

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA, MONROE DIVISION

Patricia Alejandra Rondon Hernandez v. U.S. Immigration and
Customs Enforcement, et al.

Rondon Hernandez · No. 3:25-cv-01618 · Decided January 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana recommends dismissing Patricia Alejandra Rondon Hernandez’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition without prejudice as moot. Because Hernandez was released from immigration custody and removed to Mexico, the court concluded that no live controversy remained regarding her requested release.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Monroe Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Kayla D. McClusky, United States Magistrate Judge
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Monroe Division
DECIDED	January 6, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-cv-01618
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging her immigration detention and requesting immediate release. The magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal without prejudice as moot because petitioner had been released and removed from the United States.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Article III case-or-controversy and mootness review; mootness may be raised sua sponte.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Patricia Alejandra Rondon Hernandez v. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, et al.

TOPICS

immigration detention

removal proceedings

subject matter jurisdiction

immigration

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration law

federal habeas corpus

constitutional jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether petitioner's § 2241 challenge to her immigration detention became moot after she was released from custody and removed from the United States.
2. Whether the court could provide relief concerning petitioner's post-removal request for protection and concerns about being removed to Mexico without financial resources or a passport.

HOLDINGS

1. The petition became moot because petitioner was released from the detention she challenged and had already received the sole relief she sought—release from custody—leaving no live case or controversy or effectual relief for the court to grant.
2. The court could not address petitioner's post-removal requests for protection because the petition was moot and the court had no authority to grant the requested relief in the closed detention controversy.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In order to maintain jurisdiction, the court must have before it an actual case or controversy at all stages of the judicial proceedings.” (at 2)

“A case becomes moot only when it is impossible for a court to grant any effectual relief whatever to the prevailing party.” (at 2)

“Because Bailey was released . . . this court can no longer provide him with that relief.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Patricia Alejandra Rondon Hernandez, a Venezuelan citizen, entered the United States on or about January 21, 2025, and was taken into immigration custody five days later. She was ordered removed on February 21, 2025, and an asylum officer determined that it was more likely than not that she would be tortured in Venezuela. She later filed a § 2241 petition seeking release from detention, but she was released and removed to Mexico while the petition was pending.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed the § 2241 petition on October 23, 2025, asserting that she had been detained beyond the statutory removal period and that removal was not likely in the near future. While the petition was pending, she was released from custody and removed to Mexico. The magistrate judge therefore recommended dismissal without prejudice for lack of a live case or controversy, subject to objections under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b).

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001)
- *Herndon v. Upton*, 2021 WL 116535, at *2 (5th Cir. Jan. 13, 2021)
- *Spencer v. Kemna*, 523 U.S. 1, 7 (1998)
- *Deakins v. Monaghan*, 484 U.S. 193, 199 (1988)
- *U.S. v. Vega*, 960 F.3d 669, 672 (5th Cir. 2020)
- *Knox v. Serv. Emps. Int'l Union, Loc. 1000*, 567 U.S. 298, 307 (2012)
- *Powell v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486, 496 (1969)
- *New York State Rifle & Pistol Ass'n, Inc. v. City of New York, New York*, 140 S. Ct. 1525, 1526 (2020)
- *Bailey v. Southerland*, 821 F.2d 277, 278 (5th Cir. 1987)
- *Nyabwa v. Dep't of Homeland Sec. Immigration & Customs Enf't Field Office Dir.*, 537 F. App'x 451 (5th Cir. 2013)
- *Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA MONROE DIVISION PATRICIA ALEJANDRA RONDON CIVIL ACTION NO. 25-1618 HERNANDEZ SECTION P VS. JUDGE JERRY EDWARDS, JR. U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS MAG. JUDGE KAYLA D. MCCLUSKY ENFORCEMENT, ET AL. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION Petitioner Patricia Alejandra Rondon Hernandez,¹ who was previously in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security and the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, petitions the Court for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241.2 For reasons below, the Court should dismiss her petition as moot.

Background Petitioner is a citizen of Venezuela. [doc. # 1-2, p. 4]. She entered the United States on or about January 21, 2025. [doc. # 1-2, p. 4]. She was taken into immigration custody on January 26, 2025. [doc. # 1, p. 6]. She was ordered removed from the United States on February 21, 2025. *Id.* The same day, a DHS asylum officer determined it was more likely than not that 1 Petitioner's "A-Number" is 231432548.

