

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. ED CV 25-3475 PA (SSCx) Date January 13, 2026

Title Ashraf Farhan Husny Sulaiman v. Kristi Noem, et al.

Present: The Honorable PERCY ANDERSON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Kamilla Sali-Suleyman

Not Reported

N/A

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

None

None

Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS - COURT ORDER

Before the Court is a “Request to Set Hearing on Order to Show Cause Re: Preliminary Injunction” (“Request”) Docket No. 22) filed by petitioner Ashraf Farhan Husny Sulaiman (“Petitioner”). After the Court denied Petitioner’s “Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order as to Immediate Release” (“Second TRO Application”) on January 13, 2026, Petitioner filed this Request to convert his Second TRO Application into an “Application for Preliminary Injunction,” and to have the hearing on the Application for Preliminary Injunction “without regard to the notice requirement of Local Rule 6-1.” (Request at p. 2.)

Petitioner’s Request relies on Local Rule 65-1, which provides:

L.R. 65-1 Temporary Restraining Orders and Preliminary Injunctions. A party seeking a temporary restraining order (“TRO”) must submit an application, a proposed TRO, a declaration setting forth the facts and certification required by F.R.Civ.P. 65(b)(1)(A) and (B), and a proposed order to show cause why a preliminary injunction should not issue. If the TRO is denied, the Court may set the hearing on the order to show cause without regard to the twenty-eight (28) days notice of motion requirement of L.R. 6-1.

Local Rule 65-1 (emphasis added).

As an initial matter, Petitioner’s filing is procedurally improper. Specifically, Petitioner has violated the Local Rules by filing the “Request.” There are no “Requests” contemplated by the Local Rules. Instead, Local Rule 6-1 states:

Unless otherwise provided by rule or order of the Court, no oral motions will be recognized and every motion shall be presented by a written notice of motion. The notice of motion shall be filed with the

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	ED CV 25-3475 PA (SSCx)	Date	January 13, 2026
Title	Ashraf Farhan Husny Sulaiman v. Kristi Noem, et al.		

Clerk not later than twenty-eight (28) days before the date set for hearing, and shall be served on each of the parties electronically or, if excepted from electronic filing, either by deposit in the mail or by personal service. If mailed, the notice of motion shall be served not later than thirty-one (31) days before the Motion Day designated in the notice. If served personally, or electronically, the notice of motion shall be served not later than twenty-eight (28) days before the Motion Day designated in the notice.

In addition to the filing of a noticed motion in compliance with the applicable Local Rules, a party may seek relief through the filing of an Ex Parte Application pursuant to Local Rule 7-19 and the Court's orders. Petitioner's "Request" does not comply with the requirements for Ex Parte Applications or noticed motions. Petitioner may not evade the requirements for noticed motions and Ex Parte Applications simply by labeling his filings as "Requests." Any future "Requests" filed by Petitioner will be summarily denied.

Additionally, on the merits, although Local Rule 65-1 provides that a Court "may" set a hearing on an order to show cause without regard to Local Rule 6-1's notice requirements for noticed motions, that authority is within the Court's discretion. Here, Petitioner has not established good cause to shorten time in this manner. As noted in the Court's Order denying the Second TRO Application, Petitioner has been detained for more than a month, and waited more than three weeks after filing the original Petition to seek his release from immigration detention. Moreover, Petitioner's Request fails to provide any reason or basis for the request to hear the "Application for Preliminary Injunction" on shortened notice other than noting that the Court is permitted to set a hearing in this manner under Local Rule 65-1.

For all of the foregoing reasons, the Court thus denies Petitioner's Request to convert his Second TRO Application into an Application for Preliminary Injunction, and to set hearing date without regard to the notice requirement of Local Rule 6-1.

IT IS SO ORDERED.