

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

**Erfan Eftekhari v. Jeremy Casey, Facility Administrator at the
Imperial Regional Detention Facility, Gregory J. Archambeault,
Director of the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement San
Diego Field Office, Todd Lyons, Acting Director of U.S. Immigration
and Customs Enforcement, Kristi Noem, Secretary of the U.S.
Department of Homeland Security, and Pam Bondi, U.S. Attorney
General**

Eftekhari · No. 25-cv-3245-JES-MSB · Decided November 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California ordered the respondents to show cause why Erfan Eftekhari’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 should not be granted. The court set a briefing schedule and stayed Eftekhari’s removal from the district pending further order to preserve jurisdiction.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 ERFAN EFTEKHARI, Case No.: 25-cv-3245-JES-MSB 12 Petitioner,
ORDER: 13 v. (1) REQUIRING A RESPONSE TO 14 JEREMY CASEY, Facility administrator
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS at the Imperial Regional Detention 15 CORPUS; Facility,
GREGORY J. 16 ARCHAMBEAULT, Director of the U.S. (2) SETTING BRIEFING
Immigration and Customs Enforcement 17 SCHEDULE; and San Diego Field Office, TODD
LYONS, 18 acting Director of U.S. Immigration and (3) STAYING REMOVAL OF Customs
Enforcement, KRISTI NOEM, 19 PETITIONER TO PRESERVE Secretary of the U.S.
Department of JURISDICTION 20 Homeland Security, and PAM BONDI, U.S. Attorney General,
21 [ECF No. 1] Respondents.

22 23 Before the Court is Petitioner Erfan Eftekhari’s (“Petitioner’s”) Petition for Writ of 24
Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (“Petition”), filed on November 21, 2025, 25 and
transferred to this Court on November 24, 2025. ECF No. 1. 26 Respondents are ORDERED TO
SHOW CAUSE as to why the Petition should not 27 be granted by filing a Response no later than
5:00 p.m. on Monday, December 1, 2025.

28 1 ||The Response shall include any documents relevant to the determination of the issues 2
||raised in the Petition and address whether an evidentiary hearing on the Petition is 3 ||necessary.
Respondents SHALL SERVE a copy of the Response on the Petitioner. 4 || Petitioner may file an
optional Traverse in support of the Petition no later than 5:00 p.m. 5 Tuesday, December 2, 2025.

After the petition has been fully briefed, the Court will 6 || determine whether it is appropriate to
take the matter under submission or if oral argument 7 || will be required. 8 To preserve the
Court’s jurisdiction pending a ruling in this matter, Petitioner shall 9 ||not be removed from this
District unless and until the Court orders otherwise. See Doe v. 10 || Bondi, Case.

No. 25-cv-805-BJC-JLB, 2025 WL 1870979 at *2 (S.D. Cal. June 11, 2025) 11 (‘Federal courts
retain jurisdiction to preserve the status quo while determining whether it 12 subject matter
jurisdiction over a case and while a petition is pending resolution from 13 court.’) (citing cases);
A.M. v. LaRose et al., 25-cv-01412, ECF No. 2 (S.D. Cal. June 14 ||4, 2025) (“Pursuant to
Petitioner’s request for a Temporary restraining order, the Court 15 || hereby (1) RESTRAINS and
ENJOINS Respondents, their agents, employees, successors, 16 attorneys, and all persons in
active concert and participation with them, from removing 17 || Petitioner A.M. from the United
States or this District pending further order of this Court’); 18 || see also A.A.R.P v. Trump, 605
U.S. 91, 97 (2025) (Federal courts have “the power to issue 19 || injunctive relief to prevent
irreparable harm to the applicant and to preserve [] jurisdiction 20 || over the matter.”); Nguyen v.
Scott, No. 2:25-CV-01398, 2025 WL 2097979, at *3 (W.D.

21 || Wash. July 25, 2025) (enjoining the Respondents from removing Petitioner without 22
approval from the court). 23 IT IS SO ORDERED. 24 || Dated: November 25, 2025 26 Honorable
James E. Sunmons Jr. 07 United States District Judge 28