

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Larry Porchia v. James Dzurenda, et al.

Porchia · No. 2:25-cv-01839-APG-NJK · Decided December 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada denied Larry Porchia’s motion for a temporary restraining order concerning alleged deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs. The court found no current likelihood of irreparable harm because Porchia had been transferred to another facility, where he was receiving medical care, medications, testing approvals, and cardiology follow-up. The court also granted the defendants’ motion to extend time.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Andrew P. Gordon
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	December 5, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-01839-APG-NJK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff, an inmate alleging deliberate indifference to serious medical needs, moved for a temporary restraining order. The district court denied the TRO and granted defendants' motion to extend time.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A temporary restraining order requires a showing including a likelihood of irreparable harm; the court assessed whether that requirement remained satisfied based on the current record.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reported citation.

TOPICS

- injunctions
- prisoners rights
- health law
- civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil rights
- prisoner medical care
- injunctive relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Porchia was entitled to a temporary restraining order based on alleged deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs.
2. Whether defendants should receive an extension of time.

HOLDINGS

1. A temporary restraining order was not warranted because Porchia no longer demonstrated a likelihood of irreparable harm based on the undisputed evidence of his medical care after transfer.
2. Defendants' motion to extend time was granted.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Accordingly, there is no need for an injunction because even if Porchia faced a likelihood of irreparable harm when he filed his motion, he does not now.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Porchia was an inmate in Nevada Department of Corrections custody and was housed at High Desert State Prison when he filed the action and sought emergency relief based on alleged deliberate indifference to his serious heart-related medical needs. He was later transferred to Lovelock Correctional Center. Defendants presented undisputed evidence that he was receiving medical attention and medications, had been approved for tests and cardiology follow-up, had normal blood-pressure checks, and did not require intensive care.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Larry Porchia filed suit while incarcerated at High Desert State Prison and sought a temporary restraining order concerning his heart-related medical treatment. Before the court ruled, he was transferred to Lovelock Correctional Center, where defendants submitted evidence that he was receiving medical care, medications, testing approvals, and cardiology follow-up. Porchia did not reply or dispute that evidence.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)

OPINION

Porchia

PER CURIAM.

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 LARRY PORCHIA, Case No.: 2:25-cv-01839-APG-NJK 4 Plaintiff Order Denying Motion for
Temporary Restraining Order 5 v. [ECF No. 1-1] 6 JAMES DZURENDA, et al., 7 Defendants 8

Larry Porchia is an inmate in the custody of the Nevada Department of Corrections. 9 Porchia was at High Desert State Prison (HDSP) when he filed this lawsuit and moved for a 10 temporary restraining order (TRO) based on allegations that the defendants were deliberately 11 indifferent to his serious medical needs related to his heart condition. ECF Nos. 1; 1-1. 12 However, he has since been moved to Lovelock Correctional Center (LLC). ECF No. 24-1 at 2. 13 The defendants have presented evidence that since Porchia arrived at LLC, he has received 14 medical attention and medications, has been approved for various tests and a cardiology follow 15 up, his blood pressure checks have been normal, and he does not require intensive care. Id. at 2- 16 4. Porchia has not filed a reply, and thus has not disputed that evidence. Accordingly, there is 17 no need for an injunction because even if Porchia faced a likelihood of irreparable harm when he 18 filed his motion, he does not now. See *Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 19 (2008). 20 I THEREFORE ORDER Larry Porchia's motion for temporary restraining order (ECF 21 No. 1-1) is DENIED. 22 // // // 23 // // // 1 I FURTHER ORDER that the defendants' motion to extend time (ECF No. 23) is 2] GRANTED. 3 DATED this 5th day of December, 2025. Gy > ANDREW P.GORDON sits 6 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 7 8 9 10 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23