

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district-court order; precedential status unknown and not identified as precedential in the source metadata.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)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-cal/2025/sukhjot-singh-sekhon-v-warden-of-the-golden-state-annex-seducv73>