

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Sukhjot Singh Sekhon v. Warden of the Golden State Annex
Detention Facility, et al.

Sekhon v. Warden of the Golden State Annex Detention Facility · No. 1:25-cv-1692-DC-JDP (P) · Decided
December 2, 2025

SUMMARY

The court grants an immigration detainee's application to proceed in forma pauperis and motion for appointment of counsel in a 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition. The court appoints the Federal Defender, orders service of the petition and a show-cause response, and directs the parties to propose a briefing schedule. The respondent is also prohibited from transferring the petitioner outside the Eastern District of California pending further order.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jeremy D. Peterson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 2, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-1692-DC-JDP (P)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se immigration detainee filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, an application to proceed in forma pauperis, and a motion for appointment of counsel. On preliminary review, the court granted in forma pauperis status and appointed counsel, ordered service and a response, and temporarily prohibited transfer of petitioner outside the judicial district.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Preliminary review under Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, applied to the § 2241 petition through Rule 1(b). The court assessed whether the petition alleged a possible constitutional violation warranting service and a response.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district-court order; precedential status unknown and not identified as precedential in the source metadata.

PARTIES

Sukhjot Singh Sekhon v. Warden of the Golden State Annex Detention Facility, et al.

TOPICS

immigration detention

injunctions

immigration

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration

habeas corpus

civil procedure

constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether petitioner satisfied the requirements to proceed in forma pauperis.
2. Whether the interests of justice required appointment of counsel for the pro se immigration detainee.
3. Whether preliminary review showed that petitioner might be entitled to habeas relief, requiring service of the § 2241 petition and a response from respondents.
4. Whether the court could restrict respondent from transferring petitioner outside the district pending further order to preserve jurisdiction over the § 2241 petition.

HOLDINGS

1. Petitioner satisfied the required showing and was entitled to proceed in forma pauperis.
2. Appointment of counsel was warranted because the complexity of the legal issues made appointment necessary in the interests of justice.
3. Because petitioner might be entitled to relief if the alleged constitutional violation were proved, respondents were required to be served and to show cause why the writ should not issue.
4. Pending further order, respondents were prohibited from transferring petitioner to another detention center outside the judicial district.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions...” (at 2)

“to preserve the court’s jurisdiction or maintain the status quo by injunction pending review of an agency’s action” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Sukhjot Singh Sekhon was an immigration detainee held at the Golden State Annex Detention Facility and filed a pro se § 2241 habeas petition alleging a violation of constitutional rights. The court considered his requests to proceed in forma pauperis and for appointed counsel, and was concerned that a transfer outside the district could interfere with its jurisdiction over the pending petition.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The petition was filed in the Eastern District of California and had not yet been adjudicated on the merits. After preliminary review under Rule 4, the court concluded that petitioner might be entitled to relief if his alleged constitutional violation were proved, ordered respondents to show cause, and issued case-management and jurisdiction-preservation directives.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Weygandt v. Look, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983)
- F.T.C. v. Dean Foods Co., 384 U.S. 597, 604 (1966)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 SUKHJOT SINGH SEKHON, Case No. 1.25-cv-1692-DC-JDP (P) 12
Petitioner, 13 v. ORDER 14 WARDEN OF THE GOLDEN STATE ANNEX DETENTION
FACILITY, et al., 15 Respondents. 16 17 18 Petitioner, an immigration detainee who is
representing himself, filed a petition for a writ 19 of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

Petitioner has filed an application to proceed in 20 forma pauperis, ECF No. 2, and a motion for
the appointment of counsel, ECF No. 3. 21 Petitioner’s application to proceed in forma pauperis
makes the required showing and is 22 granted. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). Petitioner’s motion for
the appointment of counsel, ECF No. 23 3, will also be granted.

In light of the complexity of the legal issues involved, the court has 24 determined that the
interests of justice require the appointment of counsel. See 18 U.S.C. 25 § 3006A(a)(2)(B); see
also Weygandt v. Look, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983).

The court will 26 appoint the Federal Public Defender to represent petitioner throughout the
course of these 27 proceedings. 28 1 The court has conducted a preliminary review of the petition
pursuant to Rule 4 of the 2 Rules Governing Habeas Corpus Cases Under Section 2254.1 Because
petitioner may be entitled 3 to the requested relief if the claimed violation of constitutional rights
is proved, respondent will 4 be served with the § 2241 petition and directed to show cause why the
writ should not be granted 5 by filing a return.

See 28 U.S.C. § 2243. 6 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 7 1.
Petitioner’s application to proceed in forma pauperis, ECF No. 2, is GRANTED. 8 2. Petitioner’s
motion for the appointment of counsel, ECF No. 3, is GRANTED.

The 9 Federal Defender is appointed to represent petitioner. 10 3. The Clerk of the Court shall
serve a copy of this order on the Federal Defender, 11 Attention: Habeas Appointment. 12 4. The

Clerk of the Court shall serve a copy of this order together with a copy of 13 petitioner's application for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 on the United 14 States Attorney.

15 5. The parties are directed to meet and confer within three days from the date of this order 16 for the purpose of submitting a joint proposed briefing schedule in this case. The parties shall file 17 a joint proposed briefing schedule no later than seven days from the date of this order. 18 6.

In order to ensure this court's jurisdiction to resolve the pending § 2241 petition, 19 respondent shall not transfer petitioner to another detention center outside of this judicial district, 20 pending further order of the court. See 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) (establishing the All Writs Act which 21 empowers the federal courts to "issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective 22 jurisdictions...."); see also *F.T.C. v. Dean Foods Co.*, 384 U.S. 597, 604 (1966) (emphasizing 23 that federal courts have the power to "to preserve the court's jurisdiction or maintain the status 24 quo by injunction pending review of an agency's action").

25 26 27 1 Rule 1(b) of the Rules Governing Habeas Corpus Cases Under Section 2254 allows a district court to apply any or all of the rules to other types of habeas corpus petitions, including 28 § 2241 petitions. IT IS SO ORDERED. ° Dated: _ December 2, 2025 gene Ws 4 JEREMY D. PETERSON 5 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28