

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA, ALEXANDRIA DIVISION**

**Xiong Zeng v. Judge James D. Cain, Jr., DHS/ICE, and Magistrate
Judge Hornsby**

Zeng · No. 26-142-P · Decided March 10, 2026

OPINION

Zeng

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
ALEXANDRIA DIVISION

XIONG ZENG CIVIL ACTION NO. 26-142-P
VERSUS JUDGE JAMES D. CAIN, JR.
DHS/ICE MAGISTRATE JUDGE HORNSBY
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

In accordance with the standing order of this court, this matter was referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge for review, report, and recommendation.

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

Before the court is a petition for writ of habeas corpus filed by pro se petitioner Xiong Zeng (“Petitioner”), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2241. This petition was filed in this court on January 16, 2026. Petitioner, an immigration detainee, was detained in the Winn Correctional Center in Winnfield, Louisiana, when he filed this petition. He challenges his detention. Petitioner names DHS/ICE as respondent. Petitioner was ordered on January 20, 2026 to file, within 30 days of the service of the order, amended pleadings (Doc. 3). However, that order was returned to this court on February 10, 2026, by the United States Postal Service marked “RETURNED TO SENDER - NEED A # Not Correct-UNKNOWN.” To date, Plaintiff has not informed this court of a correct number or address. Accordingly; IT IS RECOMMENDED that this petition be DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE, sua sponte, for failure to prosecute, pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as interpreted by the court and under the court's inherent power to control its own docket. See *Link v. Wabash Railroad Company*, 370 U.S. 626, 82 S.Ct. 1386 (1962); *Rogers v. Kroger Company*, 669 F.2d 317, 320-321 (5th Cir. 1982).

OBJECTIONS

Under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), parties aggrieved by this recommendation have fourteen (14) days from service of this Report and Recommendation to file specific, written objections with the Clerk of Court unless an extension of time is granted

under Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b). A party may respond to another party's objections within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy thereof. Counsel are directed to furnish a courtesy copy of any objections or responses to the District Judge at the time of filing. A party's failure to file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation set forth above, within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy shall bar that party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the proposed factual findings and legal conclusions that were accepted by the district court and that were not objected to by the aforementioned party. See *Douglas v. U.S.A.A.*, 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc). Page 2 of 3 **THUS DONE AND SIGNED**, in chambers, at Shreveport, Louisiana, on this 10th day of March 2026. Mark L. Hornsby U.S. Magistrate Judge Page 3 of 3