

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
Alexandria Division**

ISMOIL SAMADOV, )  
 )  
                   *Petitioner,* )  
 )  
                   v. )  
 )  
 DONALD J. TRUMP, *et al.*, )  
 )  
                   *Respondents.* )  
 )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Case No. 1:25-cv-1441 (PTG/WEF)

**FEDERAL RESPONDENTS' MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO  
THE MOTION FOR A TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER**

ERIK S. SIEBERT  
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

By: \_\_\_\_\_ */s/* \_\_\_\_\_  
CHRISTIAN J. COOPER  
Special Assistant United States Attorney  
Office of the United States Attorney  
2100 Jamieson Avenue  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Tel: (703) 299-3831  
Fax: (703) 299-3983  
Email: Christian.Cooper@usdoj.gov  
*Counsel for Federal Respondents*

## **BACKGROUND**

In addition to filing a Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus, *see* Dkt. 1, on September 2, 2025, Petitioner Ismoil Samadov filed a motion for a temporary restraining order (“TRO”) seeking to restrain Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) from removing Petitioner from the country while his underlying habeas petition pends with this Court. *See* Dkt. 2, at 1. That same day, this Court ordered that Petitioner shall not be removed from this Court’s jurisdiction or the United States unless and until the Court issues a contrary order. *See* Dkt. 3, at 1. Petitioner, therefore, has received the claimed relief he sought through his TRO, and this Court should deny Petitioner’s TRO as moot.

## **ARGUMENT**

In his motion for a TRO, Petitioner requests that this Court enter an order staying his removal until this Court acts on his Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus. *See* Dkt. 1, at 1. Because this Court granted the relief Petitioner seeks by entering a subsequent order preventing his removal, *see* Dkt. 3, at 1, Petitioner’s motion for a TRO is moot.

It is well-established that, pursuant to Article III of the United States Constitution, this Court’s jurisdiction extends only to “cases or controversies.” U.S. Const. art. III; *see also Whitmore v. Arkansas*, 495 U.S. 149, 154-55 (1990) (“Article III, of course, gives the federal courts jurisdiction over only ‘cases or controversies’ . . .”). Part of the constitutional “case or controversy” requirement is that which has become known as the “mootness” doctrine, which provides generally that a “case or controversy” no longer exists “when the issues presented are no longer ‘live’ or the parties lack a legally cognizable interest in the outcome.” *Powell v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486, 496 (1969); *see also Mellen v. Bunting*, 327 F.3d 355, 363-64 (4th Cir. 2003). As the Supreme Court has repeatedly held, “[t]his case-or-controversy requirement subsists through all stages of

federal judicial proceedings, trial and appellate.” *Lewis v. Continental Bank*, 494 U.S. 472, 477-78 (1990); *see also Arizonans for Official English v. Arizona*, 520 U.S. 43, 66 (1997).

Petitioner filed his motion for a TRO on September 2, 2025, seeking to enjoin ICE from removing Petitioner while his habeas petition is pending with this Court. *See* Dkt. 1, at 1. That same day, this Court ordered that Petitioner shall not be removed until a contrary order from the Court. *See* Dkt. 3, at 1. Because this Court has provided the relief Petitioner seeks, there is no longer a “live” issue before this Court, and Plaintiff’s case has been rendered moot. *See Qui v. Mayorkas*, 2024 WL 329140, at \*2 (E.D. Va. Jan. 29, 2024) (finding that the issue to compel USCIS to process an asylum application became moot after USCIS scheduled an interview on plaintiff’s asylum application); *Moiseyev v. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, 2024 WL 3201265, at \*1 (W.D. Wash. June 24, 2024) (dismissing case as moot because “[plaintiff] has achieved the relief sought in the complaint: adjudication on his asylum application”); *Tu v. Mayorkas*, 2024 WL 2111551, at \*3 (E.D.N.Y. May 10, 2024) (“[S]ince USCIS has adjudicated [plaintiff’s] Form I-589, this Court is unable to compel it to do so.”); *Yan Zheng v. Sessions*, 2018 WL 3040350, at \*3 (M.D.N.C. June 19, 2018) (“the case is moot . . . as the requested relief—adjudication of the application—has already occurred”).

Accordingly, this Court should deny Petitioner’s TRO as moot.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Federal Respondents respectfully request that the Court deny the motion for a TRO as moot.

//

//

//

