

1 BILAL A. ESSAYLI
First Assistant United States Attorney
2 DAVID M. HARRIS
Assistant United States Attorney
3 Chief, Civil Division
DANIEL A. BECK
4 Assistant United States Attorney
Chief, Complex and Defensive Litigation Section
5 KAREN E. SMITH (Md. Bar No. 0712120288)
Special Assistant United States Attorney
6 Federal Building, Suite 7516
300 North Los Angeles Street
7 Los Angeles, California 90012
Telephone: (213) 917-0138
8 E-mail: karen.smith@usdoj.gov
Attorneys for Federal Respondents
9

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12

13 JAROLD MAVERICH
14 RUEDA PADILLA

15 Petitioner,

16 v.

17 MARK BOWEN, Warden of the
Adelanto Detention Facility, et al.,

18 Respondents.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

No. 2:25-cv-10780-CAS-SK

**FEDERAL RESPONDENTS'
RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE RE: PRELIMINARY
INJUNCTION**

Honorable Christina Snyder
United States District Judge

**RESPONDENTS' OPPOSITION TO OSC RE: PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION;
SUGGESTION OF MOOTNESS**

On November 21, 2025, the Court issued an order [Dkt. 13] effectuating the Petitioner's immediate release from custody and enjoining Respondents from re-arresting or re-detaining Petitioner without pre-deprivation notice of a change in circumstances. The Court's order further required Respondents to show cause as to why a preliminary injunction should not issue. Respondents hereby show such cause.

Petitioner was released from custody following the Court Order and placed on electronic monitoring. He was also given a report date of November 28, 2025.

Releasing Petitioner moots the requested preliminary injunction and this habeas petition more generally. *See Iron Arrow Honor Society v. Heckler*, 464 U.S. 67, 70 (1983); *United States v. Geophysical Corp. of Alaska*, 732 F.2d 693, 698 (9th Cir. 1984) ("We cannot take jurisdiction over a claim as to which no effective relief can be granted."); *see Franciso Coc Tut v. Noem*, 5:25-cv-02701-DOC, Dkt. 13 (Oct. 13, 2025) (attached as Ex. 2) (granting TRO, but denying PI and stating, "The Court understands Petitioners' concerns regarding re-detention. Petitioners may seek relief from the Court should they be re-detained...."); *J.P. v. Santacruz*, No. 8:25-CV-01640-FWS, 2025 WL 2998305, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2025) (dismissing case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction where petitioner requested notice and a hearing before a neutral adjudicator prior to his potential future re-detention and/or re-arrest).

While Respondents continue to oppose the issuance of a preliminary injunction pursuant to the legal positions stated in the Respondents' brief in opposition to the Petitioners' *ex parte* application for a temporary restraining order, and the Respondents maintain that those positions warrant denying a preliminary injunction on the merits, the issue is mooted in any event by the TRO's issuance [Dkt. 13].

Accordingly, the OSC re: preliminary injunction should be discharged, and the Petitioner should either voluntarily dismiss the Petition or else be required to respond to an OSC re: Dismissal.

1 Dated: November 26, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

2 BILAL A. ESSAYLI
First Assistant United States Attorney
3 DAVID M. HARRIS
Assistant United States Attorney
4 Chief, Civil Division
DANIEL A. BECK
5 Assistant United States Attorney
Chief, Complex and Defensive Litigation Section

6 /s/ Karen E. Smith
7 Karen E. Smith
8 Special Assistant United States Attorney

9 Attorneys for Federal Respondents

10 **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH L.R. 11-6.2**

11 The undersigned, counsel of record for Respondents, certifies that the
12 memorandum of points and authorities contains 1986 words, which complies with the
13 word limit of L.R. 11-6.1.

14 Dated: November 26, 2025

15 /s/ Karen E. Smith
Karen E. Smith
16 Special Assistant United States Attorney