

ERIC GRANT
United States Attorney
VERONICA M.A. ALEGRÍA
Assistant United States Attorney
501 I Street, Suite 10100
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: (916) 554-2700

Attorneys for Respondents

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JASMEET SINGH,

Petitioner,

v.

WARDEN OF THE GOLDEN STATE ANNEX
DETENTION FACILITY, ET AL.,

Respondents.

CASE NO. 1:25-CV- 01657-JLT-SKO

RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR HABEAS
CORPUS; MOTION TO DISMISS PETITION AS
MOOT

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Jasmeet Singh ("Petitioner") seeks a Writ of Habeas Corpus from his detention by the Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") for his unlawful entry into the United States. ECF 1. However, since the filing of the Petition, Petitioner has been charged with a crime and remanded to the custody of the U.S. Marshals, thereby rendering the Petition moot. Accordingly, the Court should dismiss the Petition as moot.

II. PETITIONER'S CRIMINAL CASE

On November 26, 2025, a criminal complaint was filed against Petitioner in *United States v. Jasmeet Singh*, 2:25-CR-0284-TLN in the Eastern District of California (hereinafter "Criminal Case"). Criminal Case ECF 1. On December 2, 2025, Petitioner made his initial appearance on the criminal complaint and defendant was ordered detained by Magistrate Judge Chi Soo Kim after a detention hearing. Criminal Case ECF 7, 9, 13, 15. In the Order of Detention, the Petitioner was remanded to the custody of the Attorney General and the United States Marshal. Ex 1 at 4.

1 On December 18, 2025, Petitioner was indicted by a grand jury for the Interstate Communication
2 of Threats of Violence in violation of 18 U.S.C § 875(c). Ex. 2. According to the indictment, Petitioner
3 communicated via a WhatsApp call a threat to injure Victim 1. *Id.* That same day, December 18,
4 2025, Petitioner was arraigned before Magistrate Judge Sean C. Riordan. Criminal Case ECF 18.

5 III. ARGUMENT

6 The Constitutional limit of the scope of federal court jurisdiction to federal cases or controversies
7 “underpins . . . [the] mootness jurisprudence.” *Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw Env'tl. Servs. (TOC),*
8 *Inc.*, 528 U.S. 167, 180 (2000). Mootness is thus jurisdictional. *See Cole v. Oroville Union High Sch.*
9 *Dist.*, 228 F.3d 1092, 1098 (9th Cir. 2000). “This means that, throughout the litigation, the plaintiff
10 ‘must have suffered, or be threatened with, an actual injury traceable to the defendant and likely to be
11 redressed by a favorable judicial decision.’” *Spencer v. Kemna*, 523 U.S. 1, 7 (1998) (quotation
12 omitted). When, because of intervening events, a court cannot give any effectual relief in favor of the
13 petitioner, the proceeding should be dismissed as moot. *Calderon v. Moore*, 518 U.S. 149, 150 (1996).

14 “[T]he essence of habeas corpus is an attack by a person in custody upon the legality of that
15 custody, and . . . the traditional function of the writ is to secure release from illegal custody.” *Preiser v.*
16 *Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475, 484 (1973). If a petitioner is not longer imprisoned by the allegedly illegal
17 custody, then the court cannot fashion the habeas relief requested by the petitioner and the petition
18 becomes moot. *Burnett v. Lampert*, 432 F.3d 996, 1001 (9th Cir. 2005) (holding that the petitioner’s
19 release on parole and subsequent reimprisonment rendered his habeas corpus petition moot).

20 Here, Petitioner challenges his detention by ICE as unlawful. Subsequent to filing his petition,
21 however, Petitioner was charged by a federal grand jury for a criminal violation and a federal magistrate
22 judge ordered his detention and remanded him to the custody of the U.S. Attorney General and U.S.
23 Marshal. Petitioner is no longer in ICE custody and there is no challenge before this Court regarding the
24 unlawfulness of his current custody situation.

25 Accordingly, the Court must dismiss this moot petition because nothing remains before the Court
26 to be remedied. *Kemna*, 523 U.S. at 18. There is no longer jurisdiction to reach the merits of the case.

27 //

28 //

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

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner's Habeas Corpus Petition should be dismissed as moot.

Dated: December 31, 2025

ERIC GRANT
United States Attorney

By: /s/ Veronica M.A. Alegria
VERONICA M.A. ALEGRIA
Assistant United States Attorney