

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Eugene Trifonov v. Kristi Noem et al

Trifonov · No. 5:25-cv-03460-DOC-JDE · Decided January 6, 2026

OPINION

Eugene Trifonov v. Kristi Noem et al

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 5:25-cv-03460-DOC-JDE Date: January 6, 2026 Title: Eugene Trifonov v. Kristi Noem et al PRESENT:

THE HONORABLE DAVID O. CARTER, JUDGE

Karlen Dubon Not Present Courtroom Clerk Court Reporter

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR

PLAINTIFF: DEFENDANTS: None Present None Present

PROCEEDINGS (IN CHAMBERS): ORDER ENTERING

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

On December 22, 2025 this Court issued an Order Granting Petitioner’s Ex Parte Application for a Temporary Restraining Order (the “TRO”) (Dkt. 4) and set a hearing on a preliminary injunction for January 5, 2026. Respondents filed a response as to why a preliminary injunction should not issue on December 29, 2025 (Dkt. 6), and Petitioner filed his Reply on December 31, 2025 (Dkt. 8). Oral argument on the preliminary injunction was held on January 5, 2026. “The standard for issuing a temporary restraining order is identical to the standard for issuing a preliminary injunction.” *Lockheed Missile & Space Co. v. Hughes Aircraft Co.*, 887 F. Supp. 1320, 1323 (N.D. Cal. 1995). In issuing the TRO, the Court found that Petitioner made a sufficient showing under each of the Winter factors. See generally TRO; see *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 22 (2008). The Court sees no reason to depart from its previous analysis and incorporates that analysis herein. Accordingly, this Court GRANTS A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION with the same restraint as in the TRO: “[A]ny future enforcement actions after [Petitioner’s] release must comply with the required procedures.” TRO at 7. The Court outlined the

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 5:25-cv-03460-DOC-JDE Date: January 6, 2026 Page 2 most pertinent of these procedures in its TRO. See *id.* at 3-8. For purposes of clarification, as this Court previously noted,

“the absence of any travel documents suggests that Petitioner [is] not going to be imminently removed.” TRO at 5-6 (citing *Hoac v. Becerra*, No. 2:25-cv-01740-DC-JDP, 2025 WL 1993771, at *4 (E.D. Cal. July 16, 2025)). And of course, Petitioner must be given an opportunity to be heard according to procedures if such a travel document is provided. The Clerk shall serve this minute order on the parties. MINUTES FORM 11 Initials of Deputy Clerk: kdu
CIVIL-GEN