

1 VENABLE LLP
2 Sarah S. Brooks (SBN 266292)
3 ssbrooks@venable.com
4 2049 Century Park East, Suite 3400
5 Los Angeles, CA 90067
6 Telephone: (310) 229-9900
7 Facsimile: (310) 229-9901

8 *Counsel for Isaul Altamirano Ramos*

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11 ISAUL ALTAMIRANO RAMOS,

12 Petitioner,

13 v.

14 TODD LYONS, Acting Director,
15 Immigration Customs and Enforcement;
16 and ERNESTO SANTACRUZ, JR., Field
Office Acting Director for Enforcement
and Removal Operation

17 Respondents.

Case No. 2:25-cv-09785-SVW-AJR

Honorable Judge Stephen V. Wilson

**PETITIONER'S REPLY IN
SUPPORT OF HIS MOTION
FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Hearing Date: January 12, 2026

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Courtroom: 10A

VENABLE LLP
2049 CENTURY PARK EAST, SUITE 3400
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067
310-229-9900

1 **REPLY MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 Petitioner Isaul Altamirano Ramos (“Petitioner” or “Ramos”) files this
3 Reply in support to of his Motion for Reconsideration of this Court’s Order
4 Denying Petitioner’s Application for a TRO (“Order”). (Dkt. 8).

5 Here, at a minimum, intervening change in the controlling law merits a grant
6 of the motion for reconsideration. As explained in Petitioner’s motion for
7 reconsideration, on November 25, 2025, the court in *Bautista v. Santacruz*, Civil
8 Action No. 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM certified a nationwide class pursuant to Fed.
9 R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2). (Dkt. 12 at 5). Thereafter, a motion for reconsideration was
10 filed in *Bautista* and a final judgment was entered. *Bautista* is binding on this
11 Court and merits a grant of reconsideration. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23.

12 **A. *Bautista* Does Merit A Grant Reconsideration**

13 On November 25, 2025, the Court in *Bautista* certified a nationwide class
14 comprising of: “Bond Eligible Class: All noncitizens in the United States without
15 lawful status who (1) have entered or will enter the United States without
16 inspection; (2) were not or will not be apprehended upon arrival; and (3) are not or
17 will not be subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231
18 at the time the Department of Homeland Security makes an initial custody
19 determination.” *Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM, 2025 U.S.
20 Dist. LEXIS 231977 (C.D. Cal. November 25, 2025). Petitioner is a member of
21 the bond eligible class. Petitioner entered without inspection, was not apprehended
22 on arrival and was not subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1),
23 or § 1231. (Dkt. 3 at 2; Dkt. 3-1 at ¶ 2, Ex. B).

24 Respondents argue that *Bautista* is not a final judgment and does not provide
25 preclusive effect on a case like Petitioners. (Dkt. 13 at 5). Respondents state that
26 “[i]n *Bautista*, the court did not issue a class-wide declaratory judgment, and it
27 does not have preclusive effect on this case.” (Dkt. 13 at 1). But, on December 18,
28 2025, the court in *Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM granted the

1 motion for reconsideration and issued a final judgment. (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025).
2 Any arguments Respondents made in this regard are now mooted by the *Bautista*
3 Court's December 18, 2025 order.

4 Finally, Respondents also cite *389 Orange St. Partners*, 179 F.3d 656, 665
5 (9th Cir. 1999) in arguing that *Bautista* does merit reconsideration because
6 *Bautista* is not an intervening change in controlling law. But, *389 Orange* is
7 inapplicable to the present case. In *389 Orange*, the appellant "did not present this
8 argument to the district court before the district court granted summary judgment
9 in OSP's favor." Those are not the facts present here. Petitioner did raise the
10 *Bautista* case in his Application for TRO. But, after the TRO was denied, a
11 nationwide class was certified, and a final judgment was entered granting the very
12 relief that Petitioner seeks.

13 **B. CONCLUSION**

14 Petitioner respectfully asks this Court to reconsider its order denying
15 Petitioner's TRO and grant his motion for reconsideration.

16
17 DATED: December 26, 2025

VENABLE LLP

18 By: /s/ Sarah S. Brooks

19 Sarah S. Brooks

20 Attorney for Isaul Altamirano Ramos
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28