

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA, INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

Loren Gary v. Dennis Reagle, et al.

Gary · No. 1:25-cv-01331-JPH-KMB · Decided December 16, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana denied two motions for a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, a motion for declaratory judgment, and a motion to strike. The court held that the first requested injunction lacked a nexus to the claims and sought relief against a nonparty, while the second lacked supporting evidence and clarity regarding the requested relief. The court also found the declaratory judgment motion and motion to strike insufficiently specific, and left a later TRO motion under advisement.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, Indianapolis Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	James Patrick Hanlon
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, Indianapolis Division
DECIDED	December 16, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-01331-JPH-KMB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed three motions for a temporary restraining order and/or preliminary injunction, a motion for declaratory judgment, and a motion to strike the defendants' response to the declaratory-judgment motion. The court denied the first two TRO motions, the declaratory-judgment motion, and the motion to strike; the most recent TRO motion remained under advisement.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district-court order with no reporter or neutral citation.

TOPICS

- injunctions
- declaratory judgment
- civil procedure
- prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court could grant injunctive relief directed at a nonparty and unrelated to the claims in the action.
2. Whether a preliminary injunction should issue when the movant submitted no supporting evidence and failed to clearly identify the requested relief.
3. Whether the plaintiff's declaratory-judgment motion adequately stated the grounds for the requested order.
4. Whether the motion to strike the opposition to the declaratory-judgment motion adequately stated a basis for relief.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court may not enter an injunction directing a nonparty to act or refrain from acting, and it may not grant injunctive relief lacking a nexus to the claims in the action.
2. A preliminary injunction, as an extraordinary remedy, requires some evidentiary support and a sufficiently clear statement of the relief sought.
3. A motion for declaratory judgment must state with particularity the grounds for seeking the order; a conclusory one-sentence request is insufficient.
4. A motion to strike must identify a legally sufficient basis for striking the opposing filing; a vague assertion that the opposition violated constitutional rights is insufficient.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court cannot enter injunctions directing non-parties—such as Ms. McCorkle—to act or refrain from acting, nor can it order injunctive relief that lacks a nexus to the underlying claims.”

“Still, there must be some evidence in support before the Court will consider granting the “extraordinary” remedy of a preliminary injunction.”

“The Court agrees that Mr. Gary's declaratory judgment motion does not adequately state upon what grounds it would be appropriate to issue a declaratory judgment at this stage of the proceedings.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The underlying action concerns alleged Legionnaires' contamination of the water at Pendleton Correctional Facility. Gary's first TRO motion sought to prevent a nonparty staff member, Katelyn McCorkle, from handling his case-related legal mail, although the requested relief was unrelated to the claims proceeding in the action. His second TRO motion alleged that defendants Danielle Stasiak and Centurion Health denied him medical treatment, but he submitted no supporting evidence and did not clearly identify the relief sought. His declaratory-judgment motion consisted of a single conclusory sentence, and his motion to strike the defendants' response was likewise vague.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Loren Gary brought a civil-rights action concerning alleged Legionnaires' contamination of the water at Pendleton Correctional Facility. While the action was pending, he sought emergency injunctive relief, declaratory relief, and to strike the Medical Defendants' opposition to his declaratory-judgment motion. The district court denied the specified motions and warned Gary about inappropriate language in future filings.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Maddox v. Wexford Health Sources, Inc., 528 F. App'x 669, 672 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Pacific Radiation Oncology, LLC v. Queen's Medical Center, 810 F.3d 631, 636 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Dexia Credit Loc. v. Rogan, 602 F.3d 879, 885 (7th Cir. 2010)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-in/2025/loren-gary-v-dennis-reagle-et-al-so7ytv2e>