

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Jia Chen v. Alejandro Mayorkas et al.

Chen · No. 2:24-cv-06069 MRA-KS · Decided December 4, 2025

OPINION

Jia Chen v. Alejandro Mayorkas et al.

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES — GENERAL

Case No. = 2:24-cv-06069 MRA-KS Date December 4, 2025 Title Jia Chen v. Alejandro Mayorkas et al. Present: The Honorable MONICA RAMIREZ ALMADANT, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Melissa H. Kunig None Present Deputy Clerk Court Reporter Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs: Attorneys Present for Defendants: None Present None Present Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY COMPLAINT

SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED AS MOOT

Plaintiff Jia Chen (‘Plaintiff’), proceeding pro se, filed this action on July 19, 2024, against Defendants Alejandro Mayorkas, Merrick Garland, and David Radel (collectively, “Defendants”). ECF 1. Plaintiff's Complaint sought, inter alia, an order requiring Defendants to adjudicate Plaintiff's asylum application. *Jd.* at 5. On September 3, 2024, the Court entered the parties’ joint stipulation to stay this action until October 20, 2025, or until the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) rendered a decision on Plaintiff's asylum application, whichever occurred earlier. ECF 7. The Court directed the parties to file a status report regarding Plaintiff's application on or before October 13, 2025, or when USCIS renders a decision. *Id.* On November 20, 2025, Defendants filed a status update with the Court, indicating that USCIS issued a notice to Plaintiff reflecting its adjudication of Plaintiff's application on June 18, 2025. ECF 10; ECF 10-1 6. Defendants sent this notice to Plaintiff on September 22, 2025, and again on October 10, 2025. ECF 10-1 99 7,9. According to Defendants, Plaintiff had not responded by the time of filing the status report. Plaintiff is hereby ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE in writing, no later than December 17, 2025, why Plaintiff's complaint should not be dismissed as moot. Plaintiff's response shall not exceed five (5) pages. Failure to timely respond may result in dismissal of this lawsuit for lack of prosecution. See Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 41(b); L-R. 41-1; *Link v. Wabash R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630 (1962) (recognizing “inherent power” of district court to dismiss sua sponte for lack of prosecution).

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES — GENERAL

Case No. = 2:24-cv-06069 MRA-KS Date December 4, 2025 Title Jia Chen v. Alejandro Mayorkas et al. IT ISSO ORDERED. Initials of Deputy Clerk mku

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2025/jia-chen-v-alejandro-mayorkas-et-al-xauh4irg>