

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
MIDDLE DIVISION**

SARAIL MICHAEL ARCHILLA, et al.,	}	
	}	
Petitioners,	}	
	}	
v.	}	Case No.: 4:20-cv-00596-RDP-JHE
	}	
DIANNE WITTE et al.,	}	
	}	
Respondents.	}	

ORDER

Petitioner Joseph Debonnaire Soho filed a petition (along with seventeen other detainees) for habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, seeking release from ICE custody due to the COVID-19 pandemic. (Doc. # 1). Contemporaneously, all Petitioners, including Petitioner Soho, filed a Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (“TRO”). (Doc. # 2).


On May 4, 2020, Respondents filed their Opposition brief to Petitioners’ Motion for TRO. (Doc. # 11). In their brief, Respondents state that Petitioner Soho was released on an order of supervision on April 27, 2020. Therefore, they contend that his habeas corpus petition is due to be dismissed as moot. The court agrees.

After consideration of the record in this action, the court finds that Petitioner’s release on an order of supervised release has rendered his habeas corpus petition and accompanying Motion for TRO moot. *See Nyaga v. Ashcroft*, 323 F.3d 906, 913 (11th Cir. 2003); *Soliman v. United States ex rel. INS*, 296 F.3d 1237, 1242 (11th Cir. 2002). Moreover, the court finds that no exceptions to the mootness doctrine apply in this case. *See Murphy v. Hunt*, 455 U.S. 478, 482 (1982); *Carafas v. LaVallee*, 391 U.S. 234, 237 (1968).

Therefore, it is **ORDERED** that Petitioner Soho's habeas corpus petition (Doc. # 1) against Respondents and his Motion for TRO (Doc. # 2) are **DISMISSED AS MOOT**.

This dismissal shall not affect any other right, claim, or cause of action which Petitioners have, or may have, against any remaining Respondent.

DONE and **ORDERED** this May 14, 2020.


R. DAVID PROCTOR
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE