

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Lucio Gutierrez Garcia v. Warden of Adelanto Detention Facility, et
al.

Gutierrez Garcia · No. 5:25-cv-02911-AB-AJR · Decided January 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered the petitioner to show cause why his immigration habeas action should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction based on mootness. The order explains that the petitioner had stated that his sole requested relief—release from custody—was no longer available after an immigration judge denied his bond request, and it set a response deadline of February 3, 2026.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	A. Joel Richlin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	January 20, 2026
DOCKET	5:25-cv-02911-AB-AJR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause why the federal habeas action should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction based on mootness.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Mootness is a question of law, and federal courts must consider mootness sua sponte. Mootness is jurisdictional.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Lucio Gutierrez Garcia v. Warden of Adelanto Detention Facility, Respondents

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- immigration detention
- civil procedure
- immigration
- constitutional law

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Petitioner's habeas action may be moot, depriving the district court of Article III jurisdiction, after the sole requested relief—release from custody—was unavailable following denial of bond.
2. Whether Petitioner should be ordered to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction based on mootness.

HOLDINGS

1. A federal court lacks jurisdiction over an action when it cannot redress the plaintiff's injury with a favorable decision; such an action is moot and must be dismissed.
2. Mootness is jurisdictional and must be considered by the federal court sua sponte.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Article III, Section 2 of the United States Constitution establishes the scope of federal court jurisdiction, which includes “all Cases . . . arising under this Constitution . . . [and] Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party.”” (1)

“Where a federal court cannot redress the plaintiff’s injury with a favorable decision, the case is considered moot and must be dismissed.” (2)

““Mootness is a question of law, and federal courts must consider mootness sua sponte.”” (2)

““Mootness is jurisdictional.”” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Lucio Gutierrez Garcia was an immigration detainee held at the Adelanto Detention Facility. He received a bond hearing on December 23, 2025, but the Immigration Judge denied his bond request in the exercise of discretion. Because the underlying habeas petition sought only release from custody, Petitioner notified the court that the petition was moot.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner, an immigration detainee, filed a habeas petition seeking release from custody. After a December 23, 2025 bond hearing resulted in denial of release, Petitioner filed a January 16, 2026 notice stating that the habeas petition was moot because release from custody was the sole relief requested. The court ordered Petitioner to show cause by February 3, 2026, why the action should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction and warned that failure to respond could result in a recommendation of dismissal for failure to comply with court orders and failure to prosecute.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- De Funis v. Odegaard, 416 U.S. 312, 316 (1974)
- Spencer v. Kemna, 523 U.S. 1, 7 (1998)
- Wallingford v. Bonta, 82 F.4th 797, 800-01 (9th Cir. 2023)
- Burnett v. Lampert, 432 F.3d 996, 999 (9th Cir. 2005)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL Case No. 5:25-cv-02911-AB-AJR Date: January 20, 2026 Page 1 of 2 Title: Lucio Gutierrez Garcia v. Warden of Adelanto Detention Facility, et al. DOCKET ENTRY: ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THIS ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION PRESENT: HONORABLE A. JOEL RICHLIN, UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE _ Claudia Garcia-Marquez _____None_____ _None__ Deputy Clerk Court Reporter/Recorder Tape No. ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR PETITIONER: ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR RESPONDENT: None Present None Present PROCEEDINGS: (IN CHAMBERS) On January 16, 2026, Petitioner Lucio Gutierrez Garcia (“Petitioner”), an immigration detainee being held at the Adelanto Detention Facility and represented by counsel, filed a Response and Notice of Mootness (the “Notice”).

(Dkt. 7.) In the Notice, Petitioner advised that “the habeas petition is now moot” because “Petitioner was not released from ICE custody following a bond hearing that was held on December 23, 2025.” (Id. at 1.) The Notice further explains that “the bond request [was] denied based on the Immigration Judge’s discretion.” (Id.) “Because the sole relief requested in the underlying habeas petition was release from custody, Petitioner agrees that the habeas petition is now moot.” (Id.)

Article III, Section 2 of the United States Constitution establishes the scope of federal court jurisdiction, which includes “all Cases... arising under this Constitution... [and] Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party.” The Supreme Court has explained that the Article III case or controversy requirement prevents federal courts from deciding “questions that cannot affect the rights of litigants in the case before them.” *De Funis v. Odegaard*, 416 U.S. 312, 316 (1974) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Where a UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL Case No. 5:25-cv-02911-AB-AJR Date: January 20, 2026 Page 2 of 2 Title: Lucio Gutierrez Garcia v. Warden of Adelanto Detention Facility, et al. federal court cannot redress the plaintiff’s injury with a favorable decision, the case is considered moot and must be dismissed.

See, e.g., *Spencer v. Kemna*, 523 U.S. 1, 7 (1998) (“[T]hroughout 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.” (internal quotation marks omitted)). “Mootness is a question of law, and federal courts must consider mootness sua sponte.” *Wallingford v. Bonta*, 82 F.4th 797, 800-01 (9th Cir.

2023) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). “Mootness is jurisdictional.” *Burnett v. Lampert*, 432 F.3d 996, 999 (9th Cir. 2005). To the extent this action is now moot, then the Court would lack jurisdiction. Based on Petitioner’s statements of mootness in the Notice, Petitioner is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE, by February 3, 2026, why this action should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction based on mootness.

Petitioner may satisfy this Order by filing a response setting forth any reason why this Court has jurisdiction to consider Petitioner’s claims in the underlying habeas petition. Petitioner is expressly warned that failure to timely file a response to this Order will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed for failure to comply with Court orders and failure to prosecute.

See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). Finally, Petitioner is advised that if he believes this action should be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction based on mootness, he can file a stipulation for dismissal (signed by both Petitioner and Respondents) under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(B) or a request for dismissal under Rule 41(a)(2) (signed only by Petitioner, but requiring court approval).

IT IS SO ORDERED.