

JS-6

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CHUNYAN GE,

Plaintiff,

v.

DIR LA ASYLUM OFC, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. CV 23-10875 PVC

**ORDER RE: DISMISSAL WITHOUT
PREJUDICE**

On February 5, 2024, the Court granted the parties’ joint stipulation to stay the case pending adjudication of Plaintiff’s asylum application. (Dkt. Nos. 13, 14).

In the Court’s experience with numerous similar requests in recent mandamus actions challenging similar delays, the setting of an agreed interview date generally leads to the resolution of the parties’ dispute without the need for further intervention by the Court. However, staying cases requires the continued commitment of judicial resources to monitoring the cases and ensuring compliance with requirements to file status reports. It also increases the burden on the parties to file status reports or seek dismissal of the stayed case upon resolution of the matter.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

The Court finds that the more efficient approach is to dismiss this action without prejudice to either party moving to reopen *nunc pro tunc* if further Court intervention becomes necessary. The Court perceives no practical difference between this approach and the relief stipulated by the parties, apart from eliminating the need for future monitoring or action if the parties honor their agreement, as the Court expects them to.

Based on the foregoing, IT IS ORDERED THAT this action is dismissed without prejudice to any party seeking to vacate this Order and reopen the action *nunc pro tunc* if Plaintiff is unable to receive a determination in the time contemplated by the parties.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 12, 2025



PEDRO V. CASTILLO
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE