

---

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

Case No.: 5:26-cv-00835-FWS-E

Date: March 23, 2026

Title: Hani Labib Karas v. David Marin

---

---

Present: **HONORABLE FRED W. SLAUGHTER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

Rolls Royce Paschal  
Deputy Clerk

N/A  
Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Petitioner:

Attorneys Present for Respondent:

Not Present

Not Present

**PROCEEDINGS: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER DENYING AS MOOT PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION; DIRECTING PETITIONER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY CASE SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED; REFERRING FURTHER PROCEEDINGS, INCLUDING ISSUE OF WHETHER CASE SHOULD BE DISMISSED AS MOOT, TO ASSIGNED MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

On February 19, 2026, Petitioner Hani Labib Karas filed this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 against Respondent David Marin, Warden of Adelanto Immigration and Customs Enforcement Detention Facility. (Dkt. 1 (“Petition”).) In the Petition, Petitioner seeks, among other relief, a writ ordering Respondent to immediately release Petitioner from custody. (*Id.* at 19.) The same day, Petitioner filed an Application for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction. (Dkt. 2 (“Application” or “App.”).) Respondent did not file a response to the Application as required by the court’s order. (*See generally* Dkt.)

On February 24, 2026, the court granted Petitioner’s Application. (Dkt. 8 (“TRO”).) The court ordered the following: (1) Respondent “to release Petitioner from custody on or before **February 26, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time**,” “under the terms and conditions existing as if Petitioner had not been detained”; (2) “Respondent to provide Petitioner with a copy of th[e] [TRO] on or before **February 26, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time**”; and (3) Respondent “to show cause in writing on or before **March 2, 2026**, as to why the court should not issue a preliminary injunction.” (*Id.* at 7.) The same day, Respondent filed a Notice of Appearance of Counsel Patrick J. Kearney. (Dkt. 7.) Respondent did not show cause in

---

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

Case No.: 5:26-cv-00835-FWS-E

Date: March 23, 2026

Title: Hani Labib Karas v. David Marin

---

writing as to why the court should not issue a preliminary injunction by the court’s deadline. (See generally Dkt.)

On March 4, 2026, the court ordered Respondent’s counsel Patrick J. Kearney to file a response to the TRO on or before March 5, 2026, at 10:00 a.m., and also address whether Respondent complied with court’s order that Respondent “release Petitioner from custody on or before **February 26, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time**” and “provide Petitioner with a copy of th[e] [TRO] on or before **February 26, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time.**” (Dkt. 13 (“Compliance Order”) at 1.) The court warned Mr. Kearney that the next failure to comply with the court’s orders will result in the court ordering Mr. Kearney to show cause why Mr. Kearney should not be sanctioned for subsequent failures to comply with the court’s orders. Respondent failed to comply with the Compliance Order, and Mr. Kearney was ordered to show cause in writing on or before March 9, 2026, at 2:00 p.m., why Respondent’s counsel should not be sanctioned for failing to comply with the TRO and Compliance Order. (Dkt. 14 (“OSC”).)

In the response to the court’s OSC, Respondent states that Respondent partially failed to comply with the court’s TRO due to an inadvertent calendaring error. (Dkt. 16 at 2.) Respondent further states that Respondent timely complied with order to release Petitioner on February 25, 2026. (*Id.*) Respondent also states, upon receiving the OSC, Respondent’s Counsel immediately served the court’s TRO upon Petitioner and his Immigration Court Counsel. (*Id.*) Regarding the issuance of a preliminary injunction, Respondent states that the court should deny the motion for a preliminary injunction because Petitioner has received the relief sought and is no longer in immigration custody. (Dkt. 17 at 2.)

The court discharged the OSC, continued the deadline for Petitioner to file a reply regarding the issuance of a preliminary injunction to and including March 19, 2026, and continued the hearing on whether a preliminary injunction should issue to March 26, 2026, at 10:00 a.m., in Courtroom 10D. (Dkt. 19.)

Petitioner filed a reply in support of the Motion for Preliminary Injunction. (Dkt. 23.) Petitioner argues, in summary, that the case is not moot because Petitioner seeks to prevent his re-detention unless Respondent has travel documents and a travel plan. (*Id.* at 4-13.)

---

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

Case No.: 5:26-cv-00835-FWS-E

Date: March 23, 2026

Title: Hani Labib Karas v. David Marin

---

“A case becomes moot when interim relief or events have deprived the court of the ability to redress the party’s injuries.” *United States v. Alder Creek Water Co.*, 823 F.2d 343, 345 (9th Cir. 1987); *see also NASD Disp. Resol., Inc. v. Jud. Council*, 488 F.3d 1065, 1068 (9th Cir. 2007) (finding appeal to be moot when the plaintiffs had already been granted the relief they sought). Courts have an obligation to consider mootness *sua sponte*, and should deny requested relief where it is superfluous. *In re Burrell*, 415 F.3d 994, 997 (9th Cir. 2005). The “basic question in determining mootness is whether there is a present controversy as to which effective relief can be granted.” *Nw. Env’tl. Def. Ctr. v. Gordon*, 849 F.2d 1241, 1244 (9th Cir. 1988).

Here, the relief Petitioner sought in the Application was a court order releasing Petitioner from custody; refraining from removing Petitioner from the United States or transferring him from the Central District of California; reinstating his Order of Supervision terms; and issuing an order for Respondent to show cause as to why the court should not issue a preliminary injunction. (App. 4-5.) Now that Petitioner has mostly obtained that relief, (*see* TRO at 7), the court finds Petitioner fails to make an adequate showing that a preliminary injunction is warranted. (*See generally* App.) Accordingly, the court **DENIES AS MOOT** Petitioner’s request for a preliminary injunction.<sup>1</sup> *See, e.g., Yessenia Alvarez Cabanillas v. Geo Group, Inc. et al.*, 5:25-cv-03484-ODW-PC, Dkt. No. 11 (denying as moot petitioner’s request for a preliminary injunction where petitioner sought emergency injunctive relief to be released from custody and was granted the requested relief); *Mauricio Alejandro Ovalle Lombana v. Mark Bowen et al.*, 2:25-cv-10871- HDV-JC, Dkt. No. 14 (denying petitioner’s habeas petition as moot because petitioner was afforded a bond hearing and has been released on bond). **Nothing in this Order shall be read to preclude issuance of the relief Petitioner seeks in the Petition at a later stage of the proceedings.**

---

<sup>1</sup> The court finds this matter appropriate for resolution without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 78(b) (“By rule or order, the court may provide for submitting and determining motions on briefs, without oral hearings.”); C.D. Cal. L.R. 7-15 (authorizing courts to “dispense with oral argument on any motion except where an oral hearing is required by statute”). Accordingly, the hearing set for **March 26, 2026**, is **VACATED** and **OFF CALENDAR**.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

Case No.: 5:26-cv-00835-FWS-E

Date: March 23, 2026

Title: Hani Labib Karas v. David Marin

---

---

In addition, the court **ORDERS** Petitioner to show cause in writing on or before **April 10, 2026**, why this case should not be dismissed as moot in its entirety. Respondent shall file a response on or before **April 17, 2026**. Petitioner may file a reply on or before **April 24, 2026**. Absent further order of the court, no hearing will be held.

Finally, the court observes that this case has been referred to Magistrate Judge Charles F. Eick. (Dkt. 5.) Pursuant to General Order No. 05-07, further proceedings on the merits of the Petition—including the issue of whether this case should be dismissed as moot—are **REFERRED** to Magistrate Judge Eick for decision.