

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
WEST VIRGINIA

Aaron Jimmie Urban v. Chris Mason

Urban · No. 2:25-cv-00034 · Decided December 15, 2025

SUMMARY

A United States magistrate judge recommends dismissing without prejudice Aaron Jimmie Urban’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition challenging his ongoing West Virginia pretrial detention. The recommendation concludes that Urban failed to exhaust available state remedies, that Younger abstention applies to the pending state criminal proceedings, and that monetary damages are unavailable in a habeas action. The document also provides notice of the procedure and deadline for filing objections.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dwane L. Tinsley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia
DECIDED	December 15, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00034
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A state pretrial detainee filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The matter was referred to a magistrate judge for proposed findings and a recommendation under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The magistrate judge reviewed the habeas petition and recommended disposition under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), subject to de novo review of properly filed objections. The recommendation applied the exhaustion requirement for § 2241 petitions involving state pretrial detention and the Younger abstention doctrine.
PARTIES	Aaron Jimmie Urban v. Chris Mason

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the federal district court should entertain a § 2241 petition challenging an ongoing state criminal prosecution when the petitioner had not exhausted available state remedies.

2. Whether Younger abstention required dismissal of the petition because an ongoing state proceeding implicated important state interests and provided an adequate opportunity to raise federal claims.
3. Whether monetary compensation for alleged wrongful imprisonment was available in a habeas corpus proceeding.

HOLDINGS

1. A state pretrial detainee must fully exhaust available state remedies before seeking habeas relief under § 2241 in federal court.
2. Federal courts should abstain from interfering with ongoing state criminal proceedings when the proceeding is ongoing, implicates important state interests, and provides an adequate opportunity to present federal claims, absent extraordinary circumstances.
3. Monetary damages are not an available remedy in a habeas corpus proceeding.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Urban was a state pretrial detainee held at the South Central Regional Jail after being indicted by a Kanawha County grand jury on six counts, including first-degree robbery and firearm-related offenses. His state criminal proceedings remained pending, with repeated competency concerns and psychological evaluations contributing to trial delays. Urban sought federal dismissal of the state prosecution, release from custody, and compensation for alleged wrongful imprisonment, but the record indicated that he had not exhausted available state remedies.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Urban filed the present § 2241 petition on January 21, 2025, challenging his ongoing state pretrial detention and asserting due process, ineffective-assistance or self-representation, equal-protection, and speedy-trial claims. He had previously filed a § 2241 petition concerning the same custody, which was dismissed by the district court on May 16, 2024, primarily under Younger abstention. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal of the present petition without prejudice because Urban had not exhausted available state remedies, the state criminal proceeding remained ongoing, Younger abstention applied, and monetary damages were unavailable in habeas.

DISPOSITION

dismissed