

ERIC GRANT
United States Attorney
JENNIFER A. DEINES
Assistant United States Attorney
501 I Street, Suite 10-100
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: (916) 554-2700
Facsimile: (916) 554-2900

Attorneys for United States of America

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAMIRO TRUJILLO HERNANDEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

WARDEN OF THE GOLDEN STATE
ANNEX DETENTION FACILITY, *et al.*,

Respondents.

CASE NO. 1:25-CV-01711-WBS-SCR

**OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR TEMPORARY
RESTRAINING ORDER**

Respondents oppose Petitioner Ramiro Trujillo Hernandez's Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) (ECF No. 21), and respectfully request that the Court deny the Motion. Petitioner's pending habeas petition (ECF No. 1) has been fully briefed, and Mr. Trujillo Hernandez seeks the same relief through his habeas petition that he requests through his TRO motion.

Petitioner requests that the Court consider his TRO motion in the context of the underlying habeas proceedings currently before the Court and notes that the concerns about Petitioner's continued detention raised in the TRO motion "substantially overlap with the claims already presented in the pending Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and addressed in the Court's Findings and Recommendations." (ECF No. 23, "Notice Regarding Petitioner's Pro Se Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (ECF No. 21)" at 1) (citing ECF No. 19). Respondents' arguments for why the Court should deny Petitioner's habeas petition are laid out in Respondents' Return to Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (ECF No. 14), and apply to Petitioner's TRO motion, as well.

Regarding Petitioner's concerns about the medical treatment he is receiving in detention and other conditions of his detention, *see* ECF No. 21 at 7-8, Respondents are inquiring into these concerns but they are not pertinent to Petitioner's habeas petition or TRO motion, and were not raised in Petitioner's habeas petition. Petitioner's medical treatment in detention and related concerns are not a factor to be weighed in resolving his habeas petition because they do not speak to the legality or duration of his confinement. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3). The law provides other mechanisms to address such concerns, such as civil rights actions. *See Badea v. Cox*, 931 F.2d 573, 574 (9th Cir.1991) (civil rights action is proper method of challenging conditions of confinement); *Crawford v. Bell*, 599 F.2d 890, 891-92 & n. 1 (9th Cir.1979) (affirming dismissal of habeas petition on basis that challenges to terms and conditions of confinement must be brought in civil rights complaint).

Finally, the Court could conclude that Petitioner's TRO motion is untimely under Local Rule 231(b) because Petitioner "could have sought relief by motion for preliminary injunction at an earlier date without the necessity for seeking last-minute relief by motion for temporary restraining order." The delay in filing the present TRO motion would support a finding by the Court that Petitioner "unduly delayed in seeking injunctive relief," in which case "the Court may conclude that the delay constitutes laches or contradicts the applicant's allegations of irreparable injury and may deny the motion solely on either ground." *Id.*

For these reasons and for those discussed in Respondents' Return, Respondents request that the Court deny Petitioner's Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 2, 2026

ERIC GRANT
United States Attorney

By: /s/ JENNIFER A. DEINES
JENNIFER A. DEINES
Assistant United States Attorney