

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; limited precedential value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)