Nicolette Glazer Esq. (CSBN 209713)
nicolette@glazerandglazer.com
LAW OFFICES OF LARRY R GLAZER
2121 Avenue of the Stars East #800
Century City, California 90067
T:310-407-5353
F:310-407-5354

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MODESTA ARAUJO-CONTRERAS Plaintiff and Petitioner, vs. JAMES JANECKA, Warden of the Adelanto Detention Center; ERNESTO SANTACRUZ, Director of the Los Angeles Field Office, United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; PAM BONDI, Attorney General, United States Department of Justice; KRISTI NOEM, Secretary, United States Department of Homeland Security; TODD LYONS, Acting Director of Unites States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and DOES 1-5 Defendants-Respondents	5:25-cv-03442-KK-MBK Hon: Judge Kenly Kiya Kato **REPLY IN SUPPORT OF REQUEST FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

Under 28 U.S.C. § 2243, a court shall forthwith issue a writ or order the

Respondent to show cause why a writ should not issue, "unless it appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled" to a writ of habeas corpus. Here, the Court granted Petitioner's request for a Temporary Restraining Order finding that "*Petitioner is subject to Section 1226(a),* which entitles her to a bond Hearing", ECF # 8 at 3, and enjoined Respondents "from continuing to detain Petitioner unless they provide her with an individualized bond hearing before an immigration judge pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven (7) days…", *id.* at 5. (emphasis added). The TRO was issued after Respondents took the position before this Court that "Petitioner appears to be a member of the Bond Eligible Class certified in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2025 WL 3288403 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2025)" and that "[t]o the extent Petitioner seeks such a bond hearing here, it should be consistent with what Courts in this District have generally ordered, which is to require such a hearing be held within seven (7) days." See ECF # 7 at 2:2-6, 12-4 and 3:2-5. Respondents concession that Petitioner is member of the *Maldonado Bautista* class and subject to section 1226(a) detention was a judicial admission. A judicial admission is a "'formal admission[] in the pleadings which have the effect of withdrawing a fact from issue and dispensing wholly with the need for proof of the fact.'" *Am. Title Ins. Co. v. Lacelaw Corp.*, 861 F.2d 224, 226 (9th Cir. 1988) (quoting *In re Fordson Engineering Corp.*, 25 B.R. 506, 509 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 1982)). "A judicial admission must be deliberate, clear, and unambiguous." *Lam Rsch. Corp. v. Schunk Semiconductor*, 65 F. Supp. 3d 863, 870 (N.D. Cal. 2014). "[S]tatements of fact contained in a brief *may* be considered admissions of the party in the discretion of the district court." *Lacelaw*, 861 F.2d 224, 227 (9th Cir. 1988) (emphasis in original). Whether to accept or reject a judicial admission rests with the discretion of the district court. *Nat'l Abortion Fed'n v. Ctr. for Med. Progress*, 134 F. Supp. 3d 1199, 1206 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (citing *Singer v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 116 F.3d 373, 376 (9th Cir. 1997)). Here, Respondents have had all records pertaining to Petitioner in their exclusive custody and control and were placed on notice of Petitioner's claims that Petitioner's 1996 exclusion order was already executed; that no notice of intent to re-instate was provided to Petitioner and Petitioner's counsel during the adjustment of status arrest; of her claim for class membership in the *Duran Gonzalez v. DHS,* No. CV 06-1411-MJP (W.D. Wash., settlement approved Jul. 21, 2014) settlement; and that Petitioner had affirmatively asserted a fear based claim. (ECF # 1 & 5, see also ECF # 5 at PAGE ID 28, 32). Respondents were also fully aware that USCIS had accepted and decided multiple applications for adjustment of status and work permits and they could not have done so if a removal order had been re-instated. *See Morales-Izquierdo v. Gonzales*, 486 F.3d 484, 491 (9th Cir. 2007) (explaining that INA § 241 reinstatement—unlike INA § 240 first-instance removal—"deprives aliens of any relief, reopening, or review at the reinstatement stage."). When Respondents took the legal position in response to the TRO Respondents did so willingly and with full knowledge of the applicable facts. The Court should hold them to their litigation position.

Yet, before the immigration judge at the 30 December 2025 bond hearing Respondents suddenly changed position arguing that they have "reinstated" an order of removal against Petitioner and that as such the immigration judge was divested from jurisdiction to rule on Petitioner's eligibility for release. The IJ accepted the argument and found that it lacks jurisdiction to conduct a bond. See ECF # 9-1.

1. Respondents have provided no evidence that they have re-instated the 1996 Order of Exclusion.

It cannot be disputed that Respondents were aware of Petitioner's re-entry after the 1996 exclusion order since at least 2001. *See* Exhibit A, ICE submission before the IJ, at page 6. It is also undisputed that Respondents exercised their discretion favorably against a reinstatement since 2001 and specifically in 2007 when accepting the first I-485 green card application to not re-instate the 1996 removal order. *See Morales de Soto v. Lynch*, 824 F.3d 822, 825 (9th Cir. 2016) (explaining that DHS is not required to reinstate a removal order and that officers may exercise prosecutorial discretion and place someone in removal proceedings under INA § 240 in lieu of issuing a reinstatement order under INA § 241(a)(5)); *Villa-Anguiano v. Holder*, 727 F.3d 873, 878 (9th Cir. 2013) (reinstatement of removal under the INA is neither "automatic" nor "obligatory" and citing to Alcala v. Holder, 563 F.3d 1009, 1013 (9th Cir.2009)). The submission to the IJ also makes clear that the I-213 was prepared prior to the 17 December 2025 arrest. *Id.* at page 13 [factual summary ending with an entry prior to the adjustment of status interview]. As Petitioner and Petitioner's immigration attorney attested, at the interview Petitioner was not served with a Form I-871 Notice/Decision to Reinstate. Petitioner attaches a sample copy of a Form I-871 that is used to provide notice to an individual for whom ICE has decided to initiate a reinstatement procedure at Exhibit B. No form I-871 was presented to the immigration judge and none has been presented to this Court. Nor have Respondents provided a declaration from the deportation officer who made the decision to start the reinstatement process.

