

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

_____	)	
TONY HOYOS HERNANDEZ, <u>et al.</u> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 25-2344 (RBW)
v.	)	
	)	
KRISTI NOEM, in her official capacity as	)	
Secretary of the United States Department	)	
of Homeland Security, <u>et al.</u> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER**

In light of the filing of the plaintiffs’: (1) First Amended Complaint and Petition for Writ of Mandamus and Temporary Restraining Order (TRO), and Declaratory Relief, ECF No. 17;<sup>1</sup> and (2) amended motion for a temporary restraining order based on their Amended Complaint, see Plaintiffs’ Emergency Motion for Temporary Restraining Order, ECF No. 18, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that the Plaintiffs’ Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction, ECF No. 2, is **DENIED** as moot. It is further

<sup>1</sup> Although the Court accepts the plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint as filed due to the defendants’ prior representation in writing that they consented to the plaintiffs’ request, see Motion for an Extension of Time ¶ 7, ECF No. 14, the Court admonishes the plaintiffs to comply with the Court’s Orders and the Local Rules in future submissions. Specifically, the Court’s prior Order indicated that the plaintiffs were to submit a motion for leave to file the Amended Complaint, attaching both the Amended Complaint and a redlined Amended Complaint to facilitate the defendants’ and Court’s review of the changes made therein. See Min. Order (Nov. 26, 2025). Further, the Court reminds the plaintiffs of their duty to confer with the defendants on any non-dispositive motion filed in this case, pursuant to Local Rule 7(m). See LCvR 7(m) (requiring that, before filing any non-dispositive motion in a civil action, parties—including parties appearing pro se, as here—“shall discuss the anticipated motion with opposing counsel in a good-faith effort to determine whether there is any opposition to the relief sought and, if there is, to narrow the areas of disagreement” and “shall include in [their] motion a statement that the required discussion occurred, and a statement as to whether the motion is opposed.”).

**ORDERED** that the defendants' motion to dismiss the plaintiff's original Complaint, see Defendants' Combined Motion to Dismiss and Memorandum in Support Thereof and Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction, ECF No. 10, is **DENIED** as moot. It is further

**ORDERED** that the status conference currently scheduled for January 23, 2026, which served as a target date for resolving the now moot motions in this case, is **VACATED**. It is further

**ORDERED** that, on or before December 15, 2025, the parties shall file a joint proposed briefing schedule governing the filing of the defendants' opposition to the plaintiffs' amended motion for a temporary restraining order and any dispositive motion the defendant seeks to file in response to the plaintiffs' Amended Complaint. It is further

**ORDERED** that the Clerk of the Court shall forthwith mail a copy of this Order to the plaintiffs' addresses of record.

**SO ORDERED** this 10th day of December, 2025.

REGGIE B. WALTON  
United States District Judge