

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS, PEORIA DIVISION

Jeffrey Henson, Sr. v. Thomas et al.

No. 1:25-cv-01185-JEH-RLH, United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Peoria Division
(January 27, 2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois denied Jeffrey Henson’s emergency motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. Henson sought to prevent FBI agents and others from initiating or participating in federal grand jury or criminal proceedings concerning him, alleging retaliatory interference with his employment and legal consulting activities. The court held that federal courts generally do not enjoin criminal investigations or prosecutions and that the motion lacked supporting legal authority under the applicable local rule.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Peoria Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Peoria Division
DECIDED	January 27, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-01185-JEH-RLH
DISPOSITION	denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for an emergency temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction seeking to prohibit federal agents and persons acting in concert with them from initiating, presenting, directing, or participating in any grand-jury or criminal proceeding concerning him. The district court denied the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	To obtain a TRO or preliminary injunction, a plaintiff ordinarily must show some likelihood of success on the merits, no adequate remedy at law, and irreparable harm without the injunction. The court first considered whether the requested relief was legally appropriate even assuming the Rule 65 burden was satisfied.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Jeffrey Henson, Sr. v. Thomas et al.

TOPICS

injunctions

equitable relief

civil rights

criminal procedure

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

injunctive relief

federal criminal procedure

constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court could enjoin federal agents and persons acting in concert with them from initiating, presenting, directing, or participating in an ongoing federal grand-jury or criminal proceeding.
2. Whether Henson demonstrated a basis for the extraordinary equitable relief requested under the preliminary-injunction and TRO standards.
3. Whether Henson's failure to cite supporting legal authority required denial of the motion under Civil Local Rule 7.1(B).

HOLDINGS

1. The requested injunctive relief was not appropriate because federal courts ordinarily do not enjoin criminal prosecutions or interfere with ongoing federal criminal investigations, and Henson identified no authority supporting the extraordinary relief he sought.
2. The motion failed to comply with Civil Local Rule 7.1(B) because it raised legal questions without identifying supporting legal authorities, providing an independent basis for denial.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“It is a familiar rule that courts of equity do not ordinarily restrain criminal prosecutions.” (Section III)

“Prospective defendants cannot, by bringing ancillary equitable proceedings, circumvent federal criminal procedure.” (Section III)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Henson alleged that FBI Special Agents interfered with his legal consulting business, employment, clients, and business associates through retaliatory or otherwise unlawful investigative conduct. He claimed the agents made damaging statements to his employer, accessed financial accounts, and questioned clients and associates. Henson sought to prevent the defendants from participating in federal grand-jury or criminal proceedings after learning that his employer had been subpoenaed to appear before a grand jury.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Henson filed a civil-rights complaint on May 12, 2025, alleging that FBI Special Agents Eric Thomas and Andrew Huckstadt violated his First, Fourth, and Fifth Amendment rights through retaliatory conduct affecting his employment, business, clients, and financial accounts. After filing issues and service-related matters arose, Henson filed the emergency motion on December 22, 2025. The defendants responded, Henson replied, and the district court denied the motion on January 27, 2026.

DISPOSITION

denied

CASES CITED

- Woods v. Buss, 496 F.3d 620, 622 (7th Cir. 2007)
- Coleman v. Goodwill Industries of Southeastern Wisconsin, Inc., 423 F. App'x 642, 643 (7th Cir. 2011)
- Douglas v. City of Jeannette, 319 U.S. 157, 163 (1943)
- Deaver v. Seymour, 822 F.2d 66, 69-71 (D.C. Cir. 1987)
- United States v. McIntosh, 833 F.3d 1163, 1172 (9th Cir. 2016)
- Manafort v. U.S. Department of Justice, 311 F. Supp. 3d 22, 26 (D.D.C. 2018)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-ill/2026/jeffrey-henson-sr-v-thomas-et-al-dww5we40>