

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

David Escobar Jr. v. Tabatha Camacho, et al.

Escobar · No. 25-cv-2645-ABA · Decided March 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Maryland dismissed David Escobar Jr.’s challenge to an Anne Arundel County charter school’s Bring Your Own Device policy. The court held that Escobar failed to establish a concrete, particularized, and redressable injury because his daughter received a school-issued laptop at no cost, and further held that the claims were moot after the policy was clarified to provide a no-cost school device when needed. The court granted defendants’ motion to dismiss and denied the motion for a temporary restraining order as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Maryland
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Adam B. Abelson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Maryland
DECIDED	March 27, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-2645-ABA
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff, proceeding pro se individually and as parent and next friend of his minor daughter, challenged a school Bring Your Own Device policy and sought a temporary restraining order. Defendants moved to dismiss under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(1) motion challenging subject-matter jurisdiction, the plaintiff bears the burden of persuasion and the court may consider exhibits outside the pleadings to resolve factual disputes concerning jurisdiction. Standing requires a concrete, particularized, actual or imminent injury fairly traceable to the challenged conduct and redressable by a favorable ruling. Mootness is also addressed under Rule 12(b)(1).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	David Escobar Jr. v. Tabatha Camacho, Yilman Zayn Ak, Dr. Mark Bedell, Board of Education of Anne Arundel County, Chesapeake Lighthouse Foundation, CLF board of directors

TOPICS

standing subject matter jurisdiction motions to dismiss injunctions civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure constitutional law civil rights remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff established Article III standing to challenge the school's Bring Your Own Device policy in his individual capacity or as parent and next friend of his daughter.
2. Whether the claims became moot after the school provided Plaintiff's daughter with a free school-issued laptop and clarified that families were not required to provide personal devices.
3. Whether Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order should be granted.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff failed to establish a concrete and particularized current or imminent injury to himself or his daughter, and he failed to show that the requested relief would redress any alleged injury. He therefore lacked Article III standing to challenge the Bring Your Own Device policy.
2. Even if Plaintiff had standing when the action was filed, the claims were moot because the school provided his daughter a school-issued laptop and clarified that families could receive a device at no cost when needed, eliminating any live controversy.
3. The motion for a temporary restraining order was denied as moot because the action was dismissed for lack of standing and, alternatively, mootness.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Therefore, Mr. Escobar lacks a concrete and particularized current or impending harm to him or his child as required for standing." (Discussion, Standing)

"Therefore, even if Mr. Escobar had established standing, his claims are now moot." (Discussion, Mootness)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Chesapeake Science Point Elementary School adopted a Bring Your Own Device policy under which families could provide a private Chromebook for configuration with school monitoring and management software, rent a school-issued device, or seek a fee waiver. Plaintiff alleged that the policy effectively compelled families to provide private devices and challenged it under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments, Maryland constitutional provisions, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and Maryland law. Shortly after the action and amended complaint were filed, the school provided Plaintiff's daughter with a free school-issued laptop, and the school later clarified that it would provide a device for in-school use at no cost when needed.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action and a motion for a temporary restraining order on August 11, 2025, then filed an amended complaint on September 3, 2025. Defendants moved to dismiss on November 5, 2025, submitting evidence that the child had received a free school-issued laptop and that the school had clarified its policy to provide devices at no cost when needed. The court granted dismissal under Rule 12(b)(1) for lack of standing and alternatively held that the claims were moot; it denied the temporary restraining order motion as moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- King v. Rubenstein, 825 F.3d 206, 212 (4th Cir. 2016)
- Smith v. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, 290 F.3d 201, 205 (4th Cir. 2002)
- Williams v. United States, 50 F.3d 299, 304 (4th Cir. 1995)
- Sinochem International Co. v. Malaysia International Shipping Corp., 549 U.S. 422, 430-31 (2007)
- Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Environment, 523 U.S. 83, 93-102 (1998)
- Davis v. Thompson, 367 F. Supp. 2d 792, 799 (D. Md. 2005)
- Stone v. Trump, 400 F. Supp. 3d 317, 333-34 (D. Md. 2019)
- CGM, LLC v. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., 664 F.3d 46, 52 (4th Cir. 2011)
- Akers v. Maryland State Education Association, 376 F. Supp. 3d 563, 569 (D. Md. 2019)
- Clapper v. Amnesty International USA, 568 U.S. 398, 408-09 (2013)
- DaimlerChrysler Corp. v. Cuno, 547 U.S. 332, 341 (2006)
- Raines v. Byrd, 521 U.S. 811, 818 (1997)
- Monsanto Co. v. Geertson Seed Farms, 561 U.S. 139, 149 (2010)
- Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 564 n.2 (1992)
- John and Jane Parents 1 v. Montgomery County Board of Education, 78 F.4th 622, 626, 629-31, 636 (4th Cir. 2023)
- Already, LLC v. Nike, Inc., 568 U.S. 85, 90-91 (2013)
- Alvarez v. Smith, 558 U.S. 87, 92 (2009)
- Arizonans for Official English v. Arizona, 520 U.S. 43, 67 (1997)
- Murphy v. Hunt, 455 U.S. 478, 481 (1982) (per curiam)
- City of Mesquite v. Aladdin's Castle, Inc., 455 U.S. 283, 289 (1982)
- Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw Environmental Services (TOC), Inc., 528 U.S. 167, 190 (2000)