Murathan Oktar, Esq.
Tunc Law Firm P.C.
1750 East Golf Road.#1124
Schaumburg, IL 60173
Email: moktar@tunclawfirm.com
Phone: 312-224-8811

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

PHOENIX DIVISION

Bohdan Fedorenko *Petitioner* v. 1. Eric Rokosky, Warden, Eloy Federal Contract Facility; 2. Christopher McGregor, Field Office Director, Enforcement and Removal Operations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Phoenix Field Office; 3. Todd Lyons, Acting Director, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, *Respondents.*	**Docket No:**

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BOHDAN FEDORENKO

A [redacted]

TAB	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
1	*INTRODUCTION*	3
2	*JURISDICTION AND VENUE*	7
3	*PARTIES*	8
4	*FACTUAL BACKGROUND*	8
5	*CLAIMS FOR RELIEF*	
6	*COUNT ONE* *Unlawful Detention under the Immigration and Nationality Act*	12
7	*COUNT TWO* *Unlawful Parole Termination*	13
8	*COUNT THREE* *Fifth Amendment Due Process Violation*	15
9	*COUNT FOUR* *Lack of Individualized Bond Hearing*	15
10	*COUNT FIVE* *Unlawful Detention in Violation of the Temporary Protected Status Statute (8 U.S.C. § 1254a)*	17
11	*PRAYER FOR RELIEF*	19
12	*EXHIBIT LIST*	21
13	*CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE*	24

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2241

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner Bohdan Fedorenko ("Petitioner") seeks a writ of habeas corpus to challenge his unlawful, arbitrary, and indefinite detention by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE").

4. Mr. Fedorenko, a native and citizen of Ukraine (See Exhibit 1, Passport), entered the United States by air on May 23, 2023, pursuant to the Uniting for Ukraine process. Prior to his entry, he was granted advance travel authorization by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), permitting him to travel to the United States and seek parole at a port of entry (See Exhibit 2, Travel Authorization). Consistent with that authorization, Mr. Fedorenko when he arrived, an officer from **U.S. Customs and Border Protection** inspected him and paroled into the United States. His Form I-94 confirms a date of entry of May 23, 2023, reflects a class of admission of UHP, and authorizes his stay in the United States through May 21, 2025 (See Exhibit 2, Form I-94). DHS on April 6, 2026 issued a Petitioner a Notice to Appear charging him as an arriving alien under INA § 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I). *(See Exhibit 2, Notice to Appear).*

2. CBP paroled Petitioner into the United States on May 23, 2023, pursuant to INA § 212(d)(5). Petitioner was issued a Form I-94 reflecting his parole status. His

most recent I-94 reflects validity through May 21, 2025.*(See Exhibit 2, Form I-94).*

3. Petitioner also applied for Temporary Protected Status. On May 7, 2024, Petitioner filed Form I-821. USCIS approved his TPS on December 17, 2024, with validity through April 19, 2025. Prior to the expiration of his TPS, Petitioner timely filed for re-registration on January 15, 2025. USCIS issued a receipt notice on November 13, 2025. *(See Exhibit 3).* That re-registration application remains pending.

4. Mr. Fedorenko also filed Form I-131, Application for Travel Document, on January 20, 2025. This application remains pending. According to USCIS records, the case has been under review since October 10, 2025. Mr. Fedorenko was scheduled to appear for a biometrics appointment in connection with this application on April 10, 2026; however, he was unable to attend due to his detention (See Exhibit 4).

5. Petitioner timely filed for renewal of his Employment Authorization Document prior to its expiration and received a receipt notice extending his authorization to work while his Form I-765 remains pending (See Exhibit 5). He holds a valid Commercial Driver License (CDL) (See Exhibit 6) and has been continuously employed as a truck driver in the United States, through which he has supported

his spouse and his sister. At all times, Petitioner has remained in full compliance with applicable immigration requirements.

6. Petitioner's continued detention is causing substantial hardship to his family. Petitioner is married and has a sister, and he serves as the primary financial provider for his household. He provides financial support to both his spouse and his sister. As a result of his detention, they have been left without their primary source of financial support and are experiencing significant financial hardship. Petitioner and his spouse maintain a stable residence in California (see Exhibit 7, including Spouse's Passport, Spouse's Declaration, Sister's Declaration, and Sister's Passport).

