

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Brandyn James Charles Olinger v. Dr. Warren Roberts, et al.

Olinger · No. 3:25-cv-00950-MO · Decided February 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon denied Brandyn James Charles Olinger’s motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction seeking testosterone treatments while incarcerated. The court concluded that Olinger had not shown a serious medical need, likelihood of success on his Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim, or irreparable harm because recent testosterone levels were generally within the normal range and his treating endocrinologist advised him to remain off testosterone. The court also denied Olinger’s second motion for appointment of counsel.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael W. Mosman
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
DECIDED	February 12, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-cv-00950-MO
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction requiring prison officials to provide testosterone treatments, and separately moved for appointment of counsel.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must establish likely success on the merits, likely irreparable harm absent relief, that the balance of equities favors relief, and that an injunction is in the public interest. A plaintiff may alternatively show serious questions going to the merits and that the balance of hardships tips sharply in his favor, while satisfying the remaining Winter factors. A mandatory injunction altering the status quo is disfavored and requires that the facts and law clearly favor the moving party.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Brandyn James Charles Olinger v. Dr. Warren Roberts, et al.

TOPICS

prisoners rights section 1983 injunctions health law civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights prisoner medical care injunctive relief civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff was entitled to a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction requiring prison officials to provide testosterone treatments.
2. Whether Plaintiff had shown a likelihood of success on an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim based on the denial of testosterone therapy.
3. Whether Plaintiff had demonstrated irreparable harm absent preliminary injunctive relief.
4. Whether Plaintiff's second motion for appointment of counsel should be granted.

HOLDINGS

1. Preliminary injunctive relief was denied because Plaintiff did not establish a likelihood of success on the merits or a risk of irreparable harm.
2. On the record presented, Plaintiff failed to show a serious medical need for testosterone treatments or that Defendants were deliberately indifferent to such a need.
3. The second Motion for Appointment of Counsel was denied for the reasons stated in the court's November 19, 2025 order.

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.” (1)

“A request for a mandatory injunction seeking relief well beyond the status quo is disfavored and shall not be granted unless the facts and law clearly favor the moving party.” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Olinger alleged that Oregon prison officials violated his Eighth Amendment right to medical care by refusing to provide testosterone treatments prescribed after an outside endocrinology consultation. Although one prior testosterone test was below 300 ng/dL, subsequent early-morning tests were within the normal range, including tests shortly after the consultation and in October 2025. The prison's Therapeutic Level of Care Committee denied treatment because the results were not consistently below the applicable threshold, and the endocrinologist later documented normalized testosterone and prolactin levels and advised Olinger to remain off testosterone and cabergoline for the time being.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This prisoner civil-rights action came before the District of Oregon on Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction and his second Motion for Appointment of Counsel. The court incorporated the reasons from its November 19, 2025 order in denying the second counsel motion and denied preliminary injunctive relief because Plaintiff failed to show likely success on the merits or irreparable harm.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Stuhlbarg Intern. Sales Co., Inc. v. John D. Brushy and Co., Inc., 240 F.3d 832, 839 n. 7 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)
- Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell, 632 F.3d 1127, 1134-35 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Stanley v. Univ. of S. Cal., 13 F.3d 1313, 1319-20 (9th Cir. 1994)
- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1131 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Doty v. County of Lassen, 37 F.3d 540, 546 (9th Cir. 1994)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 835 (1994)
- Toguchi v. Chung, 391 F.3d 1051, 1057 (9th Cir. 2004)