

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

Menatalla Elrewiny v. John Armstrong and Evyenia Sidereas

No. 3:25-CV-463 (VDO) (D. Conn. Feb. 15, 2026) · No. 3:25-CV-463 (VDO) · Decided February 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Connecticut dismissed with prejudice Menatalla Elrewiny’s claims seeking mandamus and Administrative Procedure Act relief to compel adjudication of her parents’ visa applications. The court held that the doctrine of consular nonreviewability barred review and alternatively concluded that the complaint failed to establish unreasonable delay or entitlement to mandamus. The court denied leave to amend, directed entry of judgment for defendants, and ordered the case closed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Connecticut
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Vernon D. Oliver
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Connecticut
DECIDED	February 15, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-CV-463 (VDO)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved to dismiss the complaint under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6). The court granted the motion and dismissed all claims with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the Rule 12(b)(1) and Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss. For Rule 12(b)(6), the court accepted material factual allegations as true, drew reasonable inferences for plaintiff, and assessed whether the complaint plausibly stated a claim for relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum and order; persuasive rather than precedential
PARTIES	Menatalla Elrewiny v. John Armstrong, in his official capacity as Senior Bureau Official of the U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Evyenia Sidereas, in her official capacity as Deputy Chief of Mission at the U.S. Embassy in Egypt

TOPICS

visa petitions

consular processing

mandamus immigration

judicial review of agency action

motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration

administrative law

civil procedure

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the doctrine of consular nonreviewability barred judicial review of plaintiff's claims seeking to compel consular officials to adjudicate the visa petitions.
2. Whether plaintiff plausibly stated an Administrative Procedure Act claim based on allegedly unreasonable delay in visa adjudication.
3. Whether plaintiff satisfied the requirements for a writ of mandamus compelling adjudication of the visa petitions.
4. Whether plaintiff should be granted leave to amend.

HOLDINGS

1. The doctrine of consular nonreviewability categorically barred plaintiff's claims seeking an order compelling consular officials to adjudicate the visa petitions because the claims challenged the visa-issuing process and did not plausibly allege that the visa decision burdened a citizen's constitutional rights while lacking a legitimate and bona fide reason.
2. Plaintiff failed to state a claim under the APA because the complaint did not plausibly allege that the delay in adjudicating the visas was unreasonable.
3. Plaintiff was not entitled to a writ of mandamus because she failed to establish the necessary prerequisites, including a clear and indisputable right to relief and the absence of another adequate remedy.
4. Leave to amend was denied because plaintiff did not request it or explain how amendment would cure the deficiencies, and amendment would be futile.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Principles of consular nonreviewability provide that, except in limited circumstances, courts may not review a consular officer's decision to grant or deny a visa." (at 4)

"Much like Hsieh, Plaintiff's claims here are precluded from judicial review." (at 5)

"But considering the Hsieh's Court issuance of a broad declaration that 'the judiciary will not interfere with the visa-issuing process,' this Court cannot deduce a principled reason to conclude that Plaintiff's claims are reviewable." (at 5)

"Generally, a party must satisfy three conditions for a writ of mandamus to issue:" (at 6)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

In October 2020, Menatalla Elrewiny, a United States citizen, filed Form I-130 petitions for her parents, who were born in Egypt. USCIS approved the petitions on September 30, 2021, and the National Visa Center later deemed them documentarily qualified. The parents attended consular interviews on February 5, 2023; one parent received notice that the visa had been approved and should be processed within two weeks, and both beneficiaries later completed a requested questionnaire. Plaintiff sought an order compelling defendants to adjudicate the visa matters without further delay.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an action seeking mandamus and relief under the Administrative Procedure Act to compel adjudication of immigrant-visa petitions for her parents. Defendants moved to dismiss for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction and failure to state a claim. The district court held that consular nonreviewability barred the claims and that, independently, the complaint failed to state claims under the APA or Mandamus Act.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Operating Local 649 Annuity Trust Fund v. Smith Barney Fund Management LLC, 595 F.3d 86, 91 (2d Cir. 2010)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- DiFolco v. MSNBC Cable L.L.C., 622 F.3d 104, 111 (2d Cir. 2010)
- Chambers v. Time Warner, Inc., 282 F.3d 147, 153 (2d Cir. 2002)
- International Audiotext Network, Inc. v. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 62 F.3d 69, 72 (2d Cir. 1995)
- Leonard v. General Motors L.L.C., 504 F. Supp. 3d 73, 83 (D. Conn. 2020)
- American Academy of Religion v. Napolitano, 573 F.3d 115, 123, 125 (2d Cir. 2009)
- Trump v. Hawaii, 585 U.S. 667, 702 (2018)
- Fiallo v. Bell, 430 U.S. 787, 792, 796 (1977)
- Harisiades v. Shaughnessy, 342 U.S. 580, 596-97 (1952)
- Chen v. Rubio, 158 F.4th 393, 397 (2d Cir. 2025)
- Department of State v. Muñoz, 602 U.S. 899, 908 (2024)
- Wan Shih Hsieh v. Kiley, 569 F.2d 1179, 1180-81 (2d Cir. 1978)
- Gharedaghi v. Blinken, No. 3:24-CV-1798 (VAB), 2025 WL 2300763, at *3, *5 (D. Conn. Aug. 8, 2025)
- Khan v. United States Department of State, 722 F. Supp. 3d 92, 98 (D. Conn. 2024)
- Ceken v. Chertoff, 536 F. Supp. 2d 211, 216 (D. Conn. 2008)
- Sharifi v. Blinken, 731 F. Supp. 3d 433, 439 (E.D.N.Y. 2024)
- Adjei v. United States Department of State, No. 24-CV-1311 (JCH), 2025 WL 2877820, at *5 (D. Conn. Oct. 9, 2025)

- Balintulo v. Daimler AG, 727 F.3d 174, 186-87 (2d Cir. 2013)
- Wilson v. Merrill Lynch & Co., 671 F.3d 120, 140 (2d Cir. 2011)
- Gallop v. Cheney, 642 F.3d 364, 369 (2d Cir. 2011)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-connecticut-united-states-district-court-for-the-di/2026/menatalla-elrewiny-v-john-armstrong-and-evyenia-sidereas-st45bhy0>