

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. EDCV 25-03628-MWF (AJR)

Date: January 16, 2026

Title: Ambartsoum Pogosian v. M. Bowen et al

Present: The Honorable MICHAEL W. FITZGERALD, U.S. District Judge

Deputy Clerk:
Rita Sanchez

Court Reporter:
Not Reported

Attorneys Present for Petitioner:
None Present

Attorneys Present for Respondents:
None Present

Proceedings (In Chambers): ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR TEMPORARY
RESTRAINING ORDER [2] AND DISMISSING
ACTION AS DUPLICATIVE; ENTRY OF
JUDGMENT

Petitioner Ambartsoum Pogosian initiated this action by filing a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus on December 31, 2025. (Docket No. 1). Petitioner also filed a Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (the “TRO Motion”). (Docket No. 2).

On January 13, 2026, Respondents M. Bowen, Kristi Noem, Thomas Giles, and James Pilkington filed a Notice of Related Case, notifying the Court of a related action, *Ambartsoum Pogosian v. M. Bowen, et al.*, SACV 25-3380-DOC (DTBx) (the “Related Action”). The Related Action was initiated on December 8, 2025, and also included a request for a temporary restraining order, which the court granted on December 31, 2025. (*See* Related Action, Docket Nos. 1, 3, 6).

“It is well established that a district court has broad discretion to control its own docket, and that includes the power to dismiss duplicative claims.” *M.M. v. Lafayette Sch. Dist.*, 681 F.3d 1082, 1091 (9th Cir. 2012); *Adams v. Cal. Dep’t of Health Servs.*, 487 F.3d 684, 688 (9th Cir. 2007) (“Plaintiffs generally have no right to maintain two separate actions involving the same subject matter at the same time in the same court and against the same defendant.” (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)), *overruled on other grounds by Taylor v. Sturgell*, 553 U.S. 880 (2008). The Ninth Circuit has held that “[a]fter weighing the equities of the case, the district court may exercise its discretion to dismiss a duplicative later-filed action, to stay that action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. EDCV 25-03628-MWF (AJR)

Date: January 16, 2026

Title: Ambartsoum Pogolian v. M. Bowen et al

pending resolution of the previously filed action, to enjoin the parties from proceeding with it, or to consolidate both actions.” *Adams*, 487 F.3d at 688. “[I]n assessing whether the second action is duplicative of the first, we examine whether the causes of action and relief sought, as well as the parties or privies to the action, are the same.” *Id.* at 689.

Here, the instant Petition and the petition filed in the Related Action appear identical in both form and content. (*Compare* Petition with Related Action, Docket No. 1). The Petition should therefore be dismissed as duplicative. *See, e.g., Garza v. Hernandez*, Case No. CV 08-01022-SMS-HC, 2008 WL 3060756, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 4, 2008) (dismissing as duplicative a state prisoner’s petition for writ of habeas corpus because the same claim against the same parties had been asserted through numerous previous petitions); *Pierce v. Obama et. al.*, Case No. CV 14-01992-GSA-HC, 2015 WL 300676, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 22, 2015) (dismissing duplicative petition “to promote judicial economy and protect the parties from concurrent litigation of the same claim.”).

Accordingly, the TRO Motion is **DENIED**, and this action is **DISMISSED** *without prejudice* as duplicative.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

This Order shall constitute notice of entry of judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58. Pursuant to Local Rule 58-6, the Court **ORDERS** the Clerk to treat this Order, and its entry on the docket, as an entry of judgment.