

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA, SOUTH BEND DIVISION

Terrance D. Hood v. Ron Neal

Hood · No. 3:25-CV-952-CCB-SJF · Decided February 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The court denied Terrance D. Hood’s motion for a preliminary injunction seeking Ensure nutritional drinks and medical treatment related to his heart and pacemaker. The court held that Hood had not shown that denial of Ensure constituted constitutionally inadequate medical care or that he would suffer irreparable harm. The court also stayed the case pending screening of Hood’s amended complaint.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, South Bend Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Cristal C. Brisco
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, South Bend Division
DECIDED	February 5, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-CV-952-CCB-SJF
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for a preliminary injunction requiring prison medical personnel to provide Ensure and arrange or facilitate medical treatment. The court denied the motion and stayed the case pending screening of the amended complaint.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Preliminary injunction standard under which the movant must show a likelihood of success on the merits, likely irreparable harm absent preliminary relief, a favorable balance of equities, and that an injunction is in the public interest.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Terrance D. Hood v. Ron Neal

TOPICS

injunctions

prisoners rights

cruel and unusual punishment

section 1983

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

prisoner litigation

constitutional law

health law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Hood was entitled to a preliminary injunction requiring Indiana State Prison medical personnel to provide Ensure and arrange or facilitate the requested cardiac treatment.
2. Whether the case should be stayed while the court screened Hood's amended complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. Hood was not entitled to a preliminary injunction because he did not demonstrate that denial of Ensure constituted constitutionally inadequate medical care or that he would suffer irreparable harm without it.
2. The case was stayed pending the court's screening of Hood's amended complaint.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest.”

“Prisoners are “not entitled to demand specific care[, nor are they] entitled to the best care possible.””

“ “[D]isagreement between two medical professionals about the proper course of treatment generally is insufficient, by itself, to establish an Eighth Amendment violation.” ”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Hood, a prisoner at Indiana State Prison, alleged that prison medical personnel failed to follow a cardiologist's recommendations concerning Ensure and cardiac or pacemaker-related treatment. The record showed that he had scheduled medical appointments, extensive medical care, and a planned cardiology visit for pacemaker replacement. Both sides agreed that Hood was not receiving Ensure, but the warden asserted that Hood's body-mass index and alleged trafficking provided reasons not to provide it. Hood did not identify record evidence establishing that Ensure was constitutionally necessary or that its denial would cause irreparable harm.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Hood, an incarcerated pro se plaintiff, filed an amended complaint and a motion for a preliminary injunction concerning his cardiac and pacemaker-related medical care. The court deferred screening the amended complaint to address the allegedly urgent injunction motion. After considering the prison warden's response, medical records, and Hood's reply, the court denied preliminary relief and stayed the action pending screening.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)
- Forbes v. Edgar, 112 F.3d 262, 267 (7th Cir. 1997)
- Jackson v. Kotter, 541 F.3d 688, 697 (7th Cir. 2008)
- Johnson v. Dominguez, 5 F.4th 818, 825 (7th Cir. 2021)
- Riley v. Waterman, 126 F.4th 1287, 1296 (7th Cir. 2025)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-in/2026/terrance-d-hood-v-ron-neal-u92pz800>