

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Lonnie T. Glinski v. Kasey Morris, et al.

Glinski v. Morris · No. 2:25-cv-00956-AB · Decided December 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon granted Plaintiff Lonnie T. Glinski’s motion to stay his § 1983 action pending resolution of related state habeas proceedings. The court denied his motions for appointment of counsel and a preliminary injunction without prejudice as premature, required periodic status reports, and reserved ruling on the sufficiency of the complaint.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Amy M. Baggio
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
DECIDED	December 10, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00956-AB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 prisoner civil-rights action and moved for appointment of counsel, a preliminary injunction, and a stay pending resolution of related state habeas proceedings.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied a discretionary balancing test for a motion to stay, considering prejudice to the nonmoving party, hardship and inequity to the moving party, and judicial resources saved by avoiding duplicative litigation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; limited persuasive value

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- federal habeas corpus
- injunctions

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil rights
- prisoner litigation
- civil procedure
- federal habeas corpus

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the federal civil-rights action should be stayed pending resolution of Plaintiff's related state habeas proceedings.
2. Whether Plaintiff's motions for appointment of counsel and a preliminary injunction should be denied as premature while the action is stayed.

HOLDINGS

1. The court granted a stay because the federal action and the state habeas proceeding substantially overlapped, a stay would conserve judicial resources by avoiding duplicative litigation, and the stay would not significantly delay the case or unduly prejudice Defendants.
2. The court denied the motions for appointment of counsel and preliminary injunction as premature and without prejudice to refiling after the stay is lifted.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In deciding whether to grant a party’s motion to stay, courts in this circuit typically consider the following three factors: “(1) [the] potential prejudice to the non-moving party; (2) [the] hardship and inequity to the moving party if the action is not stayed; and (3) the judicial resources that would be saved by avoiding duplicative litigation[.]””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, an adult in custody at Two Rivers Correctional Institution, alleged that prison officials overrode medical activity limitations, compelled him to perform labor that was dangerous and painful, and failed to provide adequate medical treatment. He also alleged retaliation for filing grievances, conspiracy to conceal constitutional violations, challenges to Oregon administrative rules, and violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Rehabilitation Act. A related state habeas proceeding concerning overlapping facts and issues was pending in Umatilla County Circuit Court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Glinski filed a federal prisoner civil-rights complaint alleging unconstitutional prison conditions, deliberate indifference to medical needs, retaliation, conspiracy, and statutory violations. He moved to stay the federal action while a state habeas proceeding in Umatilla County Circuit Court was pending. The district court granted the stay, denied the motions for appointment of counsel and preliminary injunction as premature and without prejudice, and reserved ruling on the sufficiency of the complaint.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Patton v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., No. 19-cv-00081, 2019 WL 851933, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 21, 2019)

- *Confederated Tribes & Bands of Yakama Nation v. Airgas USA, LLC*, 435 F. Supp. 3d 1103, 1127 (D. Or. 2019)
- *Rivers v. Walt Disney Co.*, 980 F. Supp. 1358, 1360 (C.D. Cal. 1997)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-oregon-united-states-district-court-for-the-district/2025/lonnie-t-glinski-v-kasey-morris-et-al-iuaxc3uy>