

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA, SHREVEPORT DIVISION

David Larmar, et al. v. Latoria Grant, et al.

Larmar v. Grant · No. Civil Action No. 25-1976 · Decided February 18, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana denied Plaintiffs’ motion for a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction after finding that Plaintiffs had not made the required showing under the applicable four-factor test. The Court ordered Plaintiffs to ensure valid service of the Complaint and motion on Defendants and stated that it would address further proceedings concerning the preliminary-injunction motion after Defendants appeared.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Shreveport Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	S. Maurice Hicks, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Shreveport Division
DECIDED	February 18, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 25-1976
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs moved for a preliminary injunction. The court denied the requested injunctive relief for failure to satisfy the applicable four-factor standard and ordered Plaintiffs to complete valid service before further proceedings.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A preliminary injunction requires a showing of (1) a substantial likelihood of success on the merits, (2) a substantial threat of irreparable injury absent an injunction, (3) threatened injury that exceeds any harm resulting from the injunction, and (4) consistency with the public interest.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	David Larmar et al. v. Latoria Grant et al.

TOPICS

injunctions

service of process

civil procedure

equitable relief

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

injunctive relief

civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiffs satisfied the four-factor standard for preliminary injunctive relief.
2. Whether Plaintiffs were required to complete valid service of the Complaint and motion on Defendants before further proceedings on the preliminary-injunction motion.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiffs were not entitled to preliminary injunctive relief because they failed to demonstrate the required factors for such relief.
2. Plaintiffs were ordered to ensure that valid service of the Complaint and motion for preliminary injunction had been made on Defendants in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure before the court would take up further proceedings after Defendants appeared.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“To obtain the relief Plaintiffs seek, Plaintiffs would have to show (1) a substantial likelihood of success on the merits, (2) a substantial threat of irreparable injury absent an injunction, (3) that the threatened injury would exceed any harm that would flow from the injunction, and (4) that the injunction would not undermine the public interest.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The document provides little substantive factual background. Plaintiffs sought preliminary injunctive relief in an action against Latoria Grant and other Defendants. The court found that Plaintiffs had not made the showing required for injunctive relief and directed them to complete valid service before further proceedings.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed a civil-rights action and moved for a preliminary injunction. The district court considered the motion and denied the requested temporary restraining order, while directing Plaintiffs to ensure valid service of the Complaint and motion on Defendants. The court stated that it would address further proceedings concerning the preliminary-injunction motion after Defendants appeared.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Walgreen Co. v. Hood, 275 F.3d 475, 477 (5th Cir. 2001)

OPINION

Larmar

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

SHREVEPORT DIVISION

DAVID LARMAR, ET AL. CIVIL ACTION NO. 25-1976

VERSUS JUDGE S. MAURICE HICKS, JR.

LATORIA GRANT, ET AL. MAGISTRATE JUDGE MCCLUSKY

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Record Document 16). To obtain the relief Plaintiffs seek, Plaintiffs would have to show (1) a substantial likelihood of success on the merits, (2) a substantial threat of irreparable injury absent an injunction, (3) that the threatened injury would exceed any harm that would flow from the injunction, and (4) that the injunction would not undermine the public interest. See *Walgreen Co. v. Hood*, 275 F.3d 475, 477 (5th Cir. 2001). Because Plaintiffs have failed to make such a showing, the Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order is DENIED. Plaintiffs are hereby ordered to ensure that valid service has been made on Defendants with the Complaint (Record Document 1) and the Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Record Document 16) in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Once the Defendants have appeared, the Court will take up further proceedings regarding Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction. **THUS DONE AND SIGNED**, in Shreveport, Louisiana, this 18th day of February, 2026. Kk rtwcree [pln

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT