12 Fed.Appx. 618
This case was not selected for publication in the Federal Reporter.
Not for Publication in West's Federal Reporter See Fed. Rule of Appellate Procedure 32.1 generally governing citation of judicial decisions issued on or after Jan. 1, 2007. See also Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3. (Find CTA9 Rule 36-3)
United States Court of Appeals,
Ninth Circuit.

Richard Garrett TURAY, Plaintiff–Appellee,
v.
John Taylor ANDERSON, individual and his marital community and in his official capacity at the Special Commitment Center at Monroe WA; Norm Nelson, individually and in his marital community and his official capacity at the Special Commitment Center at Monroe, WA; William Dehmer; Scott Neil; Joan Kirchoff; Karen Sullivan; Pete Hazel, each in their individual capacity and in their official capacity as employees of the Department of Social and Health Services; Richard Bosse, in his individual capacity and in his official capacity as an employee of the Department of Corrections; Steve Wahl; Andre Simon, Defendants–Appellants,
v.
Laura McCollum, Plaintiff–Intervenor.
Jerry R. Sharp; Curtis Beard, aka Tony Wilson; Elmer Campbell; Joel Scott Reimer; Ronald L. Petersen; Joseph Aqui; Gilberto Soliz; Herman R. Paschke; Richard G. Turay; John F. Hall; Paul Begay; Randy Pedersen; Anthony Gallegos; Dennis Pryor; Rolando T. Aguilar; Samuel William Donaghe; Randy Pedersen, Plaintiffs–Appellees,
v.
Mark J. Seling, PhD; Vince Gollogly, Dr., Defendants–Appellants.

No. 99–36245. | D.C. Nos. CV–91–00664–WLD, CV–94–00121–WLD CV–94–00211–WLD CV–95–01111–WLD CV–96–00415–WLD. | Submitted June 4, 2001.[*]

[*] The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. Fed. R.App. P. 34(a)(2).

| Decided June 27, 2001.

***619** Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington William L. Dwyer, District Judge, Presiding.

Before BROWNING, WALLACE, and T.G. NELSON, Circuit Judges.

Opinion

MEMORANDUM[**]

[**] This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as may be provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36–3.

There are two issues raised in this appeal. The first, whether the district court inappropriately imposed new injunctive conditions in its November 1998 order, has been resolved by a previous panel.[1] We decline to revisit that issue under the law of the case doctrine, and instead give preclusive effect to the previous judgment affirming the district court's order.[2] Accordingly, we affirm as to that issue. We lack jurisdiction over the remaining issue: whether the district court abused its discretion when it found defendants in contempt and imposed sanctions. The district court's order did not "modify" or "continue" the injunction,[3] nor did it meet the jurisdictional standard of the collateral order doctrine—the order left the issue of sanctions "open, unfinished or inconclusive" ***620** and was thus not "final" within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1291.[4] "Piecemeal appeals are rarely entertained,"[5] and we decline to do so in this case. Accordingly, we dismiss that issue.

1 *See Sharp v. Weston,* 233 F.3d 1166 (9th Cir.2000).

2 *See Wyler Summit P'ship v. Turner Broad. Sys., Inc.,* 235 F.3d 1184, 1193 (9th Cir.2000) ("[T]he decision of an appellate court on a legal issue must be followed in all subsequent proceedings in the same case.") (internal citation and quotation marks omitted).

3 *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1).

4 *Cohen v. Beneficial Industrial Loan Corp.,* 337 U.S. 541, 546, 69 S.Ct. 1221, 93 L.Ed. 1528 (1949).

5 *Cacique, Inc. v. Robert Reiser & Co.,* 169 F.3d 619, 622 (9th Cir.1999).

AFFIRMED IN PART, DISMISSED IN PART.