

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Hector Arnulfo German Reyes v. Warden, FCI Mendota

Reyes · No. 1:24-cv-01543-CDB (HC) · Decided November 6, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California denied Respondent’s motion to stay proceedings in Hector Arnulfo German Reyes’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition. The court instead extended Respondent’s deadline to file a response by 30 days, through December 3, 2025, and set the deadline for Petitioner’s traverse at 30 days after Respondent’s filing.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	November 6, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-01543-CDB (HC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Federal prisoner petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241; respondent moved to stay the proceedings instead of filing a response to the petition.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A stay is discretionary. The court must weigh the possible damage from granting a stay, the hardship or inequity to the party required to proceed, and the orderly course of justice, including whether a stay would simplify or complicate the issues, proof, and questions of law. The length of the stay must be weighed against the strength of the justification, with a greater showing required for a particularly long or indefinite stay.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished trial-court order
PARTIES	Hector Arnulfo German Reyes v. Warden, FCI Mendota

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether respondent established sufficient hardship or inequity to warrant staying the § 2241 proceedings under the factors governing judicial stays.
2. Whether the court should extend respondent's deadline to respond to the habeas petition after denying the motion to stay.

HOLDINGS

1. Respondent's motion to stay is denied because respondent did not address the governing CMAX factors and the balance of potential damage, hardship, and orderly administration of justice did not favor a stay.
2. After denying the stay, the court continued respondent's deadline to respond to the petition by 30 days, through and including December 3, 2025.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.” (at 1)

“[I]f there is even a fair possibility that the . . . stay will work damage to someone else, the party seeking the stay must make out a clear case of hardship or inequity.” (at 1)

“In granting a stay, a court must weigh “the length of the stay against the strength of the justification given for it.”” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Hector Arnulfo German Reyes, a federal prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed a § 2241 petition alleging that the Bureau of Prisons denied him due process during a disciplinary hearing. The court ordered respondent to respond by November 3, 2025. On that deadline, respondent moved to stay rather than respond, asserting that a lapse in Department of Justice appropriations prevented DOJ and Bureau of Prisons counsel and staff from working and assisting with the response.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed a § 2241 petition alleging that the Bureau of Prisons denied him due process in connection with a disciplinary hearing. After ordering respondent to respond, the court received respondent's motion to stay based on a lapse in Department of Justice appropriations and the asserted unavailability of Bureau of Prisons personnel. The court denied the motion to stay and extended respondent's response deadline by 30 days.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Landis v. North American Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254–55 (1936)
- Lockyer v. Mirant Corp., 398 F.3d 1098, 1109, 1112 (9th Cir. 2005)
- United States v. Aerojet Rocketdyne Holdings, Inc., 381 F. Supp. 3d 1240, 1250 (E.D. Cal. May 8, 2019)
- CMAX, Inc. v. Hall, 300 F.2d 265, 268 (9th Cir. 1962)
- Yong v. I.N.S., 208 F.3d 1116, 1119 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Blanc v. Taylor, No. 1:24-cv-01212-KES-CDB, 2025 WL 437661, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 7, 2025)
- Puente v. Warden, No. 1:23-cv-00083-CDB (E.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2025)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-cal/2025/hector-arnulfo-german-reyes-v-warden-fci-mendota-y1fxdxy2>