

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA, LAKE CHARLES DIVISION

Yasar Qahtan Saud v. Federal BOP, et al.

Yasar Qahtan Saud v. Federal BOP, No. 2:25-cv-00393 (W.D. La. Mar. 16, 2026) (report and recommendation) ·
No. 2:25-cv-00393 · Decided March 16, 2026

SUMMARY

The magistrate judge recommends denying Yasar Qahtan Saud’s motions for a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction concerning religious accommodations at a federal correctional facility. The recommendation concludes that the requested relief is unavailable because Ramadan had ended, Plaintiff had not shown the required elements for injunctive relief, and the Federal Bureau of Prisons is not a proper defendant in a Bivens action. The recommendation also advises dismissing all claims against the Bureau of Prisons and provides fourteen days for objections.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Lake Charles Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Thomas P. LeBlanc, United States Magistrate Judge
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Lake Charles Division
DECIDED	March 16, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00393
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Report and recommendation on the plaintiff’s motions for a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction and screening of claims against the Federal Bureau of Prisons under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On in forma pauperis screening, the court accepts the plaintiff’s allegations as true and may dismiss claims that are frivolous, fail to state a claim, or seek monetary relief from an immune defendant. A temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction requires a clear showing of entitlement, including a substantial likelihood of success on the merits, a substantial threat of irreparable injury, favorable balancing of threatened harms, and consistency with the public interest. A no-notice TRO additionally requires specific facts showing

	immediate and irreparable injury before the adverse party can be heard and written certification of notice efforts.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Yasar Qahtan Saud v. Federal Bureau of Prisons, Warden and Chaplain at the Federal Correctional Institution at Oakdale

TOPICS

injunctions prisoners rights civil rights section 1983 civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights constitutional litigation federal courts injunctive relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Federal Bureau of Prisons may be sued in a Bivens action.
2. Whether Saud established the requirements for a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction based on alleged interference with his religious practice.
3. Whether the timing of the request and the expiration of Ramadan prevented meaningful injunctive relief.
4. Whether the claims against the Federal Bureau of Prisons should be dismissed during in forma pauperis screening.

HOLDINGS

1. A Bivens claim may not be brought against a federal agency such as the Federal Bureau of Prisons; the claims against the Bureau should therefore be dismissed.
2. Saud did not satisfy the requirements for a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction because he could not show immediate and irreparable injury, a substantial likelihood of success on the merits, or all four required injunction factors.
3. Because Saud proceeded in forma pauperis, the complaint was subject to sua sponte screening and dismissal of claims that were frivolous, failed to state a claim, or sought monetary relief from an immune defendant.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Issuing an injunction “is an extraordinary and drastic remedy, not to be granted routinely, but only when the movant, by a clear showing, carries the burden of persuasion.”” (Section II.C)

“If the movant fails to carry the “heavy burden” to show each of these prerequisites, a preliminary injunction is not warranted.” (Section II.C)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Saud, a federal inmate at the Federal Correctional Institution at Oakdale, alleged that prison officials interfered with his Islamic religious practice by failing to provide three dates per meal for breaking his Ramadan fast. He also alleged that the facility failed to provide Shia-specific religious items, restricted access to prayer facilities, postponed Eid al-Fitr prayers, and rescheduled the Eid meal. He sought emergency relief requiring religious accommodations for himself and Muslim inmates.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Saud filed an in forma pauperis complaint alleging that officials at the Federal Correctional Institution at Oakdale interfered with his religious practice during Ramadan and sought emergency injunctive relief. He later filed an amended complaint detailing alleged restrictions on religious items, prayer facilities, and Eid observances. The magistrate judge recommended denying the motions for a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, dismissing all claims against the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and addressing service on the remaining defendants by separate order.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Gonzalez v. Wyatt*, 157 F.3d 1016, 1019 (5th Cir. 1998)
- *Doe v. Dallas Independent School District*, 153 F.3d 211, 215 (5th Cir. 1998)
- *Horton v. Cockrell*, 70 F.3d 397, 400 (5th Cir. 1995)
- *Bradley v. Puckett*, 157 F.3d 1025 (5th Cir. 1998)
- *Marino v. Mairorana*, 707 F. App'x 812, 812 (5th Cir. 2018)
- *FDIC v. Meyer*, 510 U.S. 471 (1994)
- *Clark v. Prichard*, 812 F.2d 991, 993 (5th Cir. 1987)
- *White v. Carlucci*, 862 F.2d 1209, 1211 (5th Cir. 1988)
- *Miss. Power & Light Co. v. United Gas Pipe Line Co.*, 760 F.2d 618, 621 (5th Cir. 1985)
- *Enrique Bernat F., S.A. v. Guadalajara, Inc.*, 210 F.3d 439, 442 (5th Cir. 2000)
- *Enterprise Int'l, Inc. v. Corporacion Estatal Petrolera Ecuatoriana*, 762 F.2d 464, 472 (5th Cir. 1985)
- *Goff v. Harper*, 60 F.3d 518, 520 (8th Cir. 1995)
- *Rogers v. Scurr*, 676 F.2d 1211, 1214 (8th Cir. 1982)
- *Young v. Wainwright*, 449 F.2d 338, 339 (5th Cir. 1971)
- *Ali v. Washington*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 105955, *10 (E.D. Mich. May 6, 2025)
- *Sepulvado v. Jindal*, 729 F.3d 413, 417 (5th Cir. 2013)
- *Williams v. Gauna*, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 90246, *23 (S.D. Tex. Apr. 19, 2022)
- *Douglass v. United Services Automobile Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1429-30 (5th Cir. 1996)