7. Petitioner has been steadily self-employed as a commercial truck driver and maintained lawful income in the United States. Petitioner held a valid Commercial Driver's License (CDL) and valid employment authorization *(See Exhibit 6)*. His strong work ethic and reliability are further supported by a letter of recommendation from his employer. Petitioner's 2025 Form 1099 further demonstrates his consistent employment and financial stability. *(See Exhibit 6)*.

8. Despite his compliance with all immigration requirements, including the timely filing of his Form I-765 renewal prior to the expiration of his work authorization, which authorized him to continue working pursuant to the receipt notice *(See Exhibit 5)* , Mr. Fedorenko was taken into custody by ICE on March 30, 2026,

while employed as a truck driver, and remains detained at the Eloy Federal Contract Facility in Arizona.

9. The Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") has not clearly indicated under which statutory authority Petitioner is currently detained. It remains uncertain whether Petitioner is being held pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) or § 1226(a). This lack of clarity presents a grave due process concern and further underscores the arbitrariness of Petitioner's ongoing incarceration. Petitioner therefore challenges his detention under any such authority to the extent it violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

10. Regardless of the authority claimed, Petitioner contends that his ongoing detention is unlawful, arbitrary, and violates due process. Even assuming that § 1225(b) applied, Petitioner's prolonged detention without any hearing or individualized determination violates the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause. Freedom from government detention lies at the core of the liberty protected by due process.

11. Mr. Fedorenko has been jailed for a sufficient period without any chance to contest the necessity of his confinement, without any finding that he poses a flight risk or danger, and without basic procedural safeguards. The government's summary revocation of his parole and detention without notice or a prompt bond hearing is fundamentally unfair and unconstitutional.

12. Accordingly, Mr. Fedorenko petitions this Court for habeas relief. He asks the Court to order his immediate release from custody.

13. He further requests that this Court declare that any detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225 is unlawful under the facts presented and that he is entitled to release or to the protections of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), including eligibility for bond. Absent such relief, Petitioner will remain imprisoned indefinitely in violation of federal law and his constitutional rights.

14. Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court grant this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus; Declare Petitioner's detention unlawful; and Order his immediate release from custody.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

15. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question).

16. Petitioner is challenging the legality of his detention by federal authorities, which presents federal questions under the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States. The Suspension Clause (U.S. Const. art. I, § 9, cl. 2) guarantees Petitioner's right to seek habeas corpus review of his civil immigration detention.

17. Venue is proper in the District of Arizona because Petitioner is detained in this District. Petitions under § 2241 must be brought in the district of confinement. Eloy Federal Contract Facility, where Petitioner is jailed, is within the Phoenix Division of this District. The Court has personal jurisdiction over the immediate custodian of Petitioner (the warden or facility administrator in Eloy) and any federal officials overseeing his detention in this District.

PARTIES

18. Petitioner BOHDAN FEDORENKO is a native and citizen of Ukraine (A# 232-471-594). He is currently detained at Eloy Detention Center.

19. Respondent ERIC ROKOSKY, Warden of Eloy Federal Contract Facility, is the immediate physical custodian of Petitioner. In his official capacity, he has direct control over the facility where Petitioner is currently held and is therefore a proper respondent to this action.

20. Respondent CHRISTOPHER MCGREGOR is sued in his official capacity as the Acting Field Office Director of Enforcement and Removal Operations, Phoenix, Arizona.

21. Respondent TODD M. LYONS is the Acting Director of ICE. In his official capacity, he oversees the nationwide enforcement of immigration detention policies and procedures and is ultimately responsible for Petitioner's continued detention. He is sued in his official capacity.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

22. Petitioner is a national of Ukraine who lawfully traveled to the United States pursuant to the Uniting for Ukraine program after receiving advance travel authorization from the Department of Homeland Security. He was granted parole upon arrival, allowing him to reside and work in the United States, and later obtained Temporary Protected Status.

23. On or about May 23, 2023, Petitioner entered the United States by air pursuant to the Uniting for Ukraine process after receiving advance travel authorization from the Department of Homeland Security. Upon arrival at a United States port of entry, he presented himself for inspection and was processed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection as a parolee. Petitioner was paroled into the United States pursuant to INA § 212(d)(5) (8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)). He was subsequently issued a Form I-94 reflecting his parole, with a class of admission of UHP and authorization to remain in the United States through May 21, 2025. Petitioner has no known criminal history and has not been charged as removable on any criminal or national security grounds.

24. Petitioner complied with the conditions of his parole and all instructions from immigration authorities.

25. The Petitioner has no criminal record and posed no danger to the public. There is no indication that he ever failed to comply with any official requirement or that he intended to abscond.

26. Petitioner also applied for Temporary Protected Status. On May 7, 2024, Petitioner filed Form I-821. USCIS approved his TPS on December 17, 2024, with validity through April 19, 2025. Prior to the expiration of his TPS, Petitioner timely filed for re-registration on January 15, 2025. USCIS issued a receipt notice on November 13, 2025. *(See Exhibit 3).* That re-registration application remains pending.

27. PMr. Fedorenko also filed Form I-131, Application for Travel Document, on January 20, 2025. This application remains pending. According to USCIS records, the case has been under review since October 10, 2025. Mr. Fedorenko was scheduled to appear for a biometrics appointment in connection with this application on April 10, 2026; however, he was unable to attend due to his detention (*See* Exhibit 4).

28. Petitioner timely filed for renewal of his Employment Authorization Document prior to its expiration and received a receipt notice extending his authorization to work while his Form I-765 remains pending (*See* Exhibit 5). He holds a valid Commercial Driver License (CDL) (*See* Exhibit 6) and has been continuously employed as a truck driver in the United States, through which he has supported his spouse and his sister. At all times, Petitioner has remained in full compliance with applicable immigration requirements.

29. Petitioner's continued detention is causing substantial hardship to his family. Petitioner is married and has a sister, and he serves as the primary financial provider for his household. He provides financial support to both his spouse and his sister. As a result of his detention, they have been left without their primary source of financial support and are experiencing significant financial hardship. Petitioner and his spouse maintain a stable residence in California (see Exhibit 7, including Spouse's Passport, Spouse's Declaration, Sister's Declaration, and Sister's Passport).

30. Petitioner has been steadily self-employed as a commercial truck driver and maintained lawful income in the United States. Petitioner held a valid Commercial Driver's License (CDL) and valid employment authorization *(See Exhibit 6)*. His strong work ethic and reliability are further supported by a letter of recommendation from his employer. Petitioner's 2025 Form 1099 further demonstrates his consistent employment and financial stability. *(See* Exhibit 6).

31. On March 30, 2026, ICE officers arrested Petitioner. He was provided with no notice of intent to revoke parole, no hearing, and no individualized justification for why his liberty was being revoked. Petitioner was not given any arrest documents, notices, or paperwork at the time of detention. He was transferred to Eloy Federal Contract Facility, where he remains detained.

32. This arrest occurred well after Petitioner's initial entry – more than two years after he was paroled into the country. Petitioner was not attempting to flee nor was he engaged in any wrongdoing at the time; ICE's action appears to have been part of a broad change in policy to detain certain noncitizens who had previously been allowed to live in the community.

33. ICE either treated Petitioner's two-year parole as expired or affirmatively terminated his parole early. In either event, ICE did not provide Petitioner with any advance notice or opportunity to respond before stripping him of parole and liberty. He was simply taken into custody and informed that he would remain

detained. Petitioner was transported to the Eloy Federal Contract Facility in Arizona, far from his home and attorney, where he remains detained to this day.

34. Petitioner has now been detained at the Eloy Federal Contract Facility. The conditions at the detention center are difficult and impose significant hardships on him.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT ONE

Unlawful Detention under the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA)

35. Petitioner's Detention Should Be Governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), Not § 1225(b). The INA's detention framework makes an important distinction between individuals who are applicants for admission at the border and those who are arrested inside the United States while in removal proceedings. Section 1225(b) generally applies to "arriving" aliens or recent entrants who are deemed applicants for admission – it requires their detention during removal proceedings and offers no opportunity for release on bond (only DHS parole, at its discretion). In contrast, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) applies to aliens who have entered the U.S. (even if unlawfully) and are facing removal proceedings under INA § 240; under § 1226(a), such individuals are eligible for release on bond or conditional parole by the Department of Justice's immigration courts.

36. In Petitioner's case, although DHS has labeled him an "arriving alien" because he was paroled, the reality is that he has been physically present in the United States

for a prolonged period and is in standard removal proceedings. The plain text of the INA indicates that § 1226(a) – the default detention authority for those in removal proceedings – should govern here, not § 1225(b). In fact, § 1226(a) explicitly covers even those noncitizens charged as inadmissible for entering without proper documents.

37. Petitioner is charged with inadmissibility for lack of valid entry documents – a charge that squarely falls under § 1226(a) detention according to the statute's text. Thus, DHS's treatment of Petitioner under § 1225 is contrary to the statute. Had Petitioner entered the country without inspection (for example, by crossing the border illegally) and been caught days later, he would unquestionably be detained (if at all) under § 1226(a) with bond eligibility. It would be illogical and inequitable for him to be in a worse position (mandatory detention) simply because he followed the process at a port of entry and was paroled into the country. Congress did not intend § 1225(b)(2)(A) to apply to someone in Petitioner's posture – living in the U.S. for many months awaiting a hearing.

38. Accordingly, his current detention without bond is not authorized by the INA. The Court should hold that Petitioner is legally detained, if at all, under § 1226(a) and is entitled to the benefits of that provision (especially the possibility of release on bond or conditional parole by an immigration judge).

COUNT TWO

Petitioner's Parole Termination Was Unlawful

39. To the extent ICE justifies Petitioner's detention by saying his prior grant of parole has ended, Petitioner maintains that the revocation or termination of his parole was unlawful under the circumstances. DHS regulations permit termination of parole either upon the expiration of the parole period or earlier, with written notice, if the purposes of parole have been served or the agency decides continued presence is not in the public interest.

40. In Petitioner's case, it appears ICE may have treated his parole as expired after one year without properly considering an extension or alternative. Alternatively, if ICE affirmatively terminated parole prior to its expiration, Petitioner received no written notice or explanation. The NTA served on Petitioner may have purported to serve as notice of parole termination per 8 C.F.R. § 212.5(e)(2)(i). *(See Exhibit 4 for Notice to Appear; see also Exhibit 3 for Form I-94.)* Regardless of technical compliance with the regulations, the process afforded was minimal to nonexistent.

41. Petitioner had no opportunity to contest the termination of his parole or to present reasons why he should not be detained. If parole was terminated arbitrarily – for example, as part of a mass roundup of parolees – then Petitioner's continued detention is also unlawful for that reason. Furthermore, because Petitioner is eligible for other relief, terminating parole and detaining him without cause frustrates the humanitarian purpose for which parole was granted. This Court should scrutinize whether DHS properly followed the law in extinguishing Petitioner's parole and effectively converting his status to a detained applicant for

admission. Any failure by DHS to follow its own procedures or to act rationally in this respect is an additional basis to find Petitioner's detention unlawful and void.

COUNT THREE

Detention Without a Bond Hearing Violates the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause

42. Even if Petitioner's custody were deemed statutorily authorized, the Constitution forbids the government from continuing to detain him under these conditions without affording basic due process. The Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause applies to all "persons" on U.S. soil, including noncitizens like Petitioner. It protects against arbitrary detention and guarantees fundamental fairness in procedures that deprive a person of liberty. Petitioner's detention violates both procedural and substantive due process.

COUNT FOUR

Lack of Any Individualized Hearing (Procedural Due Process Violation)

43. Petitioner has never received an individualized custody hearing. At no point has an immigration judge or any neutral decision-maker reviewed whether Petitioner's imprisonment is justified by a legitimate government interest (such as risk of flight or danger) or whether alternatives to detention could serve the government's purposes.

44. Procedural due process typically requires, at minimum, notice of the reasons for detention and an opportunity to be heard at a meaningful time and in a meaningful

manner. Here, Petitioner's parole was revoked without notice or an opportunity to respond, and he was not given any prompt post-arrest hearing.

45. The DHS determination to detain him has been unilateral and non-transparent. Petitioner essentially has been told that no hearing is available at all because of his "arriving" classification. This absolute denial of any hearing mechanism is unprecedented in the civil context – even persons arrested for crimes are entitled to a bail hearing within days. Numerous courts have recognized that due process requires a bond hearing for immigration detainees whose detention becomes prolonged. For example, a federal court in Maine, in *Chiliquinga Yumbillo v. Stamper*, granted a temporary restraining order for an immigrant re-detained after living in the U.S., finding the petitioner was likely to prevail on his due process claim that re-arrest without an opportunity for bond was unlawful.

