

JS-6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case No. 2:22-cv-01916-FWS-GJS

ABDIRAHMAN ADEN KARIYE, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

JUDGMENT

///

///

///

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

1 On March 24, 2022, Plaintiffs Abdirahman Aden Kariye, Mohamad Mouslli,
2 and Hameem Shah (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) filed a Complaint alleging violations of
3 the First Amendment, Fifth Amendment, and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act
4 (“RFRA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000bb *et seq.* by Defendants Steve K. Francis, Tae D.
5 Johnson, Alejandro Mayorkas, and Mark Morgan (collectively, “Defendants”). (Dkt.
6 1.) On May 31, 2022, Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss the Complaint
7 (“Motion”). (Dkt. 40.) On July 28, 2022, the court held oral argument on the Motion
8 and thereafter took the Motion under submission. (Dkt. 49.) On October 12, 2022,
9 the court issued an order **GRANTING** Defendants’ Motion and dismissed without
10 prejudice and with leave to amend each of Plaintiffs’ claims. (Dkt. 58.)

11 On November 14, 2022, Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Complaint. (Dkt. 61.)
12 On December 27, 2022, Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss the Amended
13 Complaint (“Second Motion”). (Dkt. 68.)¹ On March 23, 2023, the court held oral
14 argument on the Second Motion and thereafter took the Second Motion under
15 submission. (Dkt. 72.) On July 19, 2023, the court issued an order **GRANTING**
16 Defendants’ Second Motion and dismissed without prejudice and with leave to amend
17 each of Plaintiffs’ claims. (Dkt. 73.)

18 On August 1, 2023, Plaintiffs filed a Notice of Intent Not to File a Second
19 Amended Complaint (“Notice”) and requested that the court enter judgment in this
20 matter. (Dkt. 75.) Defendants did not file a response to the Notice. (*See generally*
21 Dkt.) On August 15, 2023, the court ordered the parties to each submit a proposed
22 final judgment within seven days of the order, or by August 22, 2023. (Dkt. 76.) The
23 parties each lodged a proposed judgment. (Dkts. 77-80.) The court has considered
24 the parties’ lodged proposed judgments. (Dkts. 77, 78.)

25 _____
26 ¹ Defendant Mark Morgan, the former Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border
27 Protection was terminated from this case on November 14, 2022, and replaced with
28 Defendant Troy Miller, the Acting Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border
Protection. (*See generally* Dkt.)

1 Accordingly, the court finds that Defendants are entitled to judgment as a
2 matter of law on all causes of action and claims asserted against them in this action.
3 In accordance with the court’s order granting Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss the
4 Amended Complaint (Dkt. 73):

- 5
- 6 1. Final Judgment is entered in favor of Defendants and against Plaintiffs on all
7 claims asserted by Plaintiffs against Defendants.
 - 8
 - 9 2. Any motion or application for costs made by Defendants must be filed in
10 compliance with L. R. 54-2, *et seq.*

11

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13

14

15 Dated: September 5, 2023



16 _____
17 Hon. Fred W. Slaughter
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE