

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Bismarck Alfredo Martinez Obando v. Warden, Golden State Annex

Martinez Obando · No. 1:24-cv-01328-SAB-HC · Decided May 23, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California recommends granting the respondent’s motion to dismiss an immigration habeas petition as moot. The petitioner sought release from detention, but was released on an order of supervision during the litigation, eliminating the Article III case or controversy. The court also directs substitution of the Warden, Golden State Annex, as respondent and random assignment to a district judge.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stanley A. Boone
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	May 23, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-01328-SAB-HC
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, alleging that ICE detained him beyond the statutory removal period and requesting immediate release. Respondent moved to dismiss after Petitioner was released on an order of supervision.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied Article III’s case-or-controversy requirement and assessed whether an actual injury remained that could be redressed by a favorable judicial decision.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Bismarck Alfredo Martinez Obando v. Warden, Golden State Annex

TOPICS

- immigration detention
- federal habeas corpus
- removal proceedings
- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration detention

federal habeas corpus

mootness

civil procedure

constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Petitioner's release from ICE detention on an order of supervision mooted his § 2241 challenge seeking immediate release.
2. Whether the immediate custodian, Warden, Golden State Annex, should be substituted as the respondent in this core habeas challenge to physical confinement.

HOLDINGS

1. Petitioner's release on an order of supervision mooted his challenge to the legality of his extended detention because he had received the remedy he sought and no live case or controversy remained.
2. The warden of the facility where the petitioner is held is the proper respondent in a core habeas challenge to present physical confinement, and Warden, Golden State Annex should be substituted as respondent.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Given that Petitioner has received the remedy to which he would have been entitled had this Court rendered a favorable judicial decision on his petition, the Court finds that no case or controversy exists." (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner was detained by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and alleged that his detention extended beyond the removal period authorized by 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6), violating the statute and the Fifth Amendment. He sought immediate release from custody. On December 18, 2024, he was released on an order of supervision, which provided the relief sought through the petition.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed the § 2241 petition on October 30, 2024. Respondent moved to dismiss on February 3, 2025, arguing that Petitioner's release on supervision rendered the petition moot; Petitioner did not oppose the motion. The magistrate judge recommended granting the motion and dismissing the petition as moot, directed substitution of the facility warden as respondent, and ordered random assignment to a district judge for review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

DISPOSITION

dismissed

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No remand was ordered. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal as moot, directed the Clerk to randomly assign the action to a district judge and substitute Warden, Golden State Annex as respondent, and advised that

the assigned district judge would review the recommendation under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

CASES CITED

- *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 435 (2004)
- *Doe v. Garland*, 109 F.4th 1188, 1197 (9th Cir. 2024)
- *Lewis v. Continental Bank Corp.*, 494 U.S. 472, 477 (1990)
- *Spencer v. Kemna*, 523 U.S. 1, 7 (1998)
- *Abdala v. INS*, 488 F.3d 1061, 1064 (9th Cir. 2007)
- *Riley v. INS*, 310 F.3d 1253, 1256-57 (10th Cir. 2002)
- *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014)
- *Baxter v. Sullivan*, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 8
9 BISMARCK ALFREDO MARTINEZ Case No. 1:24-cv-01328-SAB-HC OBANDO, 10
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION TO Petitioner, GRANT RESPONDENT’S MOTION
TO 11 DISMISS AND TO DISMISS PETITION v. FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AS 12
MOOT WARDEN, GOLDEN STATE ANNEX, 13 (ECF No. 10) Respondent. 14 ORDER
DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO RANDOMLY ASSIGN DISTRICT 15 JUDGE AND
SUBSTITUTE WARDEN, GOLDEN STATE ANNEX, AS 16 RESPONDENT 17 18 Petitioner is
proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 19 U.S.C. § 2241.

20 I. 21 BACKGROUND 22 On October 30, 2024, Petitioner filed the instant petition for writ of
habeas corpus. (ECF 23 No. 1). Petitioner alleged that he has been detained by U.S. Immigration
and Customs 24 Enforcement (“ICE”) beyond the removal period authorized by law, in violation
of 8 U.S.C. 25 1 “[L]ongstanding practice confirms that in habeas challenges to present physical
confinement—‘core challenges’— 26 the default rule is that the proper respondent is the warden
of the facility where the prisoner is being held....” *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 435 (2004).

In the immigration detention context, the Ninth Circuit has held that 27 “[u]nder *Padilla*,
[Petitioner] must name his immediate custodian[.]” *Doe v. Garland*, 109 F.4th 1188, 1197 (9th Cir.
2024). As noted by Respondent, at the time the instant petition was filed, Petitioner’s immediate
custodian was the 1 § 1231(a)(6) and the Fifth Amendment. (ECF No. 1 at 6.2) Petitioner
requested immediate 2 release from custody.

(*Id.* at 7.) 3 On February 3, 2025, Respondent filed a motion to dismiss the petition as moot
because 4 Petitioner has been released on supervision. (ECF No. 10.) Petitioner has not filed an
opposition, 5 and the time to do so has passed. 6 II. 7 DISCUSSION 8 Article III of the United
States Constitution limits the jurisdiction of federal courts to 9 “actual, ongoing cases or
controversies.” *Lewis v. Continental Bank Corp.*, 494 U.S. 472, 477 10 (1990). “This case-or-

controversy requirement subsists through all stages of federal judicial proceedings,” which “means that, throughout the litigation, the plaintiff ‘must have suffered, or be threatened with, an actual injury traceable to the defendant and likely to be redressed by a favorable judicial decision.’” *Spencer v. Kemna*, 523 U.S. 1, 7 (1998) (quoting *Lewis*, 494 U.S. 14 at 477).

15 In the petition, Petitioner requested immediate release from ICE custody. (ECF No. 1 at 16 7.) On December 18, 2024, Petitioner was released on an order of supervision. (ECF No. 10-1 at 17 13–21.) Given that Petitioner has received the remedy to which he would have been entitled had 18 this Court rendered a favorable judicial decision on his petition, the Court finds that no case or 19 controversy exists.

See *Abdala v. INS*, 488 F.3d 1061, 1064 (9th Cir. 2007) (noting that “a petitioner’s release from detention under an order of supervision ‘moot[ed] his challenge to the legality of his extended detention’” (alteration in original) (quoting *Riley v. INS*, 310 F.3d 1253, 22 1256–57 (10th Cir. 2002))). 23 III. 24 RECOMMENDATION & ORDER 25 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY RECOMMENDS that: 26 1.

Respondent’s motion to dismiss (ECF No. 10) be GRANTED; and 27 2. The petition for writ of habeas corpus be DISMISSED as moot. 1 Further, the Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to: 2 1. Randomly assign this action to a District Judge; and 3 2. SUBSTITUTE Warden, Golden State Annex, as Respondent in the instant matter. 4 This Findings and Recommendation is submitted to the assigned United States District 5 | Court Judge, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) and Rule 304 of the Local 6 | Rules of Practice for the United States District Court, Eastern District of California.

Within 7 | FOURTEEN (14) days after service of the Findings and Recommendation, any party may file 8 | written objections with the Court, limited to fifteen (15) pages in length, including any 9 | exhibits. Such a document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and 10 | Recommendation.” Replies to the objections shall be served and filed within fourteen (14) days 11 | after service of the objections.

The assigned District Judge will then review the Magistrate 12 | Judge’s ruling pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The parties are advised that failure to file 13 | objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. 14 | *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing *Baxter v. Sullivan*, 923 F.2d 15 | 1391, 1394 (9th Cir.

1991)). 16 7 IT IS SO ORDERED. FA. ee 1g | Dated: _ May 22, 2025 STANLEY A. BOONE 19 United States Magistrate Judge 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28