

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 17 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

KEVIN WALKER JONES,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

RICHARD J. DONOVAN, CDCR; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 19-55206

D.C. No. 3:17-cv-02454-BTM-
BLM

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of California
Barry Ted Moskowitz, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 14, 2020**

Before: CANBY, FRIEDLAND, and R. NELSON, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Kevin Walker Jones appeals pro se from the district court's interlocutory order denying his motion for a permanent injunction in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging constitutional claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1). We review for an abuse of discretion. *Cummings v. Connell*,

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

316 F.3d 886, 897 (9th Cir. 2003). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Jones's motion for a permanent injunction because the district court lacked the authority to grant Jones's requested relief as it was related to non-parties. *See Zepeda v. U.S. Immigration Serv.*, 753 F.2d 719, 727 (9th Cir. 1983) (explaining that the scope of an injunction is limited to the parties in the action).

We do not consider Jones's remaining contentions because they are outside the scope of this interlocutory appeal.

All pending motions and requests are denied.

AFFIRMED.