

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Salwa Jirjees Polus v. David M. Radel, Los Angeles Asylum Office,
Director, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, et al.

Polus · No. 25-CV-542 JLS (DEB) · Decided January 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California granted the parties’ joint motion to stay an action concerning the adjudication of Plaintiff’s asylum application. The court stayed the case until May 13, 2026, vacated all deadlines, and required a joint status report if the action was not voluntarily dismissed before the stay concluded.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Janis L. Sammartino
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	January 20, 2026
DOCKET	25-CV-542 JLS (DEB)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought an action seeking adjudication of her asylum application and jointly moved with Defendants to stay the litigation.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court exercised its inherent authority to control the disposition of proceedings on its docket and determined that a stay would promote a just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of the action.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; no precedential designation appears in the opinion.
PARTIES	Salwa Jirjees Polus v. David M. Radel, Los Angeles Asylum Office, Director, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, et al.

TOPICS

- immigration
- asylum
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should grant the parties' joint motion to stay the action to allow USCIS additional time to complete the dependent spouse's vetting and pursue an extrajudicial resolution.

HOLDINGS

1. The court granted the parties' joint motion and stayed the action until May 13, 2026.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“District courts have inherent authority to stay proceedings before them.” (Document text at lines 26-28)

“[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.”

(Document text at lines 26-28)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sought judicial adjudication of an asylum application that had been pending for nearly ten years. USCIS conducted an asylum interview on September 25, 2025, but Plaintiff had added a dependent spouse to her Form I-589. The parties represented that USCIS needed additional time to complete vetting of the dependent spouse and consider new USCIS policies affecting the case.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff's asylum application had been pending for nearly ten years. After USCIS interviewed Plaintiff and she added a dependent spouse to her Form I-589, the parties jointly requested a stay to allow USCIS additional time to complete vetting and consider new policies. The court granted the motion and stayed the action until May 13, 2026.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Rohan ex rel. Gates v. Woodford, 334 F.3d 803, 817 (9th Cir.)
- Ryan v. Gonzales, 568 U.S. 57 (2013)
- Landis v. N. Am. Co., U.S. 248, 254 (1936)

OPINION

Polus

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9

10 SALWA JIRJEES POLUS, Case No.: 25-CV-542 JLS (DEB)

11 Plaintiff,

ORDER GRANTING JOINT

12 v. MOTION TO STAY

13 DAVID M. RADEL, Los Angeles Asylum (ECF No. 7) Office, Director, U.S. Citizenship and
14 Immigration Services, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Presently before the Court is the Parties'
Joint Motion to Stay ("Joint Mot.," ECF

18 No. 7). In this case, Plaintiff seeks adjudication of her asylum application, which has been
19 pending for nearly ten years. ECF No. 1 ("Compl.") ¶ 6. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration 20
Services ("USCIS") conducted an asylum interview for Plaintiff on September 25, 2025, 21
however, Plaintiff added a dependent spouse to her Form I-589. Joint Mot. at 1. The 22 Parties
represent that USCIS needs additional time to complete the vetting process for 23 Plaintiff's
dependent spouse and to consider the new USCIS policies impacting this case.

24 Id. at 2. The Parties seek that the stay in this litigation be extended until May 13, 2026, to
25 continue to work towards an extrajudicial resolution. Id. 26 "District courts have inherent
authority to stay proceedings before them." *Rohan ex rel. Gates v. Woodford*, 334 F.3d 803,
817 (9th Cir. 2003), abrogated on other grounds by 28 *Ryan v. Gonzales*, 568 U.S. 57 (2013).
"[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to 1 || the power inherent in every court to control
the disposition of the causes on its docket with 2 || economy of time and effort for itself, for
counsel, and for litigants." *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 3 U.S. 248, 254 (1936). In light of the foregoing,
the Court finds that granting the 4 || requested stay would best promote the interests of securing a
just, speedy, and inexpensive 5 || determination of the action. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 1. Accordingly,
the Court GRANTS the 6 || Parties' Joint Motion (ECF No. 7). This action is hereby STAYED
until May 13, 2026, 7 all deadlines, including Defendants' deadline to respond to Plaintiff's
Complaint, are 8 || VACATED until further order of the Court. The Parties SHALL FILE a joint
status report 9 || on or before the conclusion of this stay if Plaintiff has not voluntarily dismissed
this action 10 before that date. 1] IT IS SO ORDERED. 12 Dated: January 20, 2026 tt 13 pen Janis
L. Sammartino 14 United States District Judge 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28