

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID MARTINEZ-HERNANDEZ,  
Petitioner,  
v.  
KRISTI NOEM, Secretary, et al.,  
Respondents.

No. 2:26-cv-00449-KES-FJS (HC)

**ORDER DIRECTING RESPONDENT TO  
SHOW CAUSE WHY SANCTIONS  
SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED FOR  
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT  
ORDER**

**[TEN-DAY DEADLINE]**

Petitioner is an immigration detainee proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

On February 17, 2026, Petitioner filed a habeas petition complaining that his detention since August 29, 2023, has become unreasonably prolonged in violation of his constitutional rights. (Doc. 1.) On February 20, 2026, the Court issued an order directing Respondent to show cause why the petition should not be granted. (Doc. 7.) Respondent was provided thirty (30) days to respond. Over thirty (30) days have passed, and Respondent has failed to file a responsive pleading.

Local Rule 11-110 provides: “Failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court.”

Accordingly, Respondent is HEREBY ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE, within ten (10)

1 days of service of this Order, why appropriate sanctions should not be imposed for failing to  
2 comply with a court order.

3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 27, 2026

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
FRANK J. SINGER  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE