UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEONTI SANAIA,

Petitioner,

v.

JAMAL L. JAMISON, Warden of Philadelphia Federal Detention Center; JOHN RIFE, Acting Field Office Director of Enforcement and Removal Operations, Philadelphia Field Office, Immigration and Customs Enforcement,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Case No. 2:26-cv-2763

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner, Leonti Sanaia, a 22-year-old Citizen of Georgia, is in the physical custody of Respondents at the Philadelphia Federal Detention Center. He now faces unlawful detention because the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Executive Office of Immigration Review (EOIR) have concluded Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention.

2. Petitioner, entered the United States on or around January 7, 2023, at the age of 19, without inspection. After his entry, on that same day, he was apprehended by Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) within the United States, and detained pursuant to *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). He was thereafter released on an Order of Release on Recognizance (OREC).[1] At that time, Petitioner was also issued a Notice to Appear (NTA) and placed in removal proceedings, wherein he was charged as having entered the United States without admission or inspection. 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i).

[1] The government may release a noncitizen detained under §1226(a) on an Order of Recognizance, which is a form of conditional parole. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2)(B); *Matter of Cabrera-Fernandez*, 28 I. & N. Dec. 747, 747 (B.I.A. 2023) ("The respondents were ... released on their own recognizance pursuant to DHS' conditional parole authority under ...8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2)(B)[.]"); *Ortega-Cervantes v. Gonzales*, 501 F.3d 1111, 1115 (9th Cir. 2007) ("It is apparent that the [government] used the phrase 'release on recognizance' as another name for 'conditional parole' under § 1226(a)."); *Cruz-Miguel v. Holder*, 650 F.3d 189, 191 (2d Cir. 2011) (similar).

3. He thereafter timely filed an I-589, Application for Asylum with the Immigration Court. That application remains pending. As an asylum applicant, Petitioner has work authorization and a social security number. By all accounts, Petitioner has been a law abiding, hardworking, and productive member of society. At the time of his arrest by ICE, his final merit's hearing ("Individual Hearing") to determine the merits of his Asylum Application was scheduled for June 10, 2027, before the Philadelphia Immigration Court.

4. On April 27, 2026, Petitioner appeared for his scheduled ICE check-in, which was a condition of his OREC. When he appeared for his ICE check-in, Petitioner was detained by ICE without any prior notice, nor was Petitioner provided with a reason for being detained. Petitioner has no criminal history and has complied with all ICE reporting requirements since being released into the United States.

5. Based on the allegation in Petitioner's removal proceedings, DHS has denied or will deny Petitioner release from immigration custody, consistent with a new DHS policy issued on July 8, 2025, instructing all ICE employees to consider anyone inadmissible under § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i)—i.e., those who entered the United States without admission or inspection—to be subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond.

6. Similarly, on September 5, 2025, the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA or Board) issued a precedent decision, binding on all immigration judges, holding that an immigration judge has no authority to consider bond requests for any person who entered the United States without admission. *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). The Board determined that such individuals are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond or even submit a bond request to the immigration judge.

Previously, on May 15, 2025, the BIA previously issued a precedent decision, binding on all IJs, holding that an IJ has no authority to consider bond requests for any person who was released from detention pursuant to a grant of parole under section 212(d)(5)(a). *See Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 66 (BIA 2025). The Board determined that such individuals are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond.

7. Petitioner's detention on this basis violates the plain language of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Section 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to individuals like Petitioner who previously entered and are now residing in the United States. Instead, such individuals are subject to a different statute, § 1226(a), that allows for release on conditional parole or bond. That statute expressly applies to people who, like Petitioner, are charged as inadmissible for having entered the United States without inspection.

8. Respondents' new legal interpretation is plainly contrary to the statutory framework and contrary to decades of agency practice applying § 1226(a) to people like Petitioner.

9. Accordingly, Petitioner seeks a writ of habeas corpus requiring that he be released.

JURISDICTION

10. Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents. Petitioner is detained at the Philadelphia Federal Detention Center in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

11. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(5) (habeas corpus), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), and Article I, section 9, clause 2 of the United States Constitution (the Suspension Clause).

12. This Court may grant relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*, and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

VENUE

13. Pursuant to *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493-500 (1973), venue lies in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, the judicial district in which Petitioner currently is detained.

14. Venue is also properly in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because Respondents are employees, officers, and agencies of the United States, and because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

15. The Court must grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus or order Respondents to show cause "forthwith," unless the petitioner is not entitled to relief. 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If an order to show cause is issued, Respondents must file a return "within three days unless for good cause additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is allowed." *Id.*

16. Habeas corpus is "perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law . . . affording as it does a *swift* and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or confinement." *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963) (emphasis added). "The application for the writ usurps the attention and displaces the calendar of the judge or justice who entertains it and receives prompt action from him within the four corners of the application." *Yong v. I.N.S.*, 208 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted).

PARTIES

17. Petitioner Leonti Sanaia is a citizen of Georgia who has been in immigration detention since April 27, 2026. After arresting Petitioner, ICE did not set bond and Petitioner is unable to obtain review of his custody by an Immigration Judge, pursuant to the Board's decisions

in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025) and *Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 66 (BIA 2025).

18. Respondent Jamal L. Jamison is employed by the Federal Bureau of Prisons as Warden of the Philadelphia Federal Detention Center where Petitioner is detained. He has immediate physical custody of Petitioner. He is sued in his official capacity.

19. Respondent John Rife is the Acting Director of the Philadelphia Field Office of ICE's Enforcement and Removal Operations division. As such, Respondent Rife is Petitioner's immediate custodian and is responsible for Petitioner's detention and removal. He is named in his official capacity.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

20. The INA prescribes three basic forms of detention for the vast majority of noncitizens in removal proceedings.

21. First, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 authorizes the detention of noncitizens in standard removal proceedings before an IJ. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. Individuals in § 1226(a) detention are generally entitled to a bond hearing at the outset of their detention, *see* 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19(a), 1