

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Hector German-Reyes v. Warden, FCI-Mendota

German-Reyes · No. 1:25-cv-00742-JLT-SKO (HC) · Decided September 22, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California recommends granting the respondent’s motion to dismiss Hector German-Reyes’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition as moot. The court concluded that petitioner’s release from Bureau of Prisons custody to Immigration and Customs Enforcement custody left no further relief the court could provide regarding First Step Act credits and an immigration detainer.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sheila K. Oberto
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	September 22, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00742-JLT-SKO (HC)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner brought a 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition challenging the Bureau of Prisons' determination that he was ineligible for First Step Act credits because of an immigration detainer. Respondent moved to dismiss the petition as moot after Petitioner was released from Bureau of Prisons custody into Immigration and Customs Enforcement custody. The magistrate judge issued Findings and Recommendation to grant the motion and dismiss the petition.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The motion to dismiss was reviewed under Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases because it challenged the petition before a formal answer was filed. Mootness was analyzed under Article III's case-or-controversy requirement.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Hector German-Reyes v. Warden, FCI-Mendota

TOPICS

federal habeas corpus

motions to dismiss

immigration detention

post-conviction relief

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

federal habeas corpus

post-conviction relief

immigration detention

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Respondent could move to dismiss the § 2241 petition under Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases before filing a formal answer.
2. Whether Petitioner's § 2241 challenge to the Bureau of Prisons' application of First Step Act credits became moot after his release from Bureau of Prisons custody to Immigration and Customs Enforcement custody.

HOLDINGS

1. Because Respondent's motion challenged the petition before a formal answer was filed and was procedurally analogous to motions challenging exhaustion or procedural default, the court reviewed it under Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases.
2. The petition was moot because Petitioner was no longer in Bureau of Prisons custody and the court could provide no further relief concerning the challenged First Step Act credit determination.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A case becomes moot if the “the issues presented are no longer ‘live’ or the parties lack a legally cognizable interest in the outcome.”” (at 3)

“The Federal Court is “without power to decide questions that cannot affect the rights of the litigants before them.”” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner was a federal prisoner serving a sentence imposed pursuant to a 2018 judgment of the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota. He challenged the Bureau of Prisons' determination that he was ineligible for First Step Act time credits because of an immigration detainer. During the case, he was released from Bureau of Prisons custody to Immigration and Customs Enforcement custody on July 28, 2025, pursuant to an immigration detainer, leaving no further relief the court could provide concerning the Bureau's credit determination.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed the § 2241 petition on June 18, 2025. The court initially recommended dismissal for failure to exhaust administrative remedies, but stayed that recommendation after Petitioner objected that no immigration detainer existed. Respondent then submitted evidence that Petitioner had been released from Bureau of Prisons custody to ICE custody on July 28, 2025, pursuant to an immigration detainer, and moved to dismiss as moot. The magistrate judge recommended granting the motion, dismissing the petition as moot, and directing entry of judgment, subject to objections and review by the assigned district judge.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- O'Bremski v. Maass, 915 F.2d 418, 420 (9th Cir. 1990)
- White v. Lewis, 874 F.2d 599, 602-03 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Hillery v. Pulley, 533 F. Supp. 1189, 1194 & n.12 (E.D. Cal. 1982)
- Iron Arrow Honor Soc'y v. Heckler, 464 U.S. 67, 70 (1983)
- N.A.A.C.P., Western Region v. City of Richmond, 743 F.2d 1346, 1352 (9th Cir. 1984)
- Murphy v. Hunt, 455 U.S. 478, 481 (1982)
- North Carolina v. Rice, 404 U.S. 244, 246 (1971) (per curiam)
- Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Hayworth, 300 U.S. 227, 240-241 (1937)
- Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/hector-german-reyes-v-warden-fci-mendota-j20ezl9c>