

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

April 16, 2021

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 19-40882  
Summary Calendar

---

JESSE PAUL SKINNER,

*Plaintiff—Appellant,*

*versus*

BRYAN COLLIER; MATT GROSS; BILLY LEWIS; BRUCE  
JOHNSON; KENNETH HUTTO; JAMES KENT; BLAKE NORMAN;  
GEORGE W. JANSKY, JR.; KRystal HOHENBRINK; SAMUEL  
DOMINEY; CORA SIMS; TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL  
JUSTICE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONAL DIVISION; MICHAEL  
UTLEY; TAWONA HOLMES; MARK ROBERTS; BETH PIPKINS;  
TAMMIE MITCHELL; DONALD MUNOZ; DARRON LANE;  
KENNETH RAGLAND; JUSTIN MCKNIGHT; ALVIN PERRY; JOANIE  
TURNER; JOHN STUBBLEFIELD,

*Defendants—Appellees.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Texas  
USDC No. 9:18-CV-139

---

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, JONES, and COSTA, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:\*

Jesse Paul Skinner, Texas prisoner # 599362, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed the present lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, contending that employees at the Eastham Unit of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) and the University of Texas Medical Branch (UTMB) have been deliberately indifferent to remedying extreme hot and cold temperatures in prison cells, as well as providing adequate food, laundry, shower facilities, housing, and lighting. Skinner also alleged that the defendants violated the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act. Skinner further alleged that he was retaliated against and denied equal protection for exercising his right to file grievances and complaints regarding the aforementioned unconstitutional conditions of confinement. In addition, Skinner alleged that he was denied adequate medical care in connection with his hypertension. Skinner appeals from the district court's denial of his motions for preliminary injunctive relief and a temporary restraining order (TRO).

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1), this court has jurisdiction to review the district court's denial of Skinner's motions for a preliminary injunction. *See Byrum v. Landreth*, 566 F.3d 442, 444 (5th Cir. 2009). Skinner, however, has failed to demonstrate that "extraordinary circumstances" warrant a conclusion that the district court abused its discretion in denying his motions for a preliminary injunction. *See White v. Carlucci*, 862 F.2d 1209, 1211 (5th Cir. 1989). To the extent that Skinner is appealing the district court's denial

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

No. 19-40882

of his request for a TRO, we lack jurisdiction. *See Faulder v. Johnson*, 178 F.3d 741, 742 (5th Cir. 1999).

Accordingly, the district court's orders are **AFFIRMED IN PART** and the appeal is **DISMISSED IN PART** for lack of jurisdiction. The motion for leave to file a second reply brief is **GRANTED** and the motion regarding the district court's stay order is **DENIED**.