² This matter has been referred to the undersigned for review, report, and recommendation under 28 U.S.C. § 636, and the standing orders of the Court. Petitioner would be tortured in Venezuela. [doc. # 1-3, p. 1]. She did not appeal to the Board of Immigration Appeals. [doc. # 1, p. 6]. Petitioner filed the instant Petition on October 23, 2025. [doc. # 1, p. 10].

Channeling Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678 (2001), she primarily claimed that she had been detained beyond the removal period authorized by statute and that ICE was not likely to remove her in the near future. Id. at 8. Petitioner sought immediate release from custody. [doc. # 1, p. 9]. Petitioner, however, has been released from custody. [doc. #s 25, 26]. She was removed from the United States to Mexico.

Id. Law and Analysis A petitioner "must separately satisfy the case-or-controversy requirement of Article III, Section 2 of the Constitution." Herndon v. Upton, 2021 WL 116535, at *2 (5th Cir. Jan. 13, 2021) (citing Spencer v. Kemna, 523 U.S. 1, 7 (1998)). Jurisdiction is constrained to adjudicating "actual, ongoing controversies between litigants." Deakins v. Monaghan, 484 U.S. 193, 199 (1988). "In order to maintain jurisdiction, the court must have before it an actual case or controversy at all stages of the judicial proceedings." U.S. v. Vega, 960 F.3d 669, 672 (5th Cir.

2020). "A case becomes moot only when it is impossible for a court to grant any effectual relief whatever to the prevailing party." Knox v. Serv. Emps. Int'l Union, Loc. 1000, 567 U.S. 298, 307 (2012) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). "Simply stated, a case is moot when the issues presented are no longer 'live' or the parties lack a legally cognizable interest in the outcome." Powell v. McCormack, 395 U.S. 486, 496 (1969).

A claim is moot when a petitioner achieves the precise relief she requested. See New York State Rifle & Pistol Ass'n, Inc. v. City of New York, New York, 140 S. Ct. 1525, 1526 (2020). Courts are "obliged to raise the subject of mootness sua sponte." Bailey v. Southerland, 821 F.2d 277, 278 (5th Cir. 1987).

Here, Petitioner sought release from custody. Petitioner was released from custody when she was removed from the United States. As she is no longer subject to the detention she challenges, her Petition is moot. See Bailey v. Southerland, 821 F.2d 277, 278 (5th Cir. 1987) ("Because Bailey was released... this court can no longer provide him with that relief."); Herndon, 2021 WL 116535, at *2 ("Herndon's release mooted her § 2241 petition, notwithstanding her continued supervision, because there was no longer a live case or controversy for which any relief could be granted.

Herndon had already received the sole relief sought in her petition: release from confinement."); Nyabwa v. Dep't of Homeland Sec. Immigration & Customs Enf't Field Office Dir., 537 F. App'x 451 (5th Cir. 2013). The undersigned acknowledges that Petitioner filed a change of address subsequent to her removal and asked for the Court's "protection," raising concerns that she was deported to Mexico without financial resources or her passport. [doc. #25].

However, the Court has no authority to address her requests, as her Petition is now moot. Recommendation For the reasons above, IT IS RECOMMENDED that Petitioner Patricia Alejandra Rondon Hernandez's Petition be DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE AS MOOT.

Under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Rule 72(b), parties aggrieved by this recommendation have fourteen (14) days from service of this Report and Recommendation to file specific, written objections with the Clerk of Court. A party may respond to another party's objections within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy of any objections or response to the district judge at the time of filing.

Failure to file written objections to the proposed factual findings and/or the proposed legal conclusions reflected in this Report and Recommendation within fourteen (14) days following the date of its service, or within the time frame authorized by Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b), shall bar an aggrieved party from attacking either the factual findings or the legal conclusions accepted by the District Court, except upon grounds of plain error.

See *Douglas v. United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996). In Chambers, Monroe, Louisiana, this 6 day of January, 2026. slate Kayla DyeSic@lusky United States Magistrate Judge