

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE, WESTERN DIVISION

Robert Wegner, M.D. v. Tenet Physician Resources, St. Francis
Physician Network, LLC, St. Francis Hospital, and Tenet Healthcare
Corporation

Wegner · No. 2:25-cv-02389-SHL-atc · Decided February 17, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee denied Robert Wegner, M.D.’s motion for reconsideration of the denial of his motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. Applying Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b), the court held that newly discovered evidence concerning a December 6, 2025 telephone call did not alter its prior conclusion that Wegner lacked standing for the requested injunctive relief.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee, Western Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sheryl H. Lipman
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee, Western Division
DECIDED	February 17, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-02389-SHL-atc
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b) for reconsideration of the court's prior order denying his motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b), an interlocutory order may be revised before entry of final judgment. Reconsideration is traditionally justified by an intervening change in controlling law, newly available evidence, or the need to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice; it should not be used to relitigate previously considered issues.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential interlocutory district-court order

PARTIES

Robert Wegner, M.D. v. Tenet Physician Resources, St. Francis Physician Network, LLC, St. Francis Hospital, Tenet Healthcare Corporation

TOPICS

motion for reconsideration

standing

injunctions

civil procedure

equitable relief

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

remedies

health law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should reconsider its interlocutory order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b) based on the December 6, 2025 telephone call and related communications.
2. Whether the alleged new evidence altered the court's prior conclusion that Wegner lacked standing to obtain temporary or preliminary injunctive relief.

HOLDINGS

1. Reconsideration of the prior interlocutory order was not warranted because the December 6 telephone call was the same type of evidence previously considered and did not establish an intervening change in law, clear error, manifest injustice, or materially different grounds for relief.
2. The December 6 telephone call did not establish an injury in fact or redressable harm sufficient to give Wegner standing for the requested extraordinary relief.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Even if Defendants were not already providing the sort of relief that Wegner is requesting, to order them to do so with an injunction would once again not redress any of the harm Wegner alleges he has suffered.”
(PageID 494)

“Fielding the occasional phone call from the St. Francis staff and having to inform them that he is no longer affiliated with the hospital does not amount to an injury in fact that would warrant putting in place mechanisms that would help ensure those calls are not made.” (PageID 495)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Wegner was terminated by St. Francis Hospital on March 20, 2025, and thereafter was no longer employed by the hospital, did not have hospital privileges, and lacked malpractice-insurance coverage through it. After the court denied his request for injunctive relief, a St. Francis transfer-center operator called him on December 6, 2025, regarding a life-threatening bariatric emergency. Wegner relied on that call and an undated text exchange as new evidence that defendants lacked adequate bariatric coverage and that he faced ethical, legal, and reputational risks. He told the caller that he was no longer employed by St. Francis, lacked privileges and malpractice coverage, and could not participate in the patient's care.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court previously denied Wegner's request for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction after determining that he lacked Article III and prudential standing. Wegner later moved for reconsideration based on a December 6, 2025 telephone call concerning a bariatric-emergency patient and related communications. The defendants responded, and the court denied reconsideration.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Rodriguez v. Tenn. Laborers Health & Welfare Fund, 89 F. App'x 949, 959 (6th Cir. 2004)
- Curtiss-Wright Corp. v. Gen. Elec. Co., 446 U.S. 1, 10 (1980)
- Am. Marietta Corp. v. Essroc Cement Corp., 59 F. App'x 668, 671 (6th Cir. 2003)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-western-district-of-tennessee-western-division-united-states-di/2026/robert-wegner-m-d-v-tenet-physician-resources-st-francis-e77sf65c>