

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Ali Dehghan v. US Citizenship and Immigration Services et al

Dehghan · No. 8:24-cv-02640-SPG-KES · Decided November 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered Petitioner Ali Dehghan to show cause why his mandamus action seeking adjudication of a visa application should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. The court noted that no activity had occurred since December 10, 2024, and stated that failure to respond within fourteen calendar days would be deemed consent to dismissal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sherilyn Peace Garnett
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	November 24, 2025
DOCKET	8:24-cv-02640-SPG-KES
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner filed a petition for a writ of mandamus seeking an order compelling immigration authorities to adjudicate a visa application. After proof of service was filed and no respondents appeared or docket activity occurred for approximately eleven months, the court issued an order to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; limited precedential value
PARTIES	Ali Dehghan v. United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, United States Department of State, Consul General of the United States Embassy in Yerevan, Armenia

TOPICS

- mandamus immigration
- immigration
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should require Petitioner to show cause why the mandamus action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution.
2. Whether a federal court has inherent authority to dismiss an action sua sponte for failure to prosecute.

HOLDINGS

1. A federal court possesses inherent authority to dismiss an action sua sponte for lack of prosecution.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“See Link v. Wabash R. Co., 370 U.S. 626 (1962) (courts have inherent power to dismiss a case sua sponte for lack of prosecution).”

“Failure to file a response within fourteen (14) calendar days shall be deemed consent to dismissal.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner sought mandamus relief compelling United States immigration and consular authorities to adjudicate a visa application. He filed the petition and later filed proof of service on the respondents. No respondents appeared, and Petitioner took no further action after December 10, 2024.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On December 5, 2024, Ali Dehghan filed a petition for a writ of mandamus. He filed proof of service on December 10, 2024. Respondents did not appear, and the docket reflected no further activity through November 24, 2025. The court ordered Petitioner to show cause within fourteen calendar days why the case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution, stating that failure to respond would be deemed consent to dismissal.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Link v. Wabash R. Co., 370 U.S. 626 (1962)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL MINUTES — GENERAL Case No. 8:24-cv-02640-SPG-KES Date November 24, 2025 Title Ali Dehghan v. US Citizenship and Immigration Services et al ee Present: The Honorable SHERILYN PEACE GARNETT UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Patricia Gomez Not Reported Deputy Clerk Court Reporter / Recorder Attorneys Present for Plaintiff: Attorneys Present for Defendants:

Not Present Not Present Proceeding: (INCHAMBERS) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE On December 5, 2024, Petitioner Ali Dehghan (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition for a Writ of Mandamus.

See (ECF No. 1 (“Petition”)). In the Petition, Petitioner requests that this Court issue a writ of mandamus to compel Respondents United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, the United States Department of State, and the Consul General of the United States Embassy in Yerevan, Armenia (“Respondents”) to adjudicate a visa application. See (id.).

On December 10, 2024, Petitioner filed Proof of Service on Respondents. See (ECF No. 7). To date, Respondents have not appeared. The docket reflects that there has been no activity in this action since December 10, 2024.

Therefore, Petitioner is ordered to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. See *Link v. Wabash R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626 (1962) (courts have inherent power to dismiss a case sua sponte for lack of prosecution). Failure to file a response within fourteen (14) calendar days shall be deemed consent to dismissal. IT IS SO ORDERED. 00 00 Initials of Preparer pg