FILED
U.S. District Court
District of Kansas
03/23/2026
Clerk, U.S. District Court
By: SND Deputy Clerk

HABEAS CORPUS PETITION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF KANSAS

RUSLAN URAN UULU
[redacted]
USP Leavenworth
1300 Metropolitan Ave.
LEAVENWORTH, KS 66048

Mail address:

USP LEAVENWORTH
1300 METROPOLITAN AVENUE
PO Box 1000
Leavenworth, KS 66048

Petitioner (Pro Se),

v.

WARDEN, USP LEAVENWORTH;
FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT;
DIRECTOR, U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT;
SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY,

Respondents

Case No.: 26-3060-JWL

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
UNDER 28 U.S.C. §2241

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Ruslan Uran Uulu respectfully files this *pro se* petition for writ of habeas corpus challenging the legality of his continued detention by immigration authorities.

Petitioner was ordered removed by an Immigration Judge. Although appeal was initially waived, Petitioner subsequently filed an appeal with the Board of Immigration Appeals ("BIA"), which remains pending or subject to dismissal.

Despite the uncertain procedural posture of the appeal, Petitioner remains detained for a prolonged period without meaningful individualized review. Whether analyzed as detention during removal

proceedings or post-order detention, continued confinement without adequate procedural safeguards violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

Petitioner seeks immediate release or, alternatively, a prompt custody review consistent with constitutional requirements.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §2241 and 28 U.S.C. §1331.

Venue is proper because Petitioner is detained at:

USP Leavenworth
1300 Metropolitan Ave.
Leavenworth, Kansas

which is located within the District of Kansas.

III. CUSTODY STATUS

Petitioner is currently detained in federal custody while subject to immigration removal proceedings or a removal order.

Due to the procedural posture of the case—including a filed appeal that may be pending or subject to dismissal—the finality of the removal order remains uncertain.

Regardless of classification, Petitioner's continued detention has become prolonged and constitutionally excessive. As detention becomes prolonged, due process requires that the government justify continued detention. The burden should shift to the government to demonstrate, by clear and convincing evidence, that continued detention is necessary to prevent flight risk or danger to the community.

IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

1. Petitioner is currently detained at USP Leavenworth.
2. Petitioner has remained continuously detained since October 31, 2025.
3. On January 15, 2026, an Immigration Judge issued an order of removal.
4. Appeal was initially waived at the hearing.
5. On February 12, 2026, Petitioner subsequently filed an appeal with the BIA.
6. The appeal is pending or has not yet been finally resolved.
7. Petitioner has remained continuously detained.
8. Petitioner's detention has already extended for several months and continues without a clear endpoint, particularly in the absence of any meaningful opportunity for release.
9. There is no indication that the petitioner is a danger to the community or a flight risk.
10. Continued detention imposes severe restrictions on liberty.

V. LEGAL STANDARD

Civil immigration detention is subject to constitutional limitations.

Under the Fifth Amendment, detention must remain reasonably related to its purpose and cannot become punitive.

Relevant authority includes:

- Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678 (2001)
- Jennings v. Rodriguez, 138 S.Ct. 830 (2018)
- Demore v. Kim, 538 U.S. 510 (2003)

Even where detention is authorized by statute, it becomes unconstitutional **as applied** when it becomes unreasonably prolonged without adequate procedural safeguards.

VI. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

CLAIM I — PROLONGED DETENTION IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AS APPLIED

Petitioner's detention has become excessive in duration.

Whether considered pre-final or post-final order detention, the Constitution requires limits on the government's ability to detain individuals for extended periods without sufficient justification.

Continued detention without meaningful review violates due process.

The government cannot rely solely on statutory authority to justify continued detention where such detention has become excessive and lacks adequate procedural safeguards.

CLAIM II — LACK OF ADEQUATE PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS

Petitioner has not been afforded constitutionally sufficient custody review ensuring that continued detention is necessary.

Due process requires individualized determination that detention is justified based on flight risk or danger.

The equities in Petitioner's case strongly favor release. Petitioner has no criminal history, has demonstrated good moral character, and has a confirmed sponsor in the United States who is willing to provide housing and ensure compliance with all immigration requirements.

VII. NO MEANINGFUL CUSTODY REVIEW

Although a bond motion was previously filed, the Immigration Judge denied jurisdiction to consider release because Petitioner was classified as an arriving alien. As a result, Petitioner has never received an individualized custody determination before a neutral decisionmaker.

This lack of access to bond proceedings distinguishes Petitioner's case from ordinary detention cases and renders continued detention constitutionally deficient. Because Petitioner has been categorically denied access to bond proceedings, continued detention without judicial review is especially constitutionally problematic.

Unlike typical detention cases, Petitioner has been categorically denied access to bond proceedings due to his classification as an arriving alien. As a result, he has had no meaningful opportunity to seek release at any point during his detention.

This complete lack of access to a custody hearing renders even shorter periods of detention constitutionally suspect. Even at this stage of detention, the complete absence of any meaningful opportunity for release renders continued detention constitutionally suspect.

VIII. IRREPARABLE HARM

Petitioner suffers deprivation of liberty, emotional distress, and limited ability to pursue legal remedies.

IX. MOTION FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION

Petitioner respectfully requests expedited consideration of this Petition.

Petitioner remains detained and continues to suffer ongoing deprivation of liberty. The lack of access to a meaningful custody hearing further exacerbates this harm.

Given the nature of the claims and the ongoing constitutional violations, expedited review is warranted.

X. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court:

A. Grant the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus;
B. Order immediate release; OR
C. Order a prompt individualized custody or bond hearing;
D. Grant expedited review;
E. Grant any further relief deemed just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruslan Uran Uulu
[redacted]
Petitioner Pro Se

Date: 03/20/2026

DECLARATION

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on: March 20, 2026

Signature: /s/ *Ruslan Uran Uulu*
Petitioner Pro Se (Detained)

Enclosures:

A. $5.00 money order
B. Immigration Judge's decision dated January 15, 2026
C. Respondent's Notice of Appeal to the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA)
D. ICE Detainee Locator excerpt confirming RUSLAN URAN UULU's detention

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 19, 2026, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and all attachments by United States Mail upon the following:

United States Attorney

District of Kansas

500 State Avenue, Suite 360

Kansas City, KS 66101

Attorney General of the United States

U.S. Department of Justice

950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW

Washington, DC 20530-0001

ICE Office of the Principal Legal Advisor

Office of the Principal Legal Advisor, Chicago (Kansas City)

2345 Grand Boulevard, Suite 500

Kansas City, MO 64108

Warden
USP Leavenworth
1300 Metropolitan Avenue
Leavenworth, KS 66048

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: 03/20/2026

Signature: /s/ Ruslan Uran Uulu
Petitioner Pro Se (Detained)