

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT
Form 7. Mediation Questionnaire**

Instructions for this form: <http://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/forms/form07instructions.pdf>

9th Cir. Case Number(s) 19-35552

Case Name Adree Edmo v. Corizon, Inc., et al.

Counsel submitting this form Dylan A. Eaton

Represented party/ parties Defendants Corizon Inc., Scott Eliason, Murray Young, and Catherine Whinnery

Briefly describe the dispute that gave rise to this lawsuit.

Corizon Inc. contracts with the Idaho Department of Correction ("IDOC") to provide medical care to its inmates. Edmo is a male-to-female transgender inmate in the custody of the IDOC. Edmo has been incarcerated with the IDOC since 2012 and was diagnosed with gender dysphoria shortly thereafter. Since that time, the medical providers employed by Corizon have been treating Edmo's gender dysphoria, including providing hormone therapy and psychotherapy. However, Edmo's treating providers do not believe gender-confirmation surgery ("GCR") is an appropriate treatment for Edmo at this time.

Edmo disagrees. Consequently, Edmo brought suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the IDOC, Corizon, and various individual employees. Edmo claims that the medical treatment defendants provided was so inadequate, it amounted to cruel and unusual punishment under the Eighth Amendment.

Feedback or questions about this form? Email us at forms@ca9.uscourts.gov

Briefly describe the result below and the main issues on appeal.

On June 1, 2018, Edmo filed a Motion for Preliminary Injunction. The parties and Judge Winmill agreed it would be necessary to conduct discovery before conducting a hearing on the motion. After the parties conducted discovery, Judge Winmill held a three-day evidentiary hearing on October 10-12, 2018. On December 13, 2018, Judge Winmill issued an order, granting in part Edmo's Motion for a Preliminary Injunction. The order requires defendants to provide Edmo with GCR as promptly as possible and no later than six months from the date of the order.

Defendants have appealed the order. Defendants do not believe Judge Winmill applied the correct legal standard. Moreover, defendants do not believe the record supports many of Judge Winmill's factual findings.

Describe any proceedings remaining below or any related proceedings in other tribunals.

Because this is an appeal from an order granting a motion for preliminary injunction, the court has not yet held a trial.

Signature

Date

(use "s/[typed name]" to sign electronically-filed documents)