5. Other courts have similarly ordered bond hearings or conditional release for arriving or re-apprehended noncitizens who had been living in the community, reasoning that procedural due process demands an individualized determination of flight risk and danger once detention is no longer brief or inevitable. Petitioner's case for a hearing is at least as strong: he has a proven record of compliance and poses no danger to anyone, meaning that a fair hearing could very well result in his release. By denying him any hearing, Respondents are violating the *Mathews v. Eldridge* balancing test – the risk of erroneous deprivation of liberty here is high without a hearing, Petitioner's interest in freedom is fundamental, and the government's interests can be protected through less restrictive means like bond or

supervision. In sum, the failure to provide a timely bond hearing is a clear violation of procedural due process.

COUNT FIVE

Unlawful Detention in Violation of the Temporary Protected Status Statute (8 U.S.C. § 1254a)

6. Temporary Protected Status The TPS program provides humanitarian relief to foreign nationals from specified countries. *Sanchez v. Mayorkas*, 593 U.S. 409, 412 (2021). That relief comes in the form of temporary protection against removal in the face of war, natural disasters, or other extraordinary and temporary conditions. 8 U.S.C. § 1254a; *see also Osman v. Schmidt*, No. 25- CV-286, 2025 WL 870048, at *1 (E.D. Wis. Mar. 20, 2025). "[A] TPS recipient is 'considered as being in, and maintaining, lawful status as a nonimmigrant' for the purpose of becoming [a legal permanent resident]." *Sanchez,* 593 U.S. at 412 (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1254a(f)(4)). Relevant authorities "shall not remove the [noncitizen] from the United States during the period in which [TPS] is in effect." 8 U.S.C. § 1254a(a)(1)(A). Likewise, 8 U.S.C. § 1254a(d)(4), as part of the subsection related to documentation of TPS, provides that a non- citizen with TPS "shall not be detained by the Attorney General on the basis of the [noncitizen]'s immigration status in the United States." 8 U.S.C. § 1254a(d)(4). Under this statute, courts have considered writs of habeas corpus and determined that detained petitioners with TPS cannot remain detained pending lawful immigration proceedings. *See e.g.,*

Rojas v. Venegas, No. 1:25-CV-00056, 2025 WL 996421, at *1 (S.D. Tex. Apr. 2, 2025) ("[t]he Court holds that Petitioner is a Venezuelan national with valid Temporary Protected Status and was wrongfully detained under 8 U.S.C. 1254a(a)(1)(A)(i)."). statute. *See Chevron*, 467 U.S. at 843, In effect, "*Loper Bright* instructed us to carry out our judicial duty to say what the law is, even when agencies are involved." *Moctezuma-Reyes v. Garland*, 124 F.4th 416, 422 (6th Cir. 2024).

7. Here, Petitioner was previously granted TPS, and prior to the expiration of his status, he timely filed a re-registration application with U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. That application remains **pending adjudication**. Accordingly, Petitioner's TPS-based protection has not been affirmatively terminated, and his eligibility for continued TPS consideration remains active under governing regulations.

8. Under the statutory framework of TPS, a noncitizen who is granted TPS is considered to be in a period of authorized stay and is eligible for employment authorization and protection from removal. See 8 U.S.C. § 1254a(a)(1), (f)(4). Importantly, the TPS statute expressly prohibits detention based solely on immigration status. 8 U.S.C. § 1254a(d)(4).

9. Here, Petitioner is not only a TPS beneficiary but has also timely complied with all renewal requirements, thereby maintaining his lawful procedural posture before the agency. The pendency of his TPS re-registration preserves his protected status

and underscores that the government has not made any final determination revoking or terminating his TPS eligibility.

10. Accordingly, where an individual remains within a valid TPS framework and has a properly filed, pending renewal application, continued detention is inconsistent with the statutory protections afforded under the TPS scheme. Petitioner therefore remains in a lawful immigration posture under TPS and its implementing statute, and his detention lacks a lawful basis.

11. For these reasons, Petitioner's continued detention is contrary to the statutory protections afforded under 8 U.S.C. § 1254a and constitutes unlawful restraint in violation of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests this Court to:

a. Enter an order asserting the Court's jurisdiction over this matter under 28 U.S.C. § 2241;

b. Declare that Petitioner's ongoing detention is unlawful. In particular, declare that Petitioner is not properly subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) that violates the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution as described above;

c. Order Respondents to immediately release Petitioner from custody on his own recognizance or under appropriate conditions of supervision or, in the

alternative, order Respondents to provide Petitioner with a timely individualized bond hearing before a neutral immigration judge (or other appropriate adjudicator) at which the government bears the burden of justifying continued detention.;

d. Issue an injunction preventing Respondents from re-arresting or re-detaining Petitioner in the future based on the same removal proceedings, unless Petitioner violates a material condition of release or new circumstances arise that would lawfully warrant detention under the INA (such as a final removal order or Petitioner becoming subject to a separate detention provision) to ensure that Petitioner is not subjected again to arbitrary detention without due process;

e. Grant attorneys' fees and costs of this suit under the Equal Access to Justice Act, 5 U.S.C. § 504 and 28 U.S.C. § 2412(2), *et seq.*

Grant any other relief that the Court deems just and proper, including such relief as may be necessary to ensure that Petitioner's rights are fully protected.

Dated: April 16, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

*__/s/_Murathan Oktar_*

Murathan Oktar, Esq.

Attorney for Plaintiff

EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description of Document	Relevant Claim	Page
Exhibit 1	**Copy of Passport Biographic Page**	Proof of Identity & Citizenship	
Exhibit 2	**Form I-94 Arrival/Departure Record, Travel authorization approval under the Uniting for Ukraine program and NTA from DHS: Form I-862**	Proof of Lawful Parole Status; Proof of Authorized Presence in the United States and also outlining the respondent's identity and the allegations leading to removal proceedings.	
Exhibit 3	**Form I-821, Application for Temporary Protected Status — Approval Notice**	Proof of Temporary Protected Status (TPS); Proof of Continued Authorized Presence in the United States	
Exhibit 4	**Form I-131, Application for Travel Document**	Proof of Application for Advance Parole/Travel Document; Evidence of Good Faith Compliance with Immigration Requirements	
Exhibit 5	**Form I-765, Application for Employment Authorization (EAD) — Copy of EAD Card ; First Renewal Receipt Notice**	Proof of Employment Authorization; Proof of Continued Authorized Presence in the United States	

Exhibit No.	Description of Document	Relevant Claim	Page
	dated 01/15/2025; Second Renewal Receipt Notice dated 04/23/2025, Class C19, Receipt No. [redacted]	under Temporary Protected Status (TPS)	
Exhibit 6	**Evidence of Employment and Financial Records — Copy of Commercial Driver's License (CDL) ; Form 1099 Income Statements ; U.S. Individual Income Tax Return (Form 1040) for Tax Year 2024; U.S. Individual Income Tax Return (Form 1040) for Tax Year 2023 — Delivery Business, Gross Receipts $16,753; Vehicle Financing/Credit Documentation — Pickup Truck**	Proof of Lawful Employment and Self-Employment in the United States; Proof of Tax Compliance and Financial Responsibility; Evidence of Economic Ties and Establishment in the United States	
Exhibit 7	**Evidence of Family Ties and Hardship — Marriage Certificate of Bohdan Fedorenko and Sofiia Mebuke; Hardship Statement of Spouse Sofiia Mebuke, dated 04/16/2026 ; Copy of Spouse's Passport — Sofiia Mebuke ;**	Evidence of Family and Community Ties in the United States; Exceptional Hardship to Qualifying Relatives Upon Removal; Evidence of Established Residence and Stable Home Life	

Exhibit No.	Description of Document	Relevant Claim	Page
	Residential Lease Agreement — California		

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on April 16, 2026 I electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system, which will serve notice of electronic filing to all attorneys of record.

Dated: April 16, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

*__/s/_Murathan Oktar_*
Murathan Oktar, Esq.
Tunc Law Firm P.C.
1750 East Golf Road.#1124
Schaumburg, IL 60173
Email: moktar@tunclawfirm.com
Phone: 312-224-8811

Copies to: Counsel of Record