

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, PANAMA CITY DIVISION

Christopher Goodwin v. State of Florida and Tommy Ford

No. 5:25-cv-324-AW/MJF, United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida, Panama City
Division (December 3, 2025)

SUMMARY

The magistrate judge recommends denying without prejudice Christopher Goodwin’s emergency motion for a temporary restraining order concerning the seizure of his firearms pursuant to a Florida domestic-violence injunction. The recommendation concludes that the motion failed to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65 and the Northern District of Florida’s local rules, and that Goodwin had not established the prerequisites for emergency injunctive relief.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida, Panama City Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael J. Frank
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida, Panama City Division
DECIDED	December 3, 2025
DOCKET	5:25-cv-324-AW/MJF
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved on an emergency basis for a temporary restraining order concerning firearms seized pursuant to a Florida domestic-violence injunction. The magistrate judge issued a report and recommendation that the district court deny the motion without prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A temporary restraining order is an extraordinary remedy available only in exceptional circumstances. The movant must establish a substantial likelihood of success on the merits, a substantial likelihood of irreparable injury, that the threatened injury outweighs any injury to the nonmovant, and that the injunction would not disserve the public interest. For an ex parte TRO, Rule 65(b)(1) additionally requires specific facts showing immediate and irreparable injury and written

	certification of efforts to provide notice or reasons notice should not be required.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential report and recommendation
PARTIES	Christopher Goodwin v. State of Florida, Tommy Ford

TOPICS

injunctions civil procedure second amendment due process civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure constitutional law civil rights injunctive relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the emergency motion for a temporary restraining order complied with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b)(1).
2. Whether the motion complied with the Northern District of Florida's local rules and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 10(a) concerning case captions and case styles.
3. Whether Goodwin established the prerequisites for a temporary restraining order, including likelihood of success on the merits and irreparable injury.

HOLDINGS

1. The motion could not support an ex parte temporary restraining order because it did not state the efforts made to provide notice or the reasons notice should not be required.
2. The motion was procedurally deficient because it did not include the required case style.
3. Goodwin failed to establish entitlement to a temporary restraining order because the motion did not analyze the required factors and did not demonstrate a substantial likelihood of success or irreparable injury.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A TRO is an extraordinary remedy.”

“Failure to establish even one of the first two factors is fatal to a motion for a TRO.”

“Because Plaintiff failed to comply with applicable procedural rules and failed to establish essential prerequisites for a temporary restraining order, the undersigned respectfully RECOMMENDS that the District Court DENY without prejudice Plaintiff’s Emergency Motion for a temporary restraining order.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Goodwin alleged that the Bay County Sheriff seized his firearms on November 3, 2025, pursuant to a Florida court's domestic-violence injunction. He asserted claims under the Second, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments.

His emergency TRO motion was less than one page and did not explain efforts to notify the adverse parties or why notice should be excused, nor did it analyze the requirements for injunctive relief.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Goodwin commenced this civil-rights action against the State of Florida and Tommy Ford, alleging violations of the Second, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments after the Bay County Sheriff seized his firearms. He filed an emergency motion for a temporary restraining order. The matter was referred to a magistrate judge, who recommended denial without prejudice because the motion failed to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65 and applicable local rules and did not establish the prerequisites for injunctive relief.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Ragan v. Blakely, 2022 WL 635425, at *3 (S.D. Ga. Feb. 10, 2022)
- VanDeCruze v. Nationstar Mortg. LLC, No. 8:18-CV-1027-T-36MAP, 2018 WL 3391349, at *2 (M.D. Fla. May 1, 2018)
- Moon v. Newsome, 863 F.3d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989)
- Benisek v. Lamone, 138 S. Ct. 1942, 1943 (2018)
- Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20, 24 (2008)
- Bloedorn v. Grubs, 631 F.3d 1218, 1229 (11th Cir. 2011)
- United States v. Lambert, 695 F.2d 536, 539 (11th Cir. 1983)
- Univ. of Texas v. Camenisch, 451 U.S. 390, 395 (1981)
- Granny Goose Foods Inc. v. Bhd. of Teamsters, 415 U.S. 423, 439 (1974)
- All Care Nursing Serv. v. Bethesda Mem'l Hosp., 887 F.2d 1535, 1537 (11th Cir. 1989)
- Vital Pharm., Inc. v. Alfieri, 23 F.4th 1282, 1290–91 (11th Cir. 2022)
- In re Gateway Radiology Consultants, P.A., 983 F.3d 1239, 1254 (11th Cir. 2020)
- Ingram v. Ault, 50 F.3d 898, 900 (11th Cir. 1995)
- Swain v. Junior, 958 F.3d 1081, 1091 (11th Cir. 2020) (per curiam)
- Mazurek v. Armstrong, 520 U.S. 968, 972 (1997) (per curiam)
- Church v. City of Huntsville, 30 F.3d 1332, 1342 (11th Cir. 1994)