

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA

Jose Hernandez-Blanco v. Scarlet Grant

No. CIV-26-278-R (W.D. Okla. Feb. 26, 2026) · No. CIV-26-278-R · Decided February 26, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma grants the petitioner's motion to consolidate his immigration-detention habeas action with a related action filed by his father. The court designates the present case as the lead case, directs that future pleadings be filed only in that case, and administratively closes the related action.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
DECIDED	February 26, 2026
DOCKET	CIV-26-278-R
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner filed a 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition challenging immigration detention and moved to consolidate the action with his father's related habeas action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court exercised broad discretion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a), weighing common questions of law or fact and the interests of judicial convenience against potential delay, confusion, or prejudice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Jose Hernandez-Blanco v. Scarlet Grant

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- joinder
- immigration detention
- federal habeas corpus

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- immigration law
- habeas corpus

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the two related habeas actions should be consolidated under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a).

HOLDINGS

1. The court held that consolidation was appropriate because the actions involved common questions of law or fact, asserted nearly identical claims, involved the same respondent, were at the same litigation stage, and could be consolidated without apparent prejudice or confusion.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Consolidation of separate actions is permitted “as a matter of convenience and economy in judicial administration” and the district court is given “broad discretion to decide whether consolidation under Rule 42(a) would be desirable.””

“The two cases assert nearly identical claims for relief, involve the same respondent, are at the same stage of litigation, and appear to arise from the same set of facts.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Both cases involved immigration-detention claims against the same respondent and were at the same stage of litigation. The court found that the actions asserted nearly identical claims and appeared to arise from the same set of facts, with no apparent risk of prejudice or confusion from consolidation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court considered Petitioner's motion to consolidate this case with *David Hernandez-Gomez v. Grant*, CIV-26-282-G (W.D. Okla.). The court granted consolidation, designated this case as the lead case, directed that future pleadings be filed only in the lead case, and administratively closed the related action.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Cheney v. Judd*, 429 F. Supp. 3d 931, 936 (D.N.M. 2019)

OPINION

Hernandez-Gomez

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

JOSE HERNANDEZ-BLANCO,)

) Petitioner,)) vs.) Case No. CIV-26-278-R)

SCARLET GRANT,)

) Respondent.)

ORDER

Petitioner, proceeding pro so, has filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [Doc. No. 1] challenging his immigration detention. Petitioner has also filed a Motion to Consolidate [Doc. No. 3] seeking to consolidate this action with an action filed by his father, David Hernandez-Gomez v. Grant, CIV-26-282-G (W.D. Okla.). Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a) provides that a court may consolidate actions that “involve common questions of law or fact[.]” Consolidation of separate actions is permitted “as a matter of convenience and economy in judicial administration” and the district court is given “broad discretion to decide whether consolidation under Rule 42(a) would be desirable.” 9A Fed. Prac. & Proc. Civ. § 2383 (3d ed. 2008) “In deciding whether to grant a motion to consolidate, the court should initially consider whether the cases to be consolidated involve a common question of law or fact,” and if so, “the court should weigh the interests of judicial convenience in consolidating the cases against the delay, confusion, and prejudice that consolidation might cause.” *Cheney v. Judd*, 429 F. Supp. 3d 931, 936 (D.N.M. 2019). Upon consideration, the Court concludes that consolidation of the actions is appropriate. The two cases assert nearly identical claims for relief, involve the same respondent, are at the same stage of litigation, and appear to arise from the same set of facts. Consolidating these cases will preserve judicial resources and there does not appear to be any risk of prejudice or confusion. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion to Consolidate is GRANTED. The above-captioned case 1s designated as the lead case, with all pleadings to be filed from this date forward in the lead case ONLY. The case *David Hernandez-Gomez v. Grant*, CIV-26-282-G (W.D. Okla.) is consolidated under the lead case number, all filings are deemed filed in the lead case number, and the action 1s administratively closed. The Clerk is directed to file a copy of this order in the CIV-26-282-G action. IT IS SO ORDERED this 26" day of February, 2026.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE