

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

Jesse Joseph Aich v. Darrian Campbell

Aich · No. 26-3062-JWL · Decided April 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Kansas construed Jesse Joseph Aich’s response to an order to show cause as a motion for an extension of time. The court granted the extension, directed the Clerk to resend the order to show cause, and allowed Aich until June 2, 2026, to respond regarding potential dismissal of his § 2241 petition under the Ex parte Royall and Younger abstention doctrines.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Kansas
WRITING FOR THE COURT	James P. O'Hara
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Kansas
DECIDED	April 27, 2026
DOCKET	26-3062-JWL
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner filed a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. After the court issued an order to show cause regarding abstention, Petitioner's response was construed as a motion for an extension of time to respond.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished, nonprecedential memorandum and order
PARTIES	Jesse Joseph Aich v. Darrian Campbell

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- Federal habeas corpus
- Post-conviction relief
- Civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Petitioner's response should be liberally construed as a motion for an extension of time when the order to show cause apparently was not delivered to him.

2. Whether the court should grant additional time for Petitioner to respond to the order to show cause.

HOLDINGS

1. Because the order to show cause apparently was not delivered to Petitioner and his response did not address the issues identified in that order, the court liberally construed the response as a motion for an extension of time.
2. The motion for an extension of time was granted, and Petitioner was given until June 2, 2026, to show cause in writing why the habeas matter should not be dismissed without prejudice.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jesse Joseph Aich, a pro se pretrial detainee at the Reno County Correctional Facility in Hutchinson, Kansas, filed a § 2241 habeas petition. The court's March 24, 2026 memorandum and order to show cause was returned marked "Return to Sender," "Refused," and "Unable to Forward." Aich submitted a response by the April 24 deadline, but the response did not address the abstention doctrines identified in the show-cause order, apparently because he had not received it.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court issued a memorandum and order to show cause on March 24, 2026, directing Petitioner to explain why the action should not be dismissed without prejudice under *Ex parte Royall* and *Younger v. Harris*. The order was returned as refused and unable to be forwarded, and Petitioner stated that he did not know why it had not been delivered. Because his response did not address abstention, the court liberally construed it as a motion for an extension of time, granted the motion, and ordered that a second copy of the show-cause order be sent.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Ex parte Royall*, 117 U.S. 241 (1886)
- *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971)