

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE DIVISION

Barr v. Meekins, et al.

Barr · No. 1:25cv323/MW/ZCB · Decided May 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The magistrate judge recommends denying the plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction and protective order concerning alleged interstate stalking and law-enforcement nonresponse. The recommendation concludes that the requested relief is unrelated to the claims in the third amended complaint and seeks relief against nonparties, beyond the court’s authority.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida, Gainesville Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Zachary C. Bolitho
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida, Gainesville Division
DECIDED	May 6, 2026
DOCKET	1:25cv323/MW/ZCB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for a preliminary injunction and protective order concerning alleged ongoing interstate stalking and law-enforcement nonresponse in a civil-rights action. A magistrate judge issued a report and recommendation recommending denial of the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Preliminary injunctive relief is evaluated according to whether it preserves the status quo and prevents irreparable injury pending resolution of the merits, and the requested relief must be closely related to the conduct alleged in the complaint.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Timothy Jacob Barr v. Corrections Officer Meekins, et al.

TOPICS

- injunctions
- civil rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

civil procedure

injunctive relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether preliminary injunctive relief may be granted when the conduct addressed by the motion is unrelated in time, place, and substance to the claims in the complaint.
2. Whether the court may issue a preliminary injunction against individuals or entities that are not parties to the action.

HOLDINGS

1. Preliminary injunctive relief should be denied when the conduct addressed by the motion is not closely related to the conduct alleged in the underlying complaint.
2. A court lacks authority to issue a preliminary injunction against persons or entities that are not parties to the action.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“This necessitates that the relief sought in the motion be closely related to the conduct complained of in the actual complaint.”

“The Court lacks the authority to issue a preliminary injunction against non-parties.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff's underlying action concerns alleged excessive force by law-enforcement officers in Dixie County, Florida, in January 2023. His motion for preliminary injunction and protective order instead concerned alleged interstate stalking in Tennessee during 2025. The requested relief sought restrictions against nonparty Florent Brunet, directions to law enforcement, preservation of evidence, and permission to supplement the record with evidence of future incidents. Only Meekins, Dehart, and Chapman remained as defendants after twelve of fifteen defendants were dismissed.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff's third amended complaint alleges excessive force by law enforcement in Dixie County, Florida, in January 2023. The court dismissed twelve of the fifteen originally named defendants, leaving Meekins, Dehart, and Chapman. Plaintiff then moved for preliminary injunctive and protective relief based on alleged stalking conduct occurring in Tennessee during 2025. The report and recommendation recommends denying the motion because the requested relief is unrelated to the complaint's claims and is directed at nonparties.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- All Care Nursing Serv., Inc. v. Bethesda Mem'l Hosp., Inc., 887 F.2d 1535, 1537 (11th Cir. 1989)
- Hernandez v. Fla. Dep't of Corr., No. 3:05CV39, 2005 WL 1684419, at *1 (N.D. Fla. June 29, 2005), adopted, No. 305CV39, 2005 WL 1876159 (N.D. Fla. Aug. 4, 2005)
- Torres Puello v. Guerrero Mendez, No. 5:20cv198, 2020 WL 4004481, at *2 (M.D. Fla. June 15, 2020), adopted, 2020 WL 4001896 (M.D. Fla. July 15, 2020)
- Bethel v. Town of Loxley, No. 04-0373, 2006 WL 8437738, at *2 (S.D. Ala. Mar. 15, 2006)
- Jackson v. Baisden, No. 21-13004, 2022 WL 610314, at *1 (11th Cir. 2022)
- In re Infant Formula Antitrust Litig., MDL 878 v. Abbott Lab., 72 F.3d 842, 842-43 (11th Cir. 1995)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
GAINESVILLE DIVISION TIMOTHY JACOB BARR, Plaintiff, vs. Case No.:
1:25cv323/MW/ZCB CORRECTIONS OFFICER MEEKINS, et al., Defendants.

_____/ REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION Before the
Court is pro se Plaintiff's "Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Protective Order Regarding
Ongoing Interstate Stalking and Law Enforcement Non-Response." (Doc.

