file at that time." (ECF No. 32.) Those documents are Plaintiff's motion and Defendants' response to the motion. (ECF Nos. 15, 30.) 741 (10th Cir. 2007) (unpublished).

After all, the SLCJ defendants in this action are in no position to provide or force medical services to Plaintiff while he is in the custody of USCF. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for a Temporary Restraining and Preliminary Injunction is DENIED. (ECF No. 15.) DATED this 11th day of March 2026. BY THE COURT: IDL KE dere JUDGE DALE A. KIMBALL United States District Court Page 2 of 2