

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

**Florin Tanasache, Inocencio Castro Martinez, Russell Gomez Dzul,
Jesus Rene Carranza Gutierrez, Robert Cruz Hernandez, Oscar
Efren Cadena Alonso, Demetrio Acosta Pena, and Javier Perez v.
Kristi Noem, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security,
Pamela Bondi, U.S. Attorney General, Todd Lyons, Acting Director,
Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Ernesto Santacruz Jr.,
Acting Director, Los Angeles Field Office, Immigration and Customs
Enforcement, Enforcement and Removal Operations, Fereti Semaia,
Warden, Adelanto ICE Processing Center, Executive Office for
Immigration Review, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and
U.S. Department of Homeland Security**

Tanasache v. Noem · No. 5:25-cv-03159-JWH-AGR · Decided December 16, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California orders the respondents to show cause why sanctions should not issue for failing to timely comply with a temporary restraining order requiring bond hearings or release for two petitioners. The court also orders the petitioners to show cause why the habeas case should not be dismissed as moot because all petitioners received bond hearings and related proceedings may provide declaratory relief. The court sets deadlines for responses and a February 6, 2026 hearing.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	December 16, 2025
DOCKET	5:25-cv-03159-JWH-AGR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioners filed a 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition and an ex parte application for a temporary restraining order seeking release,

	individualized bond hearings, and related declaratory and transfer-relief. After issuing a TRO requiring bond hearings or release, the court ordered show cause regarding dismissal of the petition as moot and sanctions for respondents' alleged noncompliance.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Mootness was considered sua sponte; the court determined whether intervening events had deprived it of the ability to redress petitioners' injuries.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; persuasive value only.
PARTIES	Florin Tanasache, Inocencio Castro Martinez, Russell Gomez Dzul, Jesus Rene Carranza Gutierrez, Robert Cruz Hernandez, Oscar Efren Cadena Alonso, Demetrio Acosta Pena, Javier Perez v. Kristi Noem, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Pamela Bondi, U.S. Attorney General, Todd Lyons, Acting Director, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Ernesto Santacruz Jr., Acting Director, Los Angeles Field Office, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Enforcement and Removal Operations, Fereti Semaia, Warden, Adelanto ICE Processing Center, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, U.S. Department of Homeland Security

TOPICS

immigration detention federal habeas corpus injunctions sanctions removal proceedings

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration law federal habeas corpus civil procedure injunctive relief sanctions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether petitioners' request for a preliminary injunction requiring release or individualized bond hearings was moot after all petitioners received the opportunity for bond hearings.
2. Whether the petition should be dismissed as moot in light of the completed bond hearings and potentially overlapping declaratory relief in Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz.
3. Whether respondents should be required to show cause why sanctions should not issue for failing to comply with the TRO.

HOLDINGS

1. The request for a preliminary injunction seeking release or bond hearings was moot because all petitioners had received the opportunity for a bond hearing, leaving no effective interim relief for the court to provide.

2. The court did not impose sanctions in this order but required respondents to show cause why sanctions should not issue for failing to provide two petitioners bond hearings or release them by the TRO deadline.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A case becomes moot when interim relief or events have deprived the court of the ability to redress the party’s injuries.” (at 2)

“Further, a court has an obligation to consider mootness sua sponte, and it should deny the requested relief when it is superfluous.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The eight petitioners were detained in immigration custody and sought release or individualized bond hearings under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), along with a declaration that detention under § 1225(b)(2) was unlawful. The court's TRO required respondents to provide bond hearings by December 8, 2025, or release the petitioners. Six petitioners were offered hearings by the deadline, and the remaining two received hearings four days late. By the December 15 hearing, all petitioners had received the opportunity for bond hearings.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioners filed the habeas petition and TRO application on November 24, 2025. After a December 1 hearing, the court issued a TRO requiring respondents to provide bond hearings under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) by December 8 or release the petitioners. Six petitioners were offered hearings by the deadline, while the remaining two received hearings on December 12. The court denied the preliminary-injunction request as moot because all petitioners had received the opportunity for bond hearings, and on December 16 ordered show cause regarding dismissal of the petition as moot and sanctions for the TRO violation.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- United States v. Alder Creek Water Co., 823 F.2d 343, 345 (9th Cir. 1987)
- NASD Disp. Resol., Inc. v. Jud. Council, 488 F.3d 1065, 1068 (9th Cir. 2007)
- In re Burrell, 415 F.3d 994, 997 (9th Cir. 2005)
- Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz, No. 5:25-cv-01873 (C.D. Cal.)