

**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.

**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 is 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 is 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<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2026.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE