

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MAURA MARIA ACABAL RAMOS,

Petitioner,

v.

WARDEN OF ADELANTO DETENTION
FACILITY, et al.,

Respondent.

Case No. 5:25-02649 WLH (ADS)

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

This Report and Recommendation is submitted to the Honorable Wesley L. Hsu, United States District Judge, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 and General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Maura Maria Acabal Ramos, through counsel, filed a verified Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, stating Petitioner has been unlawfully detained by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). (Dkt. Nos. 1, 8.) Petitioner seeks immediate release or, alternatively, an individualized bond

1 hearing pursuant to § 1226(a). (Dkt. No. 8 at 3-4.) After service of the Petition,
2 Petitioner was provided an individualized bond hearing. (Dkt. No. 12.) Immigration
3 Judge Carlos Maury denied bond on the basis of flight risk. (Id.)

4 The Court ordered Petitioner to show cause why the Petition should not be
5 dismissed as moot. (Dkt. No. 13.) Petitioner filed a response stating that the Petition is
6 moot. (Dkt. No. 14.) Respondents did not file any statement to the contrary. For the
7 reasons discussed below, it is recommended the Petition be denied as moot, and this
8 action dismissed.

9 **II. DISCUSSION**

10 The Petition is moot because Petitioner has received the relief sought. “A case
11 becomes moot when interim relief or events have deprived the court of the ability to
12 redress the party’s injuries.” United States v. Alder Creek Water Co., 823 F.2d 343, 345
13 (9th Cir. 1987); see also NASD Disp. Resol., Inc. v. Jud. Council, 488 F.3d 1065, 1068
14 (9th Cir. 2007) (finding appeal to be moot when the plaintiffs had already been granted
15 the relief they sought). Courts have an obligation to consider mootness sua sponte and
16 should deny requested relief where it is superfluous. In re Burrell, 415 F.3d 994, 997
17 (9th Cir. 2005). The “basic question in determining mootness is whether there is a
18 present controversy as to which effective relief can be granted.” Nw. Env’tl. Def. Ctr. v.
19 Gordon, 849 F.2d 1241, 1244 (9th Cir. 1988).

20 Petitioner agrees the Petition is moot. (Dkt. No. 14 at 1.) Petitioner states her
21 “sole relief requested in the underlying habeas petition was a bond hearing pursuant to
22 § 1226(a).” (Id.) Petitioner was provided with an individualized bond hearing. (Dkt.
23 No. 12.) There is no further requested relief for the Court to provide. As such, the
24 Petition is moot. Accordingly, it is recommended the Petition be denied, and this action

1 be dismissed.

2 **III. RECOMMENDATION**

3 IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED that the District Judge issue an Order:

4 (1) accepting this Report and Recommendation; (2) denying the Petition as moot and
5 dismissing the action; and (3) directing that Judgment be entered accordingly.

6
7 Dated: January 30, 2026

8 /s/ Autumn D. Spaeth
9 THE HONORABLE AUTUMN D. SPAETH
United States Magistrate Judge