

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS

**Janiah Monroe, Marilyn Melendez, Lydia Heléna Vision, Sora
Kuykendall, and Sasha Reed, individually and on behalf of a class of
similarly situated individuals v. Steven Bowman, Melvin Hinton, and
Latoya Hughes**

Monroe v. Bowman · No. 3:18-CV-00156-NJR · Decided November 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois denied Defendants’ motion to stay a September 2025 preliminary injunction pending appeal. The injunction required measures concerning the transfer, placement, treatment, and monitoring of transgender inmates with gender dysphoria housed at Menard Correctional Center. The Court concluded that Defendants had not shown a likelihood of success on appeal or irreparable harm, while a stay would substantially injure Plaintiffs and disserve the public interest.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Nancy J. Rosenstengel, Chief U.S. District Judge
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
DECIDED	November 24, 2025
DOCKET	3:18-CV-00156-NJR
DISPOSITION	denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 62(c) and related appellate-stay procedures to stay portions of a September 12, 2025 preliminary injunction while their interlocutory appeal was pending.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Discretionary stay-pending-appeal analysis under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 62(c), considering the four Nken factors: likelihood of success on the merits, irreparable injury to the applicant absent a stay, substantial injury to other interested parties, and the public interest.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district court memorandum and order

PARTIES

Steven Bowman, Melvin Hinton, Latoya Hughes v. Janiah Monroe, Marilyn Melendez, Lydia Heléna Vision, Sora Kuykendall, Sasha Reed, the certified class of prisoners in the custody of the Illinois Department of Corrections who have requested evaluation or treatment for gender dysphoria

TOPICS

injunctions appellate procedure civil procedure constitutional law prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure appellate procedure constitutional law civil rights prisoners rights remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether defendants demonstrated a strong likelihood of success on their interlocutory appeal sufficient to justify staying portions of the September 12, 2025 preliminary injunction.
2. Whether defendants would suffer irreparable harm absent a stay based on the burdens of further litigation and compliance with the injunction.
3. Whether staying the injunction would substantially injure plaintiffs and whether the public interest favored a stay.
4. Whether the district court should stay related proceedings and evidentiary hearings during the appeal.

HOLDINGS

1. Defendants failed to make the strong showing of likely success on the merits required for a stay pending appeal. Their arguments concerning the specificity, scope, tailoring, and evidentiary basis of the injunction had largely been previously considered and rejected, and the challenged relief was sufficiently connected to the constitutional harms found at Menard.
2. Defendants did not establish irreparable harm based on the burden of preparing for an evidentiary hearing, litigating the appeal, or complying with the injunction.
3. A stay would substantially harm plaintiffs, and the public interest favored enforcement of the injunction rather than a stay.
4. Defendants were not entitled to stay related actions, evidentiary hearings, or other proceedings pending appeal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The party requesting a stay bears the burden of showing that the circumstances justify an exercise of [the Court’s] discretion” (Discussion, section a)

“At bottom, federal courts must ensure that ‘substantial discretion and flexibility’ remain ‘in the hands of the prison administrators.’” (Discussion, section a)

“Mere litigation expense, even substantial and unrecoverable cost, does not constitute irreparable injury.”
(Discussion, section b)

“For the reasons explained above, Defendants’ motion for a stay pending appeal (Doc. 1024) is DENIED.”
(Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The certified class consists of Illinois prisoners who have requested evaluation or treatment for gender dysphoria, and the named defendants are Illinois Department of Corrections officials sued in their official capacities. The district court found substantial evidence of inadequate mental-health services, delayed evaluations and treatment, assaults and mistreatment, cross-gender searches, and inadequate access to gender-affirming clothing and other accommodations at Menard Correctional Center. The September 2025 injunction required transfer of class members from Menard, allowed certain transferees to request a subsequent transfer, and required status reporting. Defendants asserted that compliance created administrative and housing difficulties and sought a stay pending appeal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed a class action alleging that Illinois Department of Corrections policies and practices denied transgender prisoners adequate evaluation and treatment for gender dysphoria in violation of the Eighth Amendment. The district court granted and later continued injunctive relief, and the class was certified. The Seventh Circuit vacated the February 2022 injunction as expired under the Prison Litigation Reform Act. After a 2025 evidentiary hearing, the district court issued a new preliminary injunction requiring, among other things, transfers of class members from Menard Correctional Center and periodic reporting. Defendants appealed and sought a stay; the district court denied the motion.

DISPOSITION

denied

CASES CITED

- *Monroe v. Bowman*, 122 F.4th 688 (7th Cir. 2024)
- *Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 433-34 (2009)
- *Hilton v. Braunskill*, 481 U.S. 770, 776 (1987)
- *Camelot Banquet Rooms, Inc. v. United States Small Bus. Admin.*, 14 F.4th 624, 628 (7th Cir. 2021)
- *In re A & F Enters., Inc.*, 742 F.3d 763, 766 (7th Cir. 2014)
- *Matter of Forty-Eight Insulations, Inc.*, 115 F.3d 1294, 1301 (7th Cir. 1997)
- *Michigan Coalition of Radioactive Material Users, Inc. v. Griepentrog*, 945 F.2d 150, 153 (6th Cir. 1991)
- *Endress + Hauser, Inc. v. Hawk Measurements Sys. Pty. Ltd.*, 932 F. Supp. 1147, 1149 (S.D. Ind. 1996)
- *Howe v. Hughes*, 74 F.4th 849, 857 (7th Cir. 2023)
- *Westefor v. Neal*, 682 F.3d 679, 685 (7th Cir. 2012)

- Renegotiation Bd. v. Bannercraft Clothing Co., 415 U.S. 1, 24 (1974)
- Crist v. Miller, 846 F.2d 1143, 1144 (7th Cir. 1988)
- Whole Woman's Health All. v. Hill, 937 F.3d 864, 875 (7th Cir. 2019)
- Smith v. Edwards, 88 F.4th 1119, 1124 (5th Cir. 2023)
- Banks v. Booth, 3 F.4th 445, 449 (D.C. Cir. 2021)
- Norbert v. City & Cnty. of San Francisco, 10 F.4th 918, 926 (9th Cir. 2021)
- United States v. Sec'y, Fla. Dep't of Corr., 778 F.3d 1223, 1229 (11th Cir. 2015)
- Victory v. Berks Cnty., 789 F. App'x 328, 333 (3d Cir. 2019)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-il/2025/janiah-monroe-marilyn-melendez-lydia-helena-vision-sora-6qd8s0mp>