

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Yuridiana Cardenas Hidalgo v. Eliseo Ricolcol

No. 5:25-cv-362-WLH-RAO (C.D. Cal. Aug. 4, 2025) · No. 5:25-cv-362-WLH-RAO · Decided August 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California summarily dismissed Yuridiana Cardenas Hidalgo’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition seeking immediate release under the Federal First Offenders Act. The court held that the petition was moot because Petitioner had been released from Bureau of Prisons custody. The petition was dismissed without prejudice, and pending motions were denied as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Wesley L. Hsu
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	August 4, 2025
DOCKET	5:25-cv-362-WLH-RAO
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner filed a 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition seeking immediate release based on asserted eligibility for supervised release under the Federal First Offenders Act. Respondent moved to dismiss or alternatively transfer the matter to the sentencing court for treatment as a 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. After learning that Petitioner had been released from custody, the court dismissed the petition as moot.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court independently assessed whether an Article III case or controversy remained and whether the petition had become moot.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Yuridiana Cardenas Hidalgo v. Eliseo Ricolcol, Warden

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- subject matter jurisdiction
- post-conviction relief
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

federal habeas corpus

constitutional law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Petitioner's release from federal custody rendered her § 2241 petition seeking immediate release moot.
2. Whether the court should dismiss the moot petition without prejudice and deny pending motions as moot.

HOLDINGS

1. A habeas petition seeking immediate release from federal custody becomes moot when the petitioner is released and has thereby obtained the relief sought, because no live controversy remains for the court to adjudicate.
2. The petition must be dismissed without prejudice once the court determines that it is moot, and pending motions are denied as moot.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A federal court’s jurisdiction is limited to actual cases or live controversies.” (at 1)

“Because she has obtained the relief she sought by initiating this action—namely, release from BOP custody—the matter no longer involves a “live controversy” and is therefore moot.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner was a federal inmate at FCI Victorville Medium I when she filed a § 2241 petition seeking immediate release and claiming eligibility for supervised release under the Federal First Offenders Act. While the case was pending, Bureau of Prisons records showed that she was released from custody on May 30, 2025. Because release provided the principal relief sought in the petition, the court concluded that no live controversy remained.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed the § 2241 petition on February 7, 2025. Respondent moved to dismiss on March 21, 2025. The court issued a report and recommendation recommending dismissal for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court orders, but ultimately independently verified that Petitioner had been released from Bureau of Prisons custody and dismissed the action as moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- United States v. Yepez, 108 F.4th 1093, 1099 (9th Cir. 2024)

- *Lewis v. Cont'l Bank Corp.*, 494 U.S. 472, 477 (1990)
- *Genesis Healthcare Corp. v. Symczyk*, 569 U.S. 66, 71-72 (2013)
- *Chafin v. Chafin*, 568 U.S. 165, 172 (2013)
- *Rosemere Neighborhood Ass'n v. EPA*, 581 F.3d 1169, 1173 (9th Cir. 2009)
- *Pub. Util. Comm'n v. FERC*, 100 F.3d 1451, 1458 (9th Cir. 1996)
- *Peneueta v. Ricolcol*, No. 2:23-cv-6361-PA-JC, 2024 WL 2884218, at *5 (C.D. Cal. May 21, 2024)
- *Burnett v. Lampert*, 432 F.3d 996, 1000-01 (9th Cir. 2005)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 YURIDIANA CARDENAS Case No. 5:25-cv-362-WLH-RAO HIDALGO,
12 Petitioner, 13 v. ORDER SUMMARILY DISMISSING 14 PETITION ELISEO RICOLCOL,
Warden, 15 Respondent. 16 17 On February 7, 2025, Petitioner Yuridiana Cardenas Hidalgo
("Petitioner")— 18 a then-federal inmate housed at FCI Victorville Medium I in Victorville,
California, 19 and proceeding pro se—filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 20
U.S.C. § 2241 ("Petition").

Dkt. No. 1 ("Pet."). Petitioner argues that she is eligible 21 for supervised release pursuant to the
Federal First Offenders Act (FFOA) and 22 requests that this Court order her immediate release.¹
Pet. at 1. 23 Respondent Eliseo Ricolcol filed a motion to dismiss on March 21, 2025, 24 arguing
that the FFOA does not apply to Petitioner and requesting that the Petition 25 be dismissed or,
alternatively, transferred to the appropriate sentencing court as a 26 Section 2255 motion.

Dkt. No. 7 at 3, 9–10. 27 1 The Court utilizes the pagination assigned by the CM/ECF system
when citing to 28 the Petition. 1 The Court issued its Report and Recommendation ("Report") on
May 12, 2 2025, recommending that this action be dismissed for failure to prosecute and abide 3
by the Court's orders. Dkt. No. 10.

On May 20, 2025, the Court's notice to Petitioner 4 of the Report was returned as undeliverable.
Dkt. No. 11. 5 The Court independently conducted a public records check of BOP's inmate 6
locator which indicates that Petitioner was released from BOP custody on May 30, 7 2025. See
Find an Inmate, Fed. Bureau of Prisons (June 4, 2025), 8 <https://www.bop.gov/inmateloc>
[<https://perma.cc/8LYU-CZBU>].

For the following 9 reasons, the Court dismisses the Petition as moot. 10 A federal court's
jurisdiction is limited to actual cases or live controversies. 11 *United States v. Yepez*, 108 F.4th
1093, 1099 (9th Cir. 2024) (citing *Lewis v. Cont'l 12 Bank Corp.*, 494 U.S. 472, 477 (1990)). This
constitutional limitation to cases or 13 controversies necessarily requires that parties to the
litigation have a personal stake 14 in the outcome at all stages of judicial proceedings.

Genesis Healthcare Corp. v. 15 Symczyk, 569 U.S. 66, 71–72 (2013). Because federal courts are prohibited from 16 adjudicating matters that do not affect the rights of present litigants, a suit is rendered 17 moot when there exists no live issue for the court to grant relief upon. Chafin v. 18 Chafin, 568 U.S. 165, 172 (2013) (highlighting that Article III of the U.S. 19 Constitution forbids the issuance of advisory opinions where no live case or 20 controversy exists).

When a litigant seeks action from an administrative agency, 21 performance by the agency of the relief sought is sufficient to render the claim moot 22 and absolve the federal court of jurisdiction to adjudicate the suit. Rosemere 23 Neighborhood Ass’n v. EPA, 581 F.3d 1169, 1173 (9th Cir. 2009) (quoting Pub. Util. 24 Comm’n v. FERC, 100 F.3d 1451, 1458 (9th Cir.

1996)). 25 In bringing this action, Petitioner sought immediate release from BOP 26 custody. Because she has obtained the relief she sought by initiating this action— 27 namely, release from BOP custody—the matter no longer involves a “live 28 controversy” and is therefore moot. Peneueta v. Ricolcol, No. 2:23-cv-6361-PA-JC, 1 || 2024 WL 2884218, at *5 (C.D.

Cal. May 21, 2024) (citing Burnett v. Lampert, 432 2 || F.3d 996, 1000-01 (9th Cir. 2005)). 3 For the foregoing reasons, the Petition is dismissed without prejudice. All 4 || pending motions are denied as moot. 5 6 || DATED: 8/4/2025 7 Nag HON. WESLEY L. HSU 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28