

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

John Doe v. Christopher Chestnut, et al.

Doe v. Chestnut · No. 1:24-cv-00943-EPG-HC · Decided November 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California denied as moot John Doe’s request to remain detained in the Eastern District pending resolution of his habeas petition. The court had already granted habeas relief and ordered Doe released on conditions, while noting that Doe had filed a petition for review and a motion for a temporary stay of removal in the Ninth Circuit.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	November 25, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-00943-EPG-HC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner, a federal immigration detainee proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, requested an order requiring that he remain detained in the Eastern District pending resolution of his habeas petition.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reporter citation.
PARTIES	John Doe v. Christopher Chestnut, et al.

TOPICS

federal habeas corpus

immigration detention

removal proceedings

immigration

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration

federal habeas corpus

immigration detention

removal proceedings

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the court should order that Petitioner remain detained in the Eastern District pending resolution of his habeas petition after the court had already ordered his release.

HOLDINGS

1. The request was denied as moot because the Court had already ordered Petitioner’s release on conditions.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“when the Government moves a habeas petitioner after she properly files a petition naming her immediate custodian, the District Court retains jurisdiction and may direct the writ to any respondent within its jurisdiction who has legal authority to effectuate the prisoner’s release” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

John Doe was a federal immigration detainee represented by counsel in a § 2241 habeas proceeding. After the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissed his appeal, Doe learned that he might be transferred and counsel filed a petition for review and a motion for a temporary stay of removal in the Ninth Circuit. The district court had already granted habeas relief and ordered Doe released on conditions before deciding the request addressed in this order.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Court previously granted Petitioner's § 2241 petition and determined that release from detention was the appropriate remedy. The Court then ordered Petitioner's release on conditions. Because release had already been ordered, the Court denied as moot Petitioner's subsequent request to remain detained in the Eastern District.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Rumsfeld v. Padilla, 542 U.S. 426, 441 (2004)

OPINION

(HC)Doe

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 JOHN DOE, Case No. 1:24-cv-00943-EPG-HC 12 Petitioner, ORDER DENYING
PETITIONER’S

REQUEST FOR COURT TO ORDER THAT

13 v. PETITIONER REMAIN DETAINED IN

EASTERN DISTRICT PENDING

14 CHRISTOPHER CHESTNUT, et al., RESOLUTION OF PETITION

15 Respondents. (ECF No. 25) 16 17 Petitioner John Doe, represented by counsel, is a federal immigration detainee proceeding 18 with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The parties have 19 consented to the jurisdiction of a United States magistrate judge. (ECF Nos. 4, 10, 11.) 20 On November 20, 2025, this Court granted Petitioner’s petition for writ of habeas corpus 21 and found that Petitioner’s release from detention is the appropriate remedy. (ECF No. 24.) On

22 November 25, 2025, the Court ordered Petitioner’s release on conditions. (ECF No. 27.)

23 On November 24, 2025, counsel for Petitioner submitted a declaration, stating that at 24 9:50 a.m. that morning, counsel received a panicked call from Petitioner, who was told to pack 25 his items because he was being transferred. Petitioner was not informed where he was being 26 taken. (ECF No. 25 at 2.1) Counsel checked the Executive Office of Immigration Review portal 27 and learned that the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissed Petitioner’s appeal on November 28 2025. 29 Counsel immediately filed a petition for review in the Ninth Circuit and a motion for 30 temporary stay of removal. Petitioner “asks the Court to order that he remain detained in the 31 Eastern District pending the imminent resolution of his habeas petition.” (ECF No. 25 at 3.) 32 Given that the Court has ordered Petitioner to be released, the Court DENIES as MOOT 33 Petitioner’s request that the Court order he remain detained in the Eastern District pending the 34 resolution of his habeas petition. See *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 441 (2004) (noting that 35 “when the Government moves a habeas petitioner after she properly files a petition naming her 36 immediate custodian, the District Court retains jurisdiction and may direct the writ to any 37 respondent within its jurisdiction who has legal authority to effectuate the prisoner’s release”). 38 IT IS SO ORDERED. 39 Dated: November 25, 2025 [see ey —

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | ? Counsel has not received a copy of the decision. 3 According to Ninth Circuit rules, the filing of the motion for a temporary stay of removal automatically 28 stays Petitioner’s removal.