

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	5:25-cv-03460-DOC-JDE	Date	January 29, 2026
Title	Eugene Trifonov v. Kristi Noem, et al.		

Present: The Honorable John D. Early, United States Magistrate Judge

Amber Rodriguez

n/a

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Attorneys Present for Petitioner:

Attorneys Present for Respondents:

n/a

n/a

Proceedings: (In Chambers) Order Requiring Response to Petition

On December 8, 2025, Eugene Trifonov ("Petitioner"), initially proceeding pro se but subsequently proceeding through counsel subsequently appointed, filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, challenging his detention by immigration authorities, seeking an order directing "Respondents to release Petitioner from custody." Dkt. 1 ("Petition") at 7. On December 22, 2025, the Honorable David O. Carter, United States District Judge, granted Petitioner's Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and ordered, among other things, that Petitioner be released from custody by December 24, 2025, and that Respondents show cause why a preliminary injunction should not be issued. Dkt. 4. Thereafter, following briefing and a hearing, on January 6, 2026, Judge Carter issued a Preliminary Injunction that appeared to grant the relief sought by Petitioner in the Petition. Dkt. 11 ("Order").

In light of the Order, before setting a further briefing schedule on the Petition, on January 9, 2026, the Court directed counsel for the parties to confer telephonically as to whether there can be a stipulated resolution to this matter and file a Joint Status Report stating whether a stipulated resolution is anticipated and, if no such resolution can be reached, to specify what issues remain to be decided in the Petition. Dkt. 14. On January 28, 2026, the parties filed a Joint Status Report, advising the Court that the parties met and conferred telephonically and "the parties were not able to resolve this case." Dkt. 15 at 2. Petitioner maintains that "[t]he merits of the case were addressed by Judge's Carter's temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction rulings," Respondents "offer nothing to contradict those merits rulings," and Judge Carter has already rejected Respondents' mootness contention. Id. at 2. Respondents contend "the case is moot because the Petitioner was already released from detention a month ago" and to the extent Petitioner "might seek additional relief in District Court which would delay or obstruct the potential future enforcement of Petitioner's removal pursuant to a final removal order . . . such relief is jurisdictionally barred by 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g)." Id. at 3.

As Petitioner notes, Respondents previously raised the mootness argument based on the release of Petitioner before Judge Carter (see Dkt. 6), who rejected that argument in issuing a preliminary injunction. Respondents have not provided any basis to revisit that finding.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	5:25-cv-03460-DOC-JDE	Date	January 29, 2026
Title	Eugene Trifonov v. Kristi Noem, et al.		

Accordingly, as the parties are unable to agree on a stipulated resolution, subject to any intervening order by Judge Carter, IT IS ORDERED that:

Respondents shall file and serve an Answer to the Petition within 14 days of the date of this Order asserting all arguments against the relief sought by Petitioner in the operative Petition. At the time the Answer is filed, Respondents shall lodge with the Court all records not previously lodged bearing on their arguments. Petitioner shall file an optional Reply responding to matters raised in the Answer within 7 days of the filing of the Answer. Petitioner's Reply shall not raise new grounds for relief that were not asserted in the Petition. Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, this case shall be deemed submitted on the day following the date Petitioner's Reply is due.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Courtroom Deputy ARO
