UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

FILED
MAR 24 2026
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BY _____
DEPUTY CLERK

CHHABI LAL BOHARA,
Petitioner,
v. Civil Action No. **5:26-cv-00533**
TODD M. LYONS, Acting Director,
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement,
et al.,
Respondents.

PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR IMMEDIATE RULING AND DISPOSITION OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241 AND 2243

TO THE HONORABLE COURT:

Petitioner, **CHHABI LAL BOHARA (A#** [redacted]**)**, respectfully moves this Court for an **immediate ruling** on the fully briefed Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and states as follows:

PROCEDURAL POSTURE AND COMPLETION OF THE RECORD

1. Petitioner filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to **28 U.S.C. §2241**, challenging the legality of his continued immigration detention.
2. Respondents filed their response opposing the Petition.

3. Petitioner thereafter filed a comprehensive Reply addressing Respondents' arguments and reinforcing the constitutional violations at issue.
4. The matter is now **fully briefed**, and no further submissions are necessary for this Court to resolve the Petition.
5. **This matter is fully submitted, and no further briefing or factual development is necessary for the Court to issue a ruling.**
6. Accordingly, this case is ripe for adjudication, and the Court may proceed to determine the legality of Petitioner's detention based on the complete record before it.

STATUTORY MANDATE FOR PROMPT HABEAS REVIEW

7. The federal habeas statute imposes a clear obligation on courts to act promptly in resolving challenges to unlawful detention.
8. Under **28 U.S.C. §2243**, the Court is required to **"summarily hear and determine the facts, and dispose of the matter as law and justice require."**
9. The Supreme Court has long recognized that habeas corpus is intended to be a **swift and imperative remedy in cases of unlawful restraint**.
10. As explained in *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391 (1963), the writ of habeas corpus functions as a fundamental safeguard of individual liberty.
11. Where a petition has been fully briefed, **continued delay in adjudication undermines the very purpose of the writ**.
12. The Supreme Court further reaffirmed in *INS v. St. Cyr*, 533 U.S. 289 (2001), that habeas corpus remains available to review the legality of executive detention, including in the immigration context.

PROLONGED DETENTION AND ONGOING CONSTITUTIONAL HARM

13. Petitioner has now been detained for **421 consecutive days**, having been taken into custody on **January 26, 2025**.
14. This extended period of confinement has occurred **without a bond hearing or any meaningful procedural safeguard** through which Petitioner may challenge the legality of his detention.

15. The Supreme Court has repeatedly emphasized that freedom from physical restraint lies at the core of the liberty protected by the Constitution.
16. In *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001), the Court warned that civil immigration detention is subject to constitutional limitations and **cannot become indefinite imprisonment**.
17. The Court further reaffirmed in *Boumediene v. Bush*, 553 U.S. 723 (2008), that habeas corpus exists to prevent unlawful executive detention.
18. Each additional day of detention imposes **ongoing and irreparable harm to Petitioner's liberty interests**, as the deprivation of liberty cannot be remedied after the fact.
19. Because Petitioner's detention continues without lawful justification, the need for prompt judicial intervention is urgent.

RESPONDENTS FAILED TO JUSTIFY CONTINUED DETENTION

20. Respondents' opposition relies primarily on statutory detention provisions while failing to meaningfully address the constitutional violations raised in the Petition.
21. Respondents do not justify the prolonged nature of Petitioner's detention.
22. Respondents do not demonstrate that removal is imminent or that continued detention is necessary.
23. Respondents' position would leave Petitioner detained **without any meaningful forum to challenge the legality of his confinement**.
24. As demonstrated in the Petition and Reply, this theory creates a **constitutional review gap** that cannot withstand constitutional scrutiny.
25. Respondents therefore fail to provide **lawful authority for continued detention**.

THIS COURT SHOULD ISSUE A PROMPT RULING

26. This case presents a straightforward question: whether Respondents possess lawful authority to continue detaining Petitioner.
27. The record before the Court is complete and provides all information necessary to resolve that question.
28. No additional briefing or factual development is required.

29. Under **28 U.S.C. §2243**, the Court is obligated to **dispose of the matter as law and justice require without unnecessary delay**.
30. Continued delay would allow ongoing detention that has already exceeded constitutional limits.
31. Accordingly, a prompt ruling is both statutorily required and constitutionally necessary.

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court:

a. Issue an **immediate ruling** on the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus;

b. Grant the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to **28 U.S.C. §2241**;

c. Declare that Respondents' continued detention of Petitioner is unlawful;

d. Order **Petitioner's immediate release from immigration custody**;

e. Grant any further relief the Court deems just and proper consistent with **28 U.S.C. §§2241 and 2243**, consistent with the Supreme Court's directive in *Preiser v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475 (1973), that habeas corpus provides the proper remedy for release from unlawful custody.

VERIFICATION

I, **Chhabi Lal Bohara (A#[redacted])**, declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 1746** that I am the Petitioner in the above-captioned action; that I have read the foregoing **Petitioner's Motion for Immediate Ruling and Disposition of Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241 and 2243**; and that the facts stated therein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Executed on **March 23, 2026**.

Respectfully submitted,

C. B.

Chhabi Lal Bohara
Petitioner, Pro Se
A#[redacted]

South Texas ICE Processing Center
566 Veterans Drive
Pearsall, Texas 78061

SOUTH TX ICE PROCESSING CTR
CHHABI LAL BOHARA
A [redacted]
566 Veterans Dr.
Pearsall, TX 78061

CLERK,
U.S. DISTRICT CT WESTERN DISTRICT OF T
262 WEST NUEVA ST.
SAN ANTONIO, TX 78207