

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
VIRGINIA, ROANOKE DIVISION

Bruce A. Estes v. Virginia Department of Corrections, et al.

Estes · No. 7:25-cv-00817 · Decided June 16, 2026

SUMMARY

The court dismissed without prejudice as moot Bruce A. Estes’s motions for a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate indifference to serious medical needs. The court concluded that Estes had received the recommended pain-management treatment, including a TENS unit, and therefore the requested injunctive relief was no longer necessary.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, Roanoke Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Elizabeth K. Dillon
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, Roanoke Division
DECIDED	June 16, 2026
DOCKET	7:25-cv-00817
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A pro se prisoner moved for a preliminary injunction and a temporary restraining order in a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate indifference to serious medical needs.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum opinion
PARTIES	Bruce A. Estes v. Virginia Department of Corrections, et al.

TOPICS

- injunctions
- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- health law
- civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- prisoner civil rights
- injunctive relief
- medical treatment litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Estes's motions for a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order became moot after he received the medical treatment, including a TENS Unit, that he sought.

HOLDINGS

1. The motions for a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order were moot because Estes had received the requested pain-management treatment, specifically a TENS Unit.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Thus, it appears to the court that Estes’s motions for injunctive relief are moot, as he has received the pain management treatment recommended by specialists, specifically the use of a TENS Unit.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Bruce A. Estes, a Virginia inmate, alleged that he had multiple herniated spinal discs and that medical specialists recommended a TENS Unit. He sought an injunction and temporary restraining order requiring medical treatment and exemption from activities involving prolonged sitting or standing. During the case, grievance records indicated that he was receiving a TENS Unit, ibuprofen, and lidocaine patches.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Estes filed a § 1983 complaint and moved for injunctive relief requiring medical treatment, including a TENS Unit, pain-management referral, and orthopedic consultation. After grievance materials showed that he was receiving a TENS Unit and other pain-management treatment, the district court dismissed both motions without prejudice as moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Caballero v. Aranas, 2020 WL 8459158, at *3 (D. Nev. Dec. 11, 2020)

OPINION

Estes

PER CURIAM.

AT HARRISONBURG, VA

FILED

June 16, 2026

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA LAURA A. AUSTIN, CLERK

ROANOKE DIVISION By: S/J.Vasquez

DEPUTY CLERK

BRUCE A. ESTES,)

Plaintiff,) Civil Action No. 7:25-cv-00817) Vv.)) By: Elizabeth K. Dillon VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF) Chief United States District Judge CORRECTIONS, et al.,) Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Pro se plaintiff Bruce A. Estes, a Virginia inmate at Green Rock Correctional Center, filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint alleging deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs. (See Dkt. No. 1, Compl.) Estes alleges that he has been diagnosed with multiple herniated discs in his spine and medical specialists recommended the use of a TENS Unit. (Compl. 7-8.) Estes filed a motion or a preliminary injunction “compelling defendants to provide the treatments recommended by plaintiff’s specialists, including a TENS Unit, pain management referral, and orthopedic consultation.” (Dkt. No. 2.) Estes also moved for a temporary restraining order “requiring Green Rock Correctional Center and VADOC to exempt plaintiff from any activity or program which would require him to have to sit or stand in combination until adequate pain management be made available and cleared by a specialist.” (Dkt. No. 3.) The court notes that plaintiff filed with the court additional evidence pertaining to grievances. (Dkt. No. 20.) Within those documents, a Level II grievance was denied on February 2, 2026, with the following note: “Based on the information provided and upon further investigation, the Level I response of UNFOUNDED will be UPHOLD. You are receiving a TENS unit, Ibuprofen 600mg three times daily as needed as KOP, and Lidocaine patch twice daily as needed.” (Id. at 8.) Thus, it appears to the court that Estes’s motions for injunctive relief are moot, as he has received the pain management treatment recommended by specialists, specifically the use of a TENS Unit. See, e.g., *Caballero v. Aranas*, 3:19-cv-00079-MMD-CLB, 2020 WL 8459158, at *3 (D. Nev. Dec. 11, 2020) (explaining that a prisoner requesting a preliminary injunction for examination by a doctor “was seen by Dr. Benson who completed two radiographs . . . , along with other testing, Thus, because Dr. Benson has already treated Caballero, the relief requested is moot”). For these reasons, it is HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff’s motions for a preliminary injunction and a temporary restraining order (Dkt. Nos. 2, 3) are DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE as moot. The Clerk shall send a copy of this memorandum opinion and order to plaintiff and to all counsel of record. Entered: June 16, 2026. /s/ Elizabeth K. Dillon Elizabeth K. Dillon Chief United States District Judge