36). For the reasons below, the motion should be denied. The purpose of preliminary injunctive relief is to preserve the status quo between the parties and prevent irreparable injury until the merits of the lawsuit can be resolved. All Care Nursing Serv., Inc. v. Bethesda Mem'l Hosp., Inc., 887 F.2d 1535, 1537 (11th Cir. 1989). "This necessitates that the relief sought in the motion be closely related to the conduct complained of in the actual complaint." Hernandez v. Fla. Dep't of Corr., No. 3:05CV39, 2005 WL 1684419, at *1 (N.D.

Fla. June 29, 2005), adopted, No. 305CV39, 2005 WL 1876159 (N.D. Fla. Aug. 4, 2005) (cleaned up). Here, Plaintiff's request for a preliminary injunction is not sufficiently related to the underlying claims in his third amended complaint. Plaintiff seeks a preliminary injunction that would: (1) prohibit a non-party (Florent Brunet) from coming within a reasonable distance of Plaintiff; (2) direct law enforcement to take reasonable steps to act on Plaintiff's reports; (3) direct all parties to preserve all related evidence of the alleged stalking; and (4) authorize Plaintiff to supplement the record with documentation of future incidents.

(Doc. 36 at 4). The alleged stalking conduct discussed in the motion for preliminary injunction appears to have occurred in Tennessee during 2025. (Id. at 2). Plaintiff's third amended complaint, however, involves allegations of excessive force by law enforcement that occurred in Dixie County, Florida in January of 2023. (Doc. 14 at 10).

Because Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction is based on different conduct that occurred at a different time and in a different place than the conduct alleged in the third amended complaint, Plaintiff's motion should be denied. See Torres Puello v. Guerrero Mendez, No. 5:20cv198, 2020 WL 4004481, at *2 (M.D. Fla. June 15, 2020), adopted, 2020 WL 4001896 (M.D.

Fla. July 15, 2020) (denying motion for injunctive relief because Plaintiff's request for an injunction was not related to the underlying claims in his complaint); see also *Bethel v. Town of Loxley*, No. 04-0373, 2006 WL 8437738, at *2 (S.D. Ala. Mar. 15, 2006) (denying motion for preliminary injunction because the motion was based on an incident that "is not one of the incidents included in plaintiffs' amended complaint").

Plaintiff's motion should also be denied because it seeks preliminary injunctive relief against non-parties to this action. Plaintiff named fifteen Defendants in this action, and the Court dismissed twelve of them. (Doc. 14; Doc. 24).

The only Defendants that remain are Meekins, Dehart, and Chapman. (Doc. 24). Yet, in his motion, Plaintiff seeks a preliminary injunction against other individuals and entities who are not parties to this action. (Doc. 36 at 4).

The Court lacks the authority to issue a preliminary injunction against non-parties. See *Jackson v. Baisden*, No. 21-13004, 2022 WL 610314, at *1 (11th Cir. 2022) (holding that the district court could not grant an injunction against a non-party); see also *In re Infant Formula Antitrust Litig.*, MDL 878 v. *Abbott Lab.*, 72 F.3d 842, 842-43 (11th Cir. 1995) (affirming district court's denial of a preliminary injunction against a non-party).

For the reasons above, it is respectfully RECOMMENDED that Plaintiff's "Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Protective Order Regarding Ongoing Interstate Stalking and Law Enforcement Non- Response" (Doc. 36) be DENIED. At Pensacola, Florida this 6th day of May 2026. /s/ Zachary C. Bolitho Zachary C. Bolitho United States Magistrate Judge Notice to the Parties Objections to these proposed findings and recommendations must be filed within fourteen days of the date of the Report and Recommendation.

Any different deadline that may appear on the electronic docket is for the Court's internal use only and does not control. An objecting party must serve a copy of the objections on all other parties. A party who fails to object to the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations contained in a report and recommendation waives the right to challenge on appeal the district court's order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions.

See 11th Cir. Rule 3-1; 28 U.S.C. § 636.