

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Qusai Mahasin v. Warden, USP Atwater

No. 1:25-cv-00363 JLT EPG (HC), United States District Court for the Eastern District of California (December 11, 2025)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations in a federal prisoner’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition. The court denied the petition, terminated the respondent’s motion to dismiss, and directed the clerk to close the case after the petitioner filed no objections.

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	December 11, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00363 JLT EPG (HC)
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Federal prisoner filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. A magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending denial of the petition, and the district court adopted those findings and recommendations after de novo review.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status is not identified in the source.
PARTIES	Qusai Mahasin v. Warden, USP Atwater

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- motions to dismiss
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

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

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations denying the § 2241 petition and terminating respondent's motion to dismiss should be adopted.
2. Whether the petition for a writ of habeas corpus should be denied.

HOLDINGS

1. After conducting de novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the district court adopted the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations in full.
2. The petition for a writ of habeas corpus was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Having carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.” (Opinion at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Qusai Mahasin is a federal prisoner proceeding pro se who filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Respondent filed a pleading titled a motion to dismiss and response, but the magistrate judge treated it as addressing the merits rather than presenting grounds for dismissal. The petitioner did not object to the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The matter was referred to a United States magistrate judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 3, 2025, the magistrate judge recommended denying the habeas petition and terminating respondent's motion to dismiss; petitioner filed no objections within the applicable period. The district court reviewed the matter de novo, adopted the findings and recommendations in full, denied the petition, terminated the motion to dismiss, and directed the clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

writ_denied

CASES CITED

- Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014)

OPINION

Qusai Mahasin v. Warden, USP Atwater
PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 QUSAI MAHASIN, No. 1:25-cv-00363 JLT EPG (HC)

12 Petitioner, ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS, DENYING

13 v. PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS

CORPUS, TERMINATING RESPONDENT'S

14 WARDEN, USP ATWATER, MOTION TO DISMISS, AND DIRECTING
CLERK OF COURT TO CLOSE CASE

15 Respondent. (Docs. 8, 10) 16 17 Petitioner is a federal prisoner proceeding pro se with a
petition for writ of habeas corpus 18 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. This matter was referred to a
United States Magistrate Judge 19 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. 20
On October 3, 2025, the magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations 21 recommending
that the petition for writ of habeas corpus be denied and Respondent's motion to 22 dismiss be
terminated.¹ (Doc. 10.) The Court served the findings and recommendations on 23 Petitioner and
notified him that any objections were due within 30 days. (Id. at 9.) The Court 24 advised him that
the "failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to 25 appeal the
District Court's order." (Id. at 10, citing *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 26 (9th Cir.
2014).) Plaintiff did not file objections, and the time to do so has passed. 27 1 The magistrate
judge noted that "[a]lthough the responsive pleading is titled as a 'motion to dismiss and
response,' Respondent only addresses the merits of the petition and does not provide grounds for
dismissal, as opposed to 28 denial, of the petition." (Doc. 10 at 2 n.2.) 1 According to 28 U.S.C. §
636(b)(1)(C), this Court performed a de novo review of this 2 | case. Having carefully reviewed
the matter, the Court concludes the findings and 3 || recommendations are supported by the record
and proper analysis. Thus, the Court ORDERS: 4 1. The findings and recommendations issued on
October 3, 2025 (Doc. 10) are 5 ADOPTED IN FULL. 6 2. The petition for writ of habeas corpus
is DENIED. 7 3. Respondent's motion to dismiss (Doc. 8) is TERMINATED. 8 4. The Clerk of
Court is directed to CLOSE THE CASE. 9 10 IT IS SO ORDERED. 11 | Dated: December 11,
2025 Cerin | Tower

TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28