

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Hrachya Sakoyan v. Kristi Noem, et al.

Sakoyan · No. 25-cv-03406-BAS-MSB · Decided December 4, 2025

OPINION

Sakoyan

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 HRACHYA SAKOYAN, Case No. 25-cv-03406-BAS-MSB 12 Petitioner, ORDER: 13 v.

(1) REQUIRING THE

14 KRISTI NOEM, et al.,

GOVERNMENT TO RESPOND

15 Respondents. TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (ECF No. 1); 16

17 (2) SETTING HEARING ON

PETITION; AND

18

19 (3) GRANTING MOTION TO

SEAL (ECF No. 4)

20 21 22 Petitioner Hrachya Sakoyan filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 23 28
U.S.C. § 2241. (ECF No. 1.) In his Petition, Petitioner claims that he is being detained 24 by
Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) in violation of immigration laws and 25
Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678 (2001). (Id.) In addition, Petitioner filed a Motion to 26 Seal
Exhibit A to his Petition. (ECF No. 4.) 27 Having reviewed the Petition, the Court finds summary
dismissal is unwarranted at 28 this time. See *Kourteva v. INS*, 151 F. Supp. 2d 1126, 1128 (N.D.
Cal. 2001) (“Summary 1 dismissal is appropriate only where the allegations in the petition are
vague or conclusory, 2 palpably incredible, or patently frivolous or false.”). Therefore, the Court
will order the 3 Government to respond to the Petition. 4 Further, the Court finds it appropriate to
seal the requested information. A party 5 seeking to seal a judicial record bears the burden of
overcoming the strong presumption of 6 access. *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d
1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003). The 7 showing required to meet this burden depends upon whether the
documents to be sealed 8 relate to a motion that is “more than tangentially related to the merits of
the case.” *Ctr. for 9 Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1101 (9th Cir. 2016). If the
filing meets 10 this requirement, the “compelling reasons” standard applies. *Id.* Here, because

Exhibit A 11 is part of the Petition, the relevant court filing is “more than tangentially related to the 12 merits of the case.” See *id.* Even so, the Court finds compelling reasons exist to seal the 13 exhibit, as it reveals sensitive information about Petitioner’s claim for withholding of 14 removal and the basis of persecution. See *Doe v. Becerra*, 787 F. Supp. 3d 1083, 1096 15 (E.D. Cal. 2025) (sealing similar information concerning an asylum application). 16 Accordingly, the Court ORDERS as follows: 17 1. The Government must file a response to the Petition no later than December 18 12, 2025. The Government’s response must address the allegations in the Petition and 19 must include any documents relevant to the determination of the issues raised in the 20 Petition. 21 2. Petitioner may file a reply in support of his Petition no later than December 22 19, 2025. 23 3. The parties must appear in Courtroom 12B on January 16, 2026, at 2:30 p.m. 24 for a hearing on the Petition. 25 4. The Court confirms appointment of Federal Defenders of San Diego, Inc., as 26 counsel for Petitioner under Chief Judge Order No. 134 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 18, 2025). 27 5. The Court GRANTS the Motion to Seal (ECF No. 4). The Clerk of Court 28 shall accept and file under seal Exhibit A to the Petition (ECF No. 5). I 6. The Clerk of Court shall provide the Civil Division of the U.S. Attorney’s 2 || Office with a copy of the Petition (ECF No. 1) and this Order. 3 IT IS SO ORDERED. 4 5 || DATED: December 4, 2025 yatta Bahar 6 Hon. Cynthia Bashant, Chief Judge 4 United States District Court 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 Qe