2. The 1996 Exclusion Order cannot be re-instated

First, as Petitioner argued in the Original Request for Rule 65 Relief while Petitioner is pursuing adjustment of status under the terms of the *Duran-Gonzales* settlement Respondents cannot pursue re-instatement of the 1996 exclusion order: Pursuant to the Duran-Gonzalez Settlement Agreement certain individuals who reside within the jurisdiction of the Ninth Circuit may be afforded an opportunity to establish that *Matter of Torres Garcia* should not apply to them and to apply for adjustment of status and permission to reapply for admission despite not having remained outside the United States for 10 years. Class members are divided into three subclasses. Subclass A members are applicants who (i) have remained physically present in the United States since the filing of the Form I-485, Form I-485 Supplement A, and Form I-212, and (ii) against whom removal proceedings under INA § 240 were not initiated with the filing of a Notice to Appear subsequent to the filing of the Form I-485 and Form 1-212. Petitioner is a member of the subclass based on when they filed their Forms I-212, I-485, and I-485A. Applicants who filed all three applications between August 13, 2004, and January 26, 2006, are members of the first group, and applicants who filed all three applications between January 27, 2006, and November 30, 2007, are members of the second group. According to the Settlement Agreement individuals in the first group are presumed to have reasonably relied on *Perez-Gonzalez*, and their Form I-212 applications may be adjudicated on the merits regardless of whether they spent 10 years outside the United States after their last departure. The Settlement Agreement further states that applicants in the second group must establish that their reliance *on Perez- Gonzalez* was reasonable and that *Matter of Torres-Garcia* should not apply to them. *See Garfias-Rodriguez v. Holder*, 702 F.3d 504 (9th Cir. 2012) (applying retroactivity test set forth in *Montgomery Ward & Co. v. FTC.* 691 F.2d 1322, 1333 (9th Cir. 1982)). If a class member fails to show reasonable reliance on *Perez-Gonzalez*, USCIS must still consider whether the burden of denial would be greater than the ordinary consequences of removal. Petitioner's I-485 application remains pending and she was denied the opportunity to meet her burden and the presumption applicable to her based on the settlement agreement. Because, Respondents cannot re-instate the 1996 order until the adjudication is completed, the arrest and detention are unlawful.

Second, the 1996 order cannot be reinstates unless Respondents comply with the statuary and regulatory requirements. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 292.5(a) (requiring notice and service of papers on counsel or the individual if is represented); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 241.8(b) (mandating that DHS provide written notice of reinstatement determination to the individual). Here no notice has been provided to Petitioner and/or her counsel. 8 C.F.R. § 241.8(a) requires the deportation officer to make an inquiry into the three threshold requirements for reinstatement, including obtaining the prior order and verifying the fingerprints if an identity is at issue. Subsection (b) mandates that "[i]f an officer determines that an alien is subject to removal under this section, he or she shall provide the alien with written notice of his or her determination. The officer shall advise the alien that he or she may make a written or oral statement contesting the determination. If the alien wishes to make such a statement, the officer shall allow the alien to do so and shall consider whether the alien's statement warrants reconsideration of the determination." Respondents offer no evidence that they have complied with the regulations in anyway.

Third, subsection (e) codifies an exception to the reinstatement process when as here the non-citizen "expresses a fear of returning to the country designated in that order" and mandates that :the alien shall be immediately referred to an asylum officer for an interview to determine whether the alien has a reasonable fear of persecution or torture pursuant to § 208.31 of this chapter." Here, Respondents were notified of Petitioner fear claim and said claims remains pending. See Exhibit C. If so, the person is referred to an immigration judge (IJ) to apply for withholding or protection under the United Nations Convention Against Torture (CAT). 8 C.F.R. §§ 208.31(e) (requiring asylum officer to refer case to IJ); 1208.31(e) (same); 241.8(e) (same); 1241.8(e) (same); 208.2(c)(2) (IJ jurisdiction in referred cases); 1208.2(c)(2) (same); 1208.16 (withholding only hearings before IJ). To qualify for either of these forms of protection, the person must establish a much higher likelihood of future harm than required for asylum—i.e., that persecution or torture is more likely than not. 8 C.F.R. §§ 208.16(b)(2), (c)(2). If the IJ denies the application, the person may appeal that decision to the BIA. 8

C.F.R. §§ 208.31(g)(2); 1208.31(g)(2). If the asylum officer determines the person did not establish a reasonable fear, the person may seek review of that determination by an IJ. 8 C.F.R. §§ 208.31(f), (g); 1208.31(f), (g). If the IJ disagrees with the asylum officer's determination, the person then may apply for withholding of removal and CAT protection before the IJ. 8 C.F.R. §§ 208.31(g)(2); 1208(g)(2). If the IJ agrees with the asylum officer's determination, the person cannot appeal to the BIA, 8 C.F.R. §§ 208.31(g)(1); 1208.31(g)(1), but could seek review before the 9th Circuit. This process has not been completed, accordingly, Petitioner is not subject to section 1231. See Exhibit D.

Fourth, as the I-213 and the declarations in support the TRO show Respondents have not served any form I-871 to Petitioner and her counsel. It appears that Respondents' uniform practice is not to effect service of the form I-871 even when they have issued one. Failing to serve a reinstatement order violates Petitioner's statutory, constitutional, and regulatory rights. Individuals also have statutory and constitutional rights to judicial review of a reinstatement order. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a). Due process requires timely notice of DHS' issuance of a final order of reinstatement against them, which impacts their ability to seek judicial review and their detention status. *See generally Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950). Regulations also protect these interests. See 8 C.F.R. § 241.8(b) (mandating written notice of reinstatement determination to the individual); 8 C.F.R. § 292.5 (requiring service of documents); and 8 C.F.R. § 103.8(c)(2) (requiring service of decisions in administrative proceedings upon the person in charge of institution if the person is detained). In fact,in *Villegas de la*

Paz v. Holder, 640 F.3d 650, 654-55 (6th Cir. 2010), the court held that the 30-day clock did not start until service of the reinstatement order.

Fifth, the immigration judge decision is not entitled to deference. *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369 (2024).

3. **Petitioner's claims are not moot.**

Equally unavailing are the mootness arguments. Respondents do not argue that Petitioner has failed to carry his Rule 65 burden nor have they provided new evidence. Instead, Respondents argue that "Providing the Petitioner with the Section 1226(a) bond hearing the Court ordered moots the requested preliminary injunction and this habeas petition more generally." (ECF # 9 at 2). Respondents position is unsupported by settled precedent and the facts and record in this case.

The Court should issue a preliminary injunction and grant the Writ of Habeas Corpus as requested for the following reasons:

First, TRO and preliminary injunctions are intended to "merely to preserve the relative positions of the parties until a trial on the merits can be held, and to balance the equities as the litigation moves forward." *Lackey v. Stinnie*, 604 U.S. ___, 145 S. Ct. 659, 667 (2025) (citations omitted). As the name amply indicates a TRO is "temporary" and interlocutory by nature. Taken to its logical extension adopting Respondents' position would mean that no TRO could ever become a preliminary injunction or lead to determination on the merits. Not surprisingly the courts have rejected such arguments. *See Costa v. Bazron*, 464 F. Supp. 3d 132, 142 (D.D.C. 2020) ("If compliance with the terms of a TRO were sufficient to defeat entry of a preliminary injunction, few—if any—cases would make it past the TRO stage."). This is especially apropos when the cessation of the challenged conduct "follow[s] the entry of a TRO." *Id.* "Along with its power to hear the case, court's power to grant injunctive relief survives discontinuance of the illegal conduct" because the "purpose ... is to prevent future violations." *United States v. W.T. Grant Co.*, 345 U.S. 629, 633 (1953)(citing *Goshen Mfg. Co. v. Hubert A. Myers Mfg. Co.*, 1916, 242 U.S. 202).

In fact, the Supreme Court just a few years ago explained that cases involving this very scenario do not become moot simply because a person is released from immigration detention pursuant to bond based on a court order providing temporary relief. *See Nielsen v. Preap*, 586 U.S. 392, 403 (2019) (plurality opinion) (claims of plaintiffs released on bond not moot "[u]nless th[e] preliminary [relief] was made permanent and not disturbed on appeal" because "these individuals faced the threat of re-arrest and mandatory detention."); *Carafas v. LaVallee*, 391 U.S. 234, 238 (1968) (explaining that, under the federal habeas statute, "once ... federal jurisdiction has attached in the District Court, it is not defeated by the release of the petitioner prior to completion of proceedings on such application."). Similarly, in *Diaz v. Garland*, the Ninth Circuit held that a case was not moot where the government held a bond hearing ordered by the district court. *Diaz v. Garland* 53 F.4th 1189, 1195 n.2 (9th Cir. 2022) ("The government's compliance with the district court's order does not moot its appeal.") (citing *United States v. Golden Valley Elec. Ass'n*, 689 F.3d 1108, 1112–13 (9th Cir. 2012)).

Second, "[t]he hallmark of a moot case or controversy is that the relief sought can no longer be given or is no longer needed." *Martin-Trigona v. Shiff*, 702 F.2d 380, 386 (2d Cir. 1983). "[A] case is moot when the issues presented are no longer 'live' or the parties lack a legally cognizable interest in the outcome." *Powell v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486, 496, 89 S.Ct. 1944, 23 L.Ed.2d

491 (1969). Although a justiciable controversy does not exist when the question sought to be adjudicated has been mooted by subsequent developments, this is true "only when it is impossible for a court to grant any effectual relief whatever to the prevailing party. If the parties have a concrete interest, however small, in the outcome of the litigation, the case is not moot.'" *Sanchez v. Office of the State Superintendent of Educ.*, 959 F.3d 1121, 1125–26 (D.C. Cir. 2020); *United States v. Hahn*, 359 F.3d 1315, 1323 (10th Cir. 2004) (noting "the Supreme Court has held that 'even the availability of a partial remedy is sufficient to prevent a case from being moot.'"); *Utah Animal Rights Coal. v. Salt Lake City Corp.*, 371 F.3d 1248, 1257– 58 (10th Cir. 2004) (finding justiciable nominal damages claim of $1). It is not necessary that the full measure of relief requested by the Petitioner remains available; instead, justiciability remains where the potential for "any effectual relief . . . however small" exists. *Sanchez*, 959 F.3d at 1125. Here, in her TRO and Writ the Petitioner requested the following relief that has not been awarded *but could be awarded*: that the Court (1) order Petitioner's release (2) issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus; (2) issue an injunction ordering Respondents not to arrest and re-detain Petitioner without a proper finding that he has committed a violation of the conditions of release; (3) issue an injunction ordering Respondents not revoke Petitioner's grant of release without providing prior written notice, an opportunity to respond, and be represented by counsel prior to deprivation of liberty; (4)Enter a judgment declaring that Respondents' detention of Petitioner is and will be unauthorized by statute and contrary to law; and (9) award Petitioner reasonable costs and attorney fees.

Third, "[v]oluntary cessation of challenged conduct moots a case … [but] only if it is 'absolutely clear that the allegedly wrongful behavior could not reasonably be expected to recur.'" *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Slater*, 528 U.S. 216, 222 (2000) (quoting U.S. v. Concentrated Phosphate Exp. Ass'n, 393 U.S. 199, 203 (1968)). Here, as the record shows Respondents' refusal to release and abide by the requirements of INA and the implementing regulations was not a factual based decision or an aberration. Rather, it is based on a uniform policy that Respondents have adopted. The moment this case is closed and the TRO expires, Respondents will return to their old position. In fact, through post hoc rationalization Respondents' prevented Petitioner from receiving the individualized bond hearing under section 1226(a) that this Court ordered. Nor do Respondents provide even an empty assurance that they will comply with the due process awarded to Petitioner.

Fourth, wrongs that are "capable of repetition, yet evading review" do not render a case moot. *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113, 125 (1973) (quoting *S. Pac. Terminal Co. v. ICC*, 219 U.S. 498, 515 (1911)). "Th[is] exception applies where '(1) the challenged action is in its duration too short to be fully litigated prior to cessation or expiration, and (2) there is a reasonable expectation that the same complaining party will be subject to the same action again.'" *Fed. Election Comm'n v. Wis. Right to Life, Inc.*, 551 U.S. 449, 462 (2007). This is clearly the case here.

Fifth, in *Already, LLC v. Nike, Inc.*, the Supreme Court foreclosed the cavalier approach to mootness Respondents advocate: the Court held that it is for the Respondents –and the Respondents alone-- to show that the challenged conduct "could not reasonably be expected" to resume its enforcement efforts" against Petitioner. *See Already, LLC v. Nike, Inc.*, 568 U.S. 85, 92 (2013). In that case the Supreme Court rejected the proposition that "when a defendant makes a judicially enforceable commitment to avoid the conduct that forms the basis for an Article III controversy, there is reason to apply a special rule premised on the defendant's unfettered ability to 'return to [its] old ways." *Id.* The Court explained: "That is the question the voluntary cessation doctrine poses: Could the allegedly wrongful behavior reasonably be expected to recur? Nike cannot avoid its "formidable burden" by assuming the answer to that question." *Id.* Because no such showing was even attempted in this case, this Court should retain jurisdiction and issue a Writ or a Permanent injunction. *See FBI v. Fikre,* 601 U.S. 234, 240, (2024). In *Fikre* the Court held that this is a "formidable burden," id. (citation omitted), and that "[i]n all cases"—even cases, such as Fikre, that involve a governmental defendant—"it is the defendant's burden to establish that it cannot reasonably be expected to resume its challenged conduct" and to make that showing regardless of "whether the suit happens to be new or long lingering, and whether the challenged conduct might recur immediately or later at some more propitious moment," id. at 243, (cleaned up). *Fikre* thus overruled prior caselaw under which Courts "treat the voluntary cessation of challenged conduct by government officials with more solicitude than similar action by private parties." *Board of Trs. of Glazing Health & Welfare Tr. v. Chambers*, 941 F.3d 1195, 1198 (9th Cir. 2019) (en banc) (cleaned up); *see also Brach v. Newsom*, 38 F.4th 6, 12–13 (9th Cir. 2022) (en banc) (same). Here, Petitioner is not yet subject to a final reinstated order of removal. As the Supreme Court explained in *Preap*, it is precisely because Petitioner remains vulnerable to re-detention, that Petitioner's claim is not moot even after his release. *See Preap*, 586 U.S. at 403 (explaining that a noncitizen had a live claim where release on bond was granted following a preliminary injunction and efforts to remove the non-citizens are ongoing).

Finally, habeas corpus remains an appropriate vehicle to challenge unlawful agency action, as long as the petitioner satisfies the "in custody" requirement of 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c). Here, there is no doubt that Petitioner who is now subject to an ankle monitoring and strict conditions of supervision, satisfies the 'in custody' requirements. *See Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 437 (2004) ("**Custody**" for habeas purposes is not limited to physical detention.); *Rosales v. Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement*, 426 F.3d 733, 735 (5th Cir. 2005) (removal order imposes sufficient restrictions to meet the 'in custody' requirement); *Ali v. Napolitano*, Civil Action No. 12-11384-FDS, 2013 WL 3929788, at *4–5 (D. Mass. July 26, 2013) (finding petitioner was in "**custody**" where he challenged the restraints on his liberty in his OSUP).Indeed, the seminal case of *Accardi v. Shaughnessy*, 347 U.S. 260, 268 (1954), was itself a habeas petition challenging the immigration agency's failure to comply with its own regulations around removal.

In the alternative, Petitioner requests that the Court issue a permanent injunction prohibiting Respondents from re-detaining Petitioner without a statutory and constitutionally sufficient pre-detention hearing.

Respectfully submitted by

_____*s/ Nicolette Glazer Esq.*________
Nicolette Glazer Esq.
LAW OFFICES OF LARRY R GLAZER
2121 Avenue of the Stars #800
Century City, CA 90067
T: 310-407-5353
F: 310-407-5354
nicolette@glazerandglazer.com
ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER

CERTIFICATION OF COUNSEL

The undersigned, counsel of record Petitioner, certifies that this memorandum of points and authorities contains 3907 words, which complies with the word limit set in LR. 11.6.

_____*s/ Nicolette Glazer Esq.*________
Nicolette Glazer Esq.
LAW OFFICES OF LARRY R GLAZER
1875 Century Park East #700
Century City, CA 90067

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER

Appendix C

Notice of Intent to Reinstate and Reinstatement Order

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Notice of Intent/Decision to Reinstate Prior Order

File No. [redacted]
Event No: LOS [redacted]
FIN #: [redacted]
Date: [redacted] 2016

Name: [redacted]

In accordance with section 241(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act) and 8 CFR 241.8, you are hereby notified that the Secretary of Homeland Security intends to reinstate the order of Removal (Deportation / exclusion / removal) entered against you. This intent is based on the following determinations:

1. You are an alien subject to a prior order of deportation / exclusion / removal entered on [redacted], 2000 (Date) at [redacted] CA (Location).

2. You have been identified as an alien who:

   ☒ was removed on [redacted] (Date) pursuant to an order of deportation / exclusion / removal.

   ☐ departed voluntarily on ______ (Date) pursuant to an order of deportation / exclusion / removal on or after the date on which such order took effect (i.e., who self-deported).

3. You illegally reentered the United States on or about / /2000 (Date) at or near [redacted] California (Location)

In accordance with Section 241(a)(5) of the Act, you are removable as an alien who has illegally reentered the United States after having been previously removed or departed voluntarily while under an order of exclusion, deportation or removal and are therefore subject to removal by reinstatement of the prior order. You may contest this determination by making a written or oral statement to an immigration officer. You **do not** have a right to a hearing before an immigration judge.

The facts that formed the basis of this determination, and the existence of a right to make a written or oral statement contesting this determination, were communicated to the alien in the English *language.*

[redacted]
(Printed or typed name of official)

[redacted]
(Signature of officer)

[redacted] DEPORTATION OFFICER
(Title of officer)

[redacted]

Acknowledgment and Response

I ☐ do ☐ do not wish to make a statement contesting this determination.

(Date)

[redacted] refused to sign
(Signature of Alien)

Decision, Order, and Officer's Certification

Having reviewed all available evidence, the administrative file and any statements made or submitted in rebuttal, I have determined that the above-named alien is subject to removal through reinstatement of the prior order, in accordance with section 241(a)(5) of the Act.

[redacted] 2016
(Date)

[redacted] California
(Location)

[redacted]
(Signature of authorized deciding official)

[redacted]
(Printed or typed name of official)

DEPORTATION OFFICER
(Title)

Form I-871 (Rev. 08/01/07)

Appendix D

Memorandum Re: Record of Proceedings in Reinstatement and Administrative Removal Cases

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
425 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20536

U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

APR 2 7 2006

MEMORANDUM FOR:	Field Office Directors and Special Agents in Charge
FROM:	John P. Torres (b)(6),(b)(7)(C) Director, Office of Detention and Removal Operations (b)(6),(b)(7)(C) Office of Investigations
SUBJECT:	Record of Proceedings in Reinstatement and Administrative Removal Cases

Purpose

Section 241(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5) (2000), provides the Attorney General with authority to reinstate a previously executed removal order with respect to aliens who illegally reenter the United States.

Section 238(b) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1228(b) (2000), provides the Attorney General with the authority to administratively remove certain criminal aliens.

This memorandum will standardize the practice in preparing and preserving records of proceedings (ROP) in these matters. This practice will allow these cases to be defended more successfully in federal courts.

Background

8 C.F.R. §§ 241.8 and 238.1 implement the aforementioned sections of the INA. Guidance is also provided in Chapters 14.7 and 14.8 of the Detention and Deportation Officer's Field Manual, which sets forth the procedure for reinstating a final order, the content of the ROP, and the manner of certifying a reinstatement case for judicial review. See also the Administrative Removal Proceedings Manual (M-430), Appendix 14-1 for guidance on preparation of the record in administrative removal proceedings. This memorandum reinforces guidance already in place and provides supplementary instructions to both Field Office Directors and Special Agents in Charge on how to properly create the administrative record or the ROP in reinstatement and administrative removal cases.

Discussion

A. Reinstatement:

The deciding officer (DO) must maintain a permanent ROP in each case where a Notice of Intent/Decision to Reinstate Prior Order (Form I-871) is issued. This is necessary to facilitate development of the administrative record for possible judicial review. Processing officers (PO) are required to create the ROP for presentation to the DO. Included in the ROP are those documents the Government will rely on to reinstate the prior order, and any other pleadings or evidence pertaining to the reinstatement. At a minimum, the ROP must include copies of:

1. Notice of Intent/Decision to Reinstate Prior Order (Form I-871);
2. The prior administrative removal order;
3. Notice to Alien Ordered Removed/Departure Verification (Form I-296);
4. The record check or fingerprint match, as reflected in the Integrated Automated Fingerprint ID System (IAFIS);
5. Any documentary evidence submitted by the alien;
6. Record of Sworn Statement or the alien's declination to provide such statement (Form I-877);
7. Record of Deportable/Inadmissible Alien (Form I-213);
8. Previously executed Warrant of Removal/Deportation (Form I-205); and
9. Previously executed Warning to Alien Ordered Removed or Deported (Form I-294).

Additionally, the ROP must include any other evidence that the official relied upon to support the charges and any documents that rebut the alien's assertion that reinstatement is improper, such as a decision on an application for adjustment of status if it is related to reinstatement. See 8 C.F.R. § 241.8(a).

The issuing DO must certify the authenticity of the documents contained in the ROP. It is important that the original documents that were copied and placed in the ROP be kept in the A-File for possible use in any criminal or civil action.

B. Administrative Removal:

Similarly, a ROP must be maintained where a Final Administrative Removal Order (Form I-851A) is issued. Again, POs are required to create the ROP for presentation to the DO. The ROP must include <u>copies</u> of:

1. Notice of Intent to Issue a Final Administrative Removal Order (Form I-851);
2. Evidence of immigration status (CIS, RAPS, NIIS, etc.);
3. Record of Deportable/Inadmissible Alien (Form I-213);
4. Record of Sworn Statement or the alien's declination to provide such statement (Form I-877);
5. Final Administrative Removal Order (including any supplemental memorandum of decision)(Form I-851A);
6. Certified Conviction documents for commission of an aggravated felony;
7. Any response the alien offers;
8. Any evidence the Government relied upon to support the charges; and
9. All admissible evidence (briefs and other documents) submitted by either party respecting deportability.

The ROP should include all documents in support of the Notice of Intent to Issue a Final Administrative Removal Order. See 8 C.F.R. § 238.1. The original documents that were copied and placed in the ROP should be kept in the A-File and made available for use in any potential civil or criminal action.

In both instances, the PO's written findings and conclusions of law must be supported by reasonable, substantial, and probative evidence, and must also be included in the ROP. The ROP should be clearly labeled and placed in the left hand side of the A-file. Moreover, the ROP should contain an Index (see attached sample indexes) noting which documents are contained in the ROP. A blue ROP coversheet should be placed on top of the Index and the documents.

Ultimately, the DO is responsible for the certification of authenticity of the ROP (see attached sample certification). The certification should be placed under the ROP coversheet. When feasible, DOs must maintain possession and control of the ROP during the pendency of any adjudication and ensuing legal challenge or during any credible fear proceedings. If the file is required elsewhere, the DO should retain a copy of the ROP. If necessary, the Department of

Justice's Office of Immigration Litigation will directly contact the local U. S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement's Office of the Chief Counsel (OCC) in order to obtain a copy of the ROP, which must include the DO's certification.

If you have any questions on the aforementioned information, please contact your local OCC.

Attachments

INDEX

RECORD FILE
Alien Name
A00-000-0

- ☐ Certification.
- ☐ Notice of Intent/Decision to Reinstate Prior Order (Form I-871).
- ☐ The prior administrative removal order.
- ☐ Notice to Alien Ordered Removed/Departure Verification (Form I-296).
- ☐ The record check or fingerprint match.
- ☐ Any documentary evidence submitted by the alien.
- ☐ Record of Sworn Statement or the alien's declination to provide such statement (Form I-877).
- ☐ Record of Deportable/Inadmissible Alien (Form I-213).
- ☐ Warrant of Removal/Deportation (Form I-205).
- ☐ Warning to Alien Ordered Removed or Deported (Form I-294).
- ☐ Any other evidence relied upon to support the charges.
- ☐ Any documents that rebut the alien's assertion that reinstatement is improper.

INDEX

RECORD FILE
Alien Name
A00-000-0

- ☐ Certification.
- ☐ Notice of Intent to Issue a Final Administrative Removal Order (Form I-851).
- ☐ Evidence of immigration status (CIS, RAPS. NIIS. etc.).
- ☐ Record of Deportable/Inadmissible Alien (Form I-213).
- ☐ Record of Sworn Statement or the alien's declination to provide such statement (Form I-877).
- ☐ Final Administrative Removal Order (including any supplemental memorandum of decision)(Form I-851A).
- ☐ Certified Conviction documents for commission of an aggravated felony.
- ☐ Any response the alien offers.
- ☐ Any evidence the government relied upon to support the charges.
- ☐ All admissible evidence (briefs and other documents) submitted by either party respecting deportability.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

CERTIFICATION OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. §§ 1732 - 1733, the attached Record of Proceedings are records of the United States Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

I, [name of officer], declare:

1. I am a Deportation Officer with United States Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement. I have served in this position since [month & year]. My office is located in [City, State], and my responsibilities include the maintenance and creation of the official Record of Proceedings. I am the deciding officer in the matter of [Alien Name], [A-number].

2. Attached to this Certification is a copy of the official Record of Proceedings. These documents relate to:

   Subject: [Alien Name]
   File Number: [A-number]

3. These records were prepared by personnel of the United States Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement in the ordinary course of business at or near acts, conditions, or events described in the records.

I, [name of officer], do hereby certify that I have compared the copy of the Record of Proceedings attached to this certificate with the original Record of Proceedings as it appears of record and on file in my office, and it is a true and correct copy of the original.

Date:___________

____
[Name]
Deportation Officer

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

CERTIFICATION OF ______________________:

1. I am a ___position title____ with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, United States Department of Homeland Security. I have served in this position since __________. My office is located in __________________ and my responsibilities include the maintenance and creation of the official Record of Proceedings. I am the deciding officer in the matter of _______________, file number A__ ___ ___.

2. Annexed to this Certification is the official Record of Proceedings.

I hereby certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that the annexed documents are originals, or copies thereof, of the official Record of Proceedings. These documents relate to:

Subject:
File Number: A

Dated:__________

____
Name
Title

SANDRA D. ANDERSON
Chief Counsel
PHILIP J. BETZ, JR.
Deputy Chief Counsel
MARK FREDERICK UDE
Assistant Chief Counsel
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
10400 Rancho Road
Adelanto, CA 92301
(760) 561-6366

DETAINED

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW
IMMIGRATION COURT
ADELANTO, CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of:	)	
Modesta ARAUJO DE ECHEVERRIA	)	A[redacted]
In bond proceedings	)	

Immigration Judge: Bryan DePowell Next Hearing: December 30, 2025 at 8:00 a.m.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY'S

FILING OF BOND DOCUMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Respectfully submitted this 30th Day of December 2025.

Mark Frederick Ude

Mark Frederick Ude
Assistant Chief Counsel
Sandra Anderson
Chief Counsel
Philip J. Betz, Jr.
Deputy Chief Counsel

EOIR — 4 of 19

Tab A

EARM

Logged In:

Person ID: [redacted] Sex: F DOB: [redacted] Current Age: **62** COB: **MEXIC** COC: **MEXIC**

Subject ID : [redacted] Processing Disposition: **REINSTATEMENT OF DEPORT ORDER I-871** ICE Non-Detained Portal Verified Account: **No**

Case # : [redacted] Case Category: **[16]** Docket: **ADE - 625-749 Torres**

Final Order of Removal: **No**
Final Order Date: **N/A**
Proceed With Removal: **N/A**
Days Final Order in Effect: **N/A**

Time in Custody: **13 days**
Depart / Cleared Status: **ACTIVE**

Special Class:

-- Select Different Case File --

Current / Active Alerts

In Custody

Araujo De Echeverria, Modesta [redacted]

Encounter Details

2 Encounter(s) linked to Person ID: 2881891

	Ref#	Subject ID	A-Number	Last Name	First Name	COC	Historical Priority	DOB	Encountered on	Case	Case Category	
◉	2	[redacted]		ARAUJO DE ECHEVERRIA	MODESTA	MEXIC	No Priority	[redacted]	12/17/2025	[redacted]	16	Unlink
○	1			ARAUJO DE ECHEVERRIA	MODESTA	MEXIC	No Priority		07/11/2007		8C	Unlink

Encounter Details

All information below may only be edited in EAGLE

Event / Incident Information

Event Number: [redacted]
Event Occurred On: **12/17/2025**
Event Type: **Administrative Non-Criminal Individual**
Program: **NDD - Non-Detained Docket Control**

Operation: **Local FOD OP FY 2026**
Site: **N/A**
Landmark: **N/A**

Primary Agent: **G 11058 GOUGH**
Assigned On: **12/17/2025**
Event Supervisor: **A 8006 GONZALEZ**
Assigned On: **12/17/2025**

Subject Information

FINS: [redacted]
DNA Collection Device Number: [redacted]
A-Number: [redacted]
Control Name: **ARAUJO DE ECHEVERRIA**
First Name: **MODESTA**
Middle Name: **N/A**
Maiden: **N/A**
Nickname: **N/A**
Living?: **Y**
Sex: **F**
Marital Status: **Single**
SSN: **N/A**
Juvenile Verified: **N/A**
Occupation: **N/A**
TSC Log #: **N/A**
NUIN #: **N/A**
SEN #: **N/A**

Historical Priority: **No Priority**
Criminal Type: **N/A**
Agg Felon: **No Aggravated Felony Convictions**
Primary Citizenship: **MEXICO**
Stateless Type: **N/A**
Hair: **BRO**
Eyes: **BRO**
Complexion: **LBR**
Race: **W**
Origin: **N/A**
Date of Birth: [redacted]
Age: **62**
Age at Encounter: **62**
Height: **60**
Weight: **160**
Speak/Understand English: **Y**
Read/Write English: **Y**

Role: **P**
Role Comment: **N/A**
Processing Disposition: **REINSTATEMENT OF DEPORT ORDER I-871**
INS Status: **Deportable**
POE: **SAN YSIDRO, CA**
Entry Date: **10/01/1996**
Entry Class: **Not Applicable**
Apprehension Date: **2025-12-17 11:24:42.0**
Warrant served by Warrant Service Officer (WSO)? **N/A**
Arrest Method: **Non-Custodial Arrest**
Site: **LOS**
Landmark: **LOSGEN - LOS ANGELES COUNTY GENERAL AREA, NON-SPECIFIC**
Arrest At/Near: **N/A**
Juvenile Status: **N/A**
CBP Family Unit ID: **N/A**

TECS Subject #: **N/A**
U.S. Veteran Status: **N**
Relationship to U.S. Veteran(s): **N/A**

Primary Language: **ENGLISH**
Family Members: **N/A**
Alien is the parent ***and also*** the primary caregiver of a minor within the United States: **No**
Related Minor(s): **N/A**
Alien is the legal guardian of a minor within the United States: **No**
Related Minor(s): **N/A**
Alien is involved in active parental/child welfare proceedings of children located within the United States: **No**
Related Minor(s): **N/A**

CBP Separation Reason: **N/A**
Accompanying Family Member Relation: **N/A**
Accompanying Family Member Subject ID: **N/A**
Consequence Delivery System Selection: **N/A**
ICE Family ID: **N/A**

I-213 Narrative

Narrative 1 : Created Date: 12/17/2025 02:29 PM

Name: ARAUJO, Modesta Contrera
Date of Birth: [redacted]
Alien Number [redacted]
Country of Birth: Mexico
FIN: [redacted]
FBI UCN:

ENCOUNTER DATA:

On December 17, 2025, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officers from the Los Angeles Field Office (LAFO) Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) assigned to the Los Angeles Non-Detained Unit (NDU), encountered ARAUJO due to a United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) referral. ICE ERO took custody of ARAUJO and transported her to the 7th floor NDU for processing. Records check of CIS, TECS, PCQS, PLANET, BIA, 9th Circuit, and EARM databases were completed.

On December 17, 2025, ARAUJO, was referred by USCIS during a scheduled interview with an Immigration Service Officer (ISO) in Los Angeles, CA. Records checks indicate ARAUJO is a citizen and national of MEXICO by virtue of birth. ARAUJO is not in possession of valid immigration documents allowing her to be or remain in the United States legally. ARAUJO will be arrested and processed pursuant to Section 241(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA).

On December 17, 2025, ICE ERO officers from the Los Angeles Non-Detained Unit took ARAUJO into custody and transported her to the Los Angeles Staging Facility (LASF).

IMMIGRATION HISTORY:

On August 13, 1996, ARAUJO Contreras Modesta, attempted to enter the United States using a false I-551-Permanent Resident Card and verbally claiming to be a USC.

On September 18, 1996, Immigration Judge ordered removal ARAUJO Contreras Modesta.

On the Same day, ARAUJO was deported Otay Mesa, verified by an I-296.

On March 8, 2001, ARAUJO filed the Form I-130- Petition for Alien Relative, with receipt number [redacted]

On August 5, 2005, USCIS approved the Form I-130

On July 30, 2007, ARAUJO filed the Form I-130- Petition for Alien Relative, with receipt number with receipt number [redacted]

On June 25, 2008, USCIS approved the Form I-130
On July 30, 2007, ARAUJO filed the Form I-485- Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status with receipt number [redacted]

On June 25, 2008, USCIS denied the Form I-485

On August 5, 2022, ARAUJO filed the Form I-130- Petition for Alien Relative, with receipt number with receipt number , with receipt number [redacted]

On September 12, 2023, USCIS approved the Form I-130

On August 29, 2025, ARAUJO filed the Form I-601- Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility, with receipt number [redacted]

As of December 16, 2025, the Form I-601 is pending.

On August 29, 2025, ARAUJO filed the Form I-765- Application for Employment Authorization with receipt number [redacted]

As of December 16, 2025, the Form I-765 is pending

On August 29, 2025, ARAUJO filed the Form I-485- Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status with receipt number [redacted]

As of December 16, 2025, the Form I-I-485 is pending

On September 29, 2025, ARAUJO filed the Form I-212- Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission into the United States After Deportation or Removal with receipt number [redacted]

As of December 16, 2025, the Form I-I-485 is pending

On December 17, 2025, ARAUJO was scheduled for his Form I-485 interview on December 17, 2025, at 7:5am pm with the Los Angeles County Field Office (6th floor), request was denied.

CRIMINAL HISTORY:

NO CRIME

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

ARAUJO filled a Motion to Reopen IJ Jurisdiction was Received on December 15, 2025. Her Attorney claims the stay has been filed.

ARAUJO declined to answer questions during Sworn Statement.

ARAUJO claims to have 3 USC children and a LPR spouse.

ARAUJO has no known personal or family circumstances precluding law enforcement action.

ARAUJO has no known ties to the community precluding law enforcement action.

ARAUJO does not claim to have fear of returning to her country of citizenship, MEXICO.

ARAUJO claims to have had surgery on her right hand a couple months ago. Other than that, no medical issue.

GANG TIES:

Does not claim gang affiliation.

CASE DISPOSITION:

ERO Los Angeles served with ARAUJO a Reinstatement of a Final Order, Form I-871, And will be removed from the United States to MEXICO.

Tab B

Tab C

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW
IMMIGRATION COURT
401 WEST A STREET, SUITE #800
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-7904

In the Matter of:
ARAUJO DE ECHEVERRIA, MODESTA

APPLICANT

Case No.: [redacted]

Docket: SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

IN EXCLUSION PROCEEDINGS

ORDER OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE

This is a summary of the oral decision entered on Sep 18, 1996. This memorandum is solely for the convenience of the parties. If the proceedings should be appealed or reopened, the oral decision will become the official opinion in this case.

(X) Applicant has been ordered excluded and deported from the United States under 212(a)(6)(C)(i) and 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) of the Act.

( ) Applicant is admitted to the United States as a __________ until __________.

( ) As a condition of admission, the applicant is to post a $__________ Maintenance of Status and Departure Bond.

( ) Applicant's request to withdraw the application for admission to United States is granted. If the applicant fails to depart on or before the date set by the District Director, Immigration and Naturalization Service, the following order shall become immediately effective: Applicant shall be ordered excluded and deported from the United States.

( ) Applicant's application for asylum was ( )granted ( )denied ( )withdrawn ( )other.

( ) Applicant's application for withholding of deportation was ( )granted ( )denied ( )withdrawn ( )other.

( ) Applicant's application for waiver under Section __________ of the Immigration and Nationality Act was ( )granted ( )denied ( )withdrawn ( )other.

( ) Proceedings were terminated.

( ) The application for adjustment of status under section (216) (216A), (245) (249) was ( )granted ( )denied ( )withdrawn ( )other. If granted, it was ordered that the applicant be issued all appropriate documents necessary to give effect to this order.

(X) Other Final order

Gaylyn N. Boone
GAYLYN N. BOONE
Immigration Judge
Date: Sep 18, 1996

Appeal: WAIVED (A/I/B)
RTO

Name of Alien: ARAUJO-DE ECHEVERRIA, MODESTA | Date: 9·18·96 | File No. [redacted]

An immigration judge has ordered that you be excluded from admission into the United States, and that you be deported from the United States.

If after your deportation is effected, you desire to reenter the United States within one year from the date of such deportation, you must, prior to commencing your travel to this country, request permission from the Attorney General to reapply for admission into the United States. Application forms for requesting such permission may be obtained by contacting any United States Consulate or office of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Your reentry within one year of the date of your deportation without the express permission of the Attorney General will subject you to prosecution as a felon and, if convicted therefor, you could be sentenced to imprisonment for not more than two years or fined not more than $1000, or both.

RECORD OF EXCLUSION AND DEPORTATION

	Date	Port	Via
Departure verified:	9·18·96	OTM	AFOOT

Signature of Officer: [signature]

Title: DEO

RIGHT INDEX

[redacted]

Modesta Araujo
(Signature of person fingerprinted)

[signature]
(Signature of official taking fingerprint)

FILE COPY

Form I-296
(Rev. 12-15-82)Y

TO: OFFICE OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE
401 WEST A STREET
SUITE 800
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

EXCLUSION CASE

A NUMBER: [redacted]

ARREST DATE: 08/13/96

I-122 ISSUED: 08/14/96

LAST NAME: ARAUJO de Echeverria FIRST NAME: Modesta

AKA:

LAST NAME: ARAUJO-Contreras FIRST NAME: Modesta

COUNTRY OF BIRTH: Mexico DOB: [redacted]

IMMIGRANT: [ ] DOE: [ ] NONIMMIGRANT: [X]

MAILING ADDRESS: COMMUTER STATUS: YES [ ] NO [X]

1) DD&P - San Diego District
880 Front Street, Room B-250
San Diego, California 92101

2)

EXCLUSION CHARGES: 212(a)(6)(C)(i) 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I)

POSSIBLE 212(c): YES [ ] NO [X]

IN CUSTODY to EOIR: YES [X] NO [ ]

COURT DATE: TO BE SET AT A LATER DATE COURT TIME: AND TIME.

ATTACHED DOCUMENTS: I-110 [X], I-122 [X], OTHER: [ ]

FROM: SAN YSIDRO PORT OF ENTRY
720 EAST SAN YSIDRO BLVD.
SAN YSIDRO, CALIFORNIA 92173-9018

BUS: (619) 662-7112
FAX: (619) 662-7154

I CERTIFY THAT I CAN RECEIVE MAIL AT THE ABOVE STATED ADDRESS AND THAT I HAVE RECEIVED A CHANGE OF ADDRESS FORM IN THE EVENT I SHOULD MOVE.

YO CERTIFICO QUE YO PUEDO RECIBIR CORREO EN LA DIRECCION ARRIBA Y QUE HE RECIBIDO LA FORMA PARA CAMBIAR DIRECCION EN CASO QUE ME CAMBIO.

Modesta ARAUJO .C
SIGNATURE - FIRMA

08/14/96
DATE - FECHA

Modesta ARAUJO DE ECHEVERRIA
A[redacted]

PROOF OF SERVICE

On 30 December 2025, I, Mark Frederick Ude, do hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the Bond Documents and any attached pages was served through the EOIR Courts and Appeals System (ECAS).

Date: _12/30/2025_ By: Mark Frederick Ude

Friday, January 2, 2026 at 18:02:00 Pacific Standard Time

Subject: Fwd: MODESTA ARAUJI CONTRERAS A[redacted]
Date: Wednesday, December 17, 2025 at 11:57:29 AM Pacific Standard Time
From: Rosana Cheung
To: Nicolette Glazer

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Rosana Cheung <lawofficesrosanacheung@yahoo.com>
> **Date:** December 17, 2025 at 10:59:40AM PST
> **To:** sandiego.outreach@ice.dhs.gov, LosAngeles.Outreach@ice.dhs.gov, Response ADE ERO <ADEEROResponse@ice.dhs.gov>, ERO.INFO@ice.dhs.gov
> **Subject: MODESTA ARAUJI CONTRERAS A**[redacted]
>
> Good morning
>
> My client went to her interview and got arrested by your office and now in Los Angeles. My client has motion to roepen pending with the San Diego immigration court and also expresses fear to return to her country and need to have a fear interview. Please let me know if you need anything else
>
> Sincerely
>
> Rosana Cheung, Esq.
> Sent from my iPhone

EOIR Automated Case Information

Court Closures Today January 2, 2026

Please check https://www.justice.gov/eoir-operational-status for up to date closures.

Home > **ARAUJO DE ECHEVERRIA, MODESTA** [redacted]

Automated Case Information

Name: ARAUJO DE ECHEVERRIA, MODESTA | A-Number: [redacted] | Docket Date: 12/30/2025

Next Hearing Information

There are no future hearings for this case.

Court Decision and Motion Information

This bond is pending.

BIA Case Information

No appeal was received for this case.

Court Contact Information

If you require further information regarding your case, or wish to file additional documents, please contact the immigration court.

COURT ADDRESS

10250 RANCHO RD, SUITE 201A
ADELANTO, CA 92301

PHONE NUMBER
(760) 561-6500

hCaptcha Privacy Policy

hCaptcha Terms of Service

Department of Justice | Executive Office for Immigration Review
5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 2600, Falls Church, VA 22041

EOIR Automated Case Information