

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Jaskaran Singh v. Warden of the Golden State Annex Detention
Facility, et al.

Singh v. Warden · No. 1:25-cv-1693-DAD-JDP (P) · Decided December 2, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California grants Jaskaran Singh’s application to proceed in forma pauperis and motion for appointment of counsel in his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition. The court appoints the Federal Defender, orders service and briefing coordination, and directs that Singh not be transferred outside the district pending further order.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jeremy D. Peterson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 2, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-1693-DAD-JDP (P)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner filed a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, an application to proceed in forma pauperis, and a motion for appointment of counsel. On preliminary review, the court granted the in forma pauperis application and counsel motion, ordered service of the petition and a return, required a proposed briefing schedule, and temporarily barred transfer of petitioner outside the district.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Preliminary review under Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Habeas Corpus Cases Under Section 2254, applied pursuant to Rule 1(b) to the § 2241 petition.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Jaskaran Singh v. Warden of the Golden State Annex Detention Facility, et al.

TOPICS

immigration detention

immigration

injunctions

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration law

habeas corpus

federal civil procedure

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether petitioner satisfied the requirements to proceed in forma pauperis.
2. Whether the interests of justice required appointment of counsel for the pro se immigration detainee.
3. Whether the § 2241 petition should proceed past preliminary review and be served on respondents for a return.
4. Whether respondent should be temporarily prohibited from transferring petitioner outside the district to preserve the court's jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. Petitioner's application to proceed in forma pauperis satisfied the required showing and was granted.
2. The interests of justice required appointment of counsel because of the complexity of the legal issues, and the Federal Public Defender was appointed to represent petitioner.
3. Because petitioner might be entitled to relief if the alleged constitutional-rights violation were proved, the petition was to be served on respondents, who were directed to show cause why the writ should not be granted by filing a return.
4. Respondent was prohibited from transferring petitioner to another detention center outside the judicial district pending further order, in order to preserve the court's jurisdiction and maintain the status quo.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jaskaran Singh was an immigration detainee held at the Golden State Annex Detention Facility and filed a pro se § 2241 habeas petition alleging a violation of constitutional rights. He requested in forma pauperis status and appointment of counsel. The court determined that the petition could warrant relief if the alleged constitutional violation were proved and that the legal issues were sufficiently complex to justify appointed counsel.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Singh, an immigration detainee proceeding without counsel, filed a § 2241 habeas petition and related motions. The district court conducted preliminary review under Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Habeas Corpus Cases Under Section 2254, as applied to the § 2241 petition. The court granted in forma pauperis status and appointed the Federal Public Defender, ordered respondents to respond to the petition, and entered interim case-management and jurisdiction-preserving directives.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Weygandt v. Look, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983)
- F.T.C. v. Dean Foods Co., 384 U.S. 597, 604 (1966)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-cal/2025/jaskaran-singh-v-warden-of-the-golden-state-annex-detention-5jfhvzyk>