

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Angel Martinez Echeverria v. James Janecka et al.

Echeverria v. Janecka · No. 5:25-cv-03070-MRA-DTB · Decided November 21, 2025

SUMMARY

The Central District of California issued an order to show cause concerning whether a habeas petition should be transferred to the Eastern District of California. The court noted conflicting information regarding the petitioner’s detention location and ordered the parties to explain why transfer should not occur by November 24, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Monica Ramirez Almadant
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	November 21, 2025
DOCKET	5:25-cv-03070-MRA-DTB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner brought a federal habeas corpus petition and an ex parte application for a temporary restraining order. Respondents moved to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, and the court issued an order to show cause regarding transfer to the Eastern District of California.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential interlocutory order
PARTIES	Angel Martinez Echeverria v. James Janecka et al.

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- immigration detention
- venue
- subject matter jurisdiction

PRACTICE AREAS

- federal habeas corpus
- immigration detention
- immigration

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the habeas matter should be transferred to the Eastern District of California based on the location of Petitioner's detention when the petition was filed.
2. Whether a transfer, rather than dismissal, is the appropriate course if the action was filed in the incorrect venue.

HOLDINGS

1. For purposes of habeas corpus relief, jurisdiction attaches when the petition is initially filed and is not destroyed by the petitioner's subsequent transfer or accompanying custodial change.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“jurisdiction attaches on initial filing for habeas corpus relief, and it is not destroyed by a transfer of the petitioner and the accompanying custodial change.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner was in immigration custody. His filings stated that he was detained at the Adelanto Detention Center in Adelanto, California, within the Central District of California, while Respondents represented that he had been held at the Golden State Annex in McFarland, California, within the Eastern District of California, since September 17, 2025. Petitioner did not directly refute Respondents’ representation concerning his place of detention when the habeas petition was filed.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus and an ex parte application for a temporary restraining order in the Central District of California. Respondents asserted that Petitioner had been detained in the Eastern District of California since September 17, 2025, and moved to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction. Petitioner argued that, if venue was improper, the action should be transferred rather than dismissed. The court ordered the parties to show cause why the matter should not be transferred to the Eastern District of California.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Francis v. Rison, 894 F.3d 353, 354 (9th Cir. 1990)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL MINUTES — GENERAL Case No. 5:25-cv-03070-MRA-DTB Date November 21, 2025 Title Angel Martinez Echeverria v. James Janecka et al. Present: The Honorable MONICA RAMIREZ ALMADANT, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Melissa H. Kunig None Present Deputy Clerk Court Reporter Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs: Attorneys Present for Defendants: None

Present None Present Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE The Court is in receipt of the Respondents' Request to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction, ECF 7, and Notice of Errata, ECF 8, and Petitioner's Reply in Support of Ex Parte Application for Restraining Order, ECF 9.

Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order indicate that Petitioner is currently in custody at the Adelanto Detention Center, Adelanto, California, which is located in the Central District of California. Respondents, however, represent, based on information provided by the Immigration and Customs Enforcement website, that since September 17, 2025, Petitioner has been in custody at the Golden State Annex, which is located in McFarland, California, in the Eastern District of California.

ECF 8-1 at 2. Respondents argue that this Court therefore lacks jurisdiction over Petitioner's habeas petition. *Jd.* at 3. In his Reply, Petitioner contends that, to the extent this action was filed in the incorrect venue, the proper course is to transfer to the Eastern District of California rather than to dismiss the petition. ECF 9.

However, Petitioner does not directly address or refute Respondents' representations as to where he was detained when he filed his habeas petition. See *Francis v. Rison*, 894 F.3d 353, 354 (9th Cir. 1990) (“[J]urisdiction attaches on initial filing for habeas corpus relief, and it is not destroyed by a transfer of the petitioner and the accompanying custodial change.” (quotation marks and citation omitted)).

The parties are therefore ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE in writing, no later than November 24, 2025, at 12:00 p.m., as to why this matter should not be transferred to the Eastern District of California. Failure to file a response by that deadline will be deemed consent to the transfer. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL MINUTES — GENERAL Case No. 5:25-cv-03070-MRA-DTB Date November 21, 2025 Title Angel Martinez Echeverria v. James Janecka et al. IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Deputy Clerk mku