

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE

Tramale J. Hooser v. Warden C. Harrison

Hooser · No. 2:24-cv-02813-MSN-tmp · Decided December 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee dismissed Tramale J. Hooser’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 without prejudice. The court found that Hooser failed to comply with an order to show cause regarding the apparent mootness of his claim after his release to residential reentry management, and dismissed the petition for failure to prosecute under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Mark S. Norris
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee
DECIDED	December 4, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-02813-MSN-tmp
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se petitioner sought habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. After the court ordered him to show cause and explain why the petition should not be dismissed as moot, he failed to respond. The district court dismissed the petition without prejudice for failure to comply with the order and failure to prosecute.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) to dismiss for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with a court order. The order does not identify a separate standard of review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Tramale J. Hooser v. Warden C. Harrison

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- civil procedure
- motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

federal habeas corpus

civil procedure

post-conviction relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the § 2241 petition should be dismissed without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to comply with the court's show-cause order and failure to prosecute.
2. Whether Hooser's other pending motions should be denied as moot.
3. Whether a certificate of appealability should be denied.

HOLDINGS

1. The court dismissed the § 2241 petition without prejudice because Hooser failed to comply with the August 19 order and failed to prosecute the action.
2. Hooser's pending motions seeking the same relief were denied as moot following dismissal of the petition.
3. The court denied a certificate of appealability because reasonable jurists would not debate whether Hooser failed to prosecute by failing to comply with the August 19 order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“[f]ailure to respond to the Court’s order within thirty (30) days of entry shall result in the dismissal of the Petition under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to prosecute.” (PageID 101)

“Accordingly, the Court DISMISSES the § 2241 Petition (ECF No. 1) WITHOUT PREJUDICE for failure to comply with the August 19 Order and for failure to prosecute.” (Order disposition)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Hooser filed a pro se § 2241 petition asserting errors in the calculation of his federal sentence and seeking release to prerelease custody. He was later released to Detroit Residential Reentry Management, which appeared to make the requested habeas relief moot or otherwise leave the availability of a remedy unclear. The court ordered him to show cause and explain why the petition should not be dismissed, but he failed to respond after the thirty-day deadline expired.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Hooser filed a § 2241 petition challenging errors in the calculation of his federal sentence and seeking prerelease custody. After Hooser was released to residential reentry management, the court ordered him to address whether the claim remained justiciable and why the petition should not be dismissed as moot. Hooser did not comply within the time allowed, so the court dismissed the petition without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and denied his other pending motions as moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)
- Fitten v. Tennessee, No. 15-1157, 2016 WL 4705599, at *4 (W.D. Tenn. Sept. 8, 2016)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE WESTERN DIVISION TRAMALE J. HOOSER,)) Petitioner,)) v.) Civ. No. 2:24-cv-02813-MSN-tmp) WARDEN C. HARRISON,) Respondent.)) O R D E R D I S M I S S I N G § 2241 PETITION WITHOUT PREJUDICE FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE On October 23, 2024, Tramale J. Hooser filed a pro se Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

(ECF No. 1, “Petition.”) Hooser asserted that there are errors in his federal sentence calculation and asked the Court to order his release to prerelease custody. (See id. at PageID 1, 6–8.) Hooser filed multiple motions requesting the same relief. (See ECF Nos. 9–11.) Hooser, however, has been released to Detroit Residential Reentry Management (“RRM”). See Federal Bureau of Prisons, <https://www.bop.gov/inmateloc/> (last accessed Dec.

4, 2025). On June 26, 2025, Hooser notified the Court of his updated mailing address in Indianapolis, Indiana. (ECF No. 12.) With Hooser’s release to RRM, Hooser’s habeas claim in the Petition appears to be moot, and so it is unclear whether the Court could order any remedy in response to the Petition.

For that reason, the Court, on August 19, 2025, ordered Hooser to: (1) show cause as to whether any issue remains in his sentence calculation; and (2) explain in writing why this Court should not dismiss the Petition as moot. (ECF No. 13 at PageID 100–01, “August 19 Order.”) The Court warned Hooser that “[f]ailure to respond to the Court’s order within thirty (30) days of entry shall result in the dismissal of the Petition under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to prosecute.” (Id. at PageID 101.)

Hooser has failed to comply with the August 19 Order, and the time to do so has expired. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). Accordingly, the Court DISMISSES the § 2241 Petition (ECF No. 1) WITHOUT PREJUDICE for failure to comply with the August 19 Order and for failure to prosecute. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). Petitioner’s other pending motions, ECF Nos. 9, 10, and 11, are accordingly DENIED AS MOOT.

The Court also DENIES a certificate of appealability because reasonable jurists would not debate whether Hooser has failed to prosecute his case by failing to comply with the August 19 Order. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Fitten v. Tennessee, No. 15-1157, 2016 WL

4705599, at *4 (W.D. Tenn. Sept. 8, 2016) (“The law regarding dismissal for failure to prosecute is clear and reasonable jurists would not disagree on its application in this case”).

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 4th day of December, 2025. s/ Mark S. Norris MARK S. NORRIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-western-district-of-ten/2025/tramale-j-hooser-v-warden-c-harrison-illupt20>