

1 Bianca de la Vega (SBN 358082)
2 biancadelavegaesq@gmail.com
3 13157 Mindanao Way, #182
4 Marina Del Rey, CA 90292
5 T: 323-389-4744

6 *Pro Bono Counsel for Edwin Rolando Ramirez-Lima*

7
8
9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11 EDWIN ROLANDO RAMIREZ-LIMA,

Case No. 2:25-CV-09890

12
13 Petitioner,

14 v.

15 TODD LYONS, Acting Director,
16 Immigration Customs and Enforcement;
17 and ERNESTO SANTACRUZ, JR.,
18 Field Office Acting Director of
19 Enforcement and Removal Operations,
20 Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

NOTICE OF RELATED CASES

21 Respondents.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Pursuant to L.R. 83-1.3, Petitioner Edwin Rolando Ramirez-Lima (“Mr. Ramirez-Lima” or “Petitioner”) files this instant Notice of Related Cases and identifies the following case, which was previously filed in this District:

1. *Lazaro Maldonado Bautista et al v. Ernesto Santacruz Jr et al*, Case No. 5:25-cv-01873 (C.D. Cal. filed July 23, 2025) (“*Lazaro Maldonado Bautista*”)

The above-listed case calls for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact, and there may be substantial duplication of labor if they are heard by different judges. *See* L.R. 83-1.31(b)-(c).

In *Ramirez-Lima*, Petitioner was arrested by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) in Los Angeles, California and sent to the Desert View Annex Detention Center in Adelanto, California, where he is currently being held. The Desert View Annex is situated in the same complex as the Adelanto Detention Center, both located on Rancho Road in Adelanto, California. Following his detention at the Desert View Annex, Petitioner seeks a request for bond. However, the memorandum published by the Department of Homeland Security on July 8, 2025, states that Section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) must be applied to any individual who enters without inspection, even if apprehended in the interior years after their initial entry.¹ Thus, Petitioner reasonably believes that his bond request will be denied on the grounds that the Court lacks jurisdiction to grant bond to an individual who entered without inspection. Petitioner reasonably believes the Court will deem him an “applicant for admission” who remains subject to mandatory detention under INA Section 235, even though Petitioner was apprehended in the interior and has lived in the United States for over 2 years.

Lazaro Maldonado Bautista is a class action lawsuit in which petitioners are also immigration detainees who were arrested by ICE in Los Angeles, California and

¹ *See ICE Memo: Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applications for Admission*, AILA (July 8, 2025), <https://shorturl.at/XF71Y>.

1 are also being held in the same complex as Desert View Annex, at Adelanto
2 Detention Center in Adelanto, California. These petitioners were denied bonds by
3 Immigration Judges because they were held to be applicants for admission who were
4 subject to mandatory detention under Section 235 of the INA, even though they have
5 lived in the United States for many years. These petitioners filed an Application for a
6 Temporary Restraining Order requesting that this Court enjoin their detention unless
7 provided with individualized bond hearings before an Immigration Judge. On July
8 28, 2025, Judge Sykes granted petitioners' Application for a Temporary Restraining
9 Order.

10 The above actions are substantially related. Every relevant factor weighs in
11 favor of the actions being related. *See* L.R. 83-1.3.1.

12 First, the actions call for determination of the substantially related questions of
13 law and fact. *See* L.R. 83-1.3.1(b). Both actions involve similarly situated petitioners
14 in the same class and judicial district who are immigration detainees that were
15 arrested in Los Angeles and are currently being detained in Adelanto, California.
16 Both actions involve petitioners who were subject to mandatory detention under
17 Section 235 of the INA, despite having lived in the United States for years, and being
18 apprehended in the interior. Given these factors, both actions involve the same legal
19 and factual determinations for the petitioners.

20 Second, the actions would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by
21 different judges. *See* L.R. 83-1.3.1(c). If the two cases continue to proceed before
22 two different judges, this substantial duplication of resources will continue. As
23 mentioned above, Judge Sykes is already presiding over *Lazaro Maldonado Bautista*
24 and has already ruled on the very issue that is the subject of *Ramirez-Lima*. Having
25 another judge become familiar with the issues will result in substantial duplication of
26 labor, and two possible inconsistent rulings may arise.

27 Accordingly, the actions should be related and assigned to Judge Sykes.
28

1 DATED: October 15, 2025

By: /s/ Bianca de la Vega

2 Bianca de la Vega

3 Pro Bono Attorney for Edwin Rolando
4 Ramirez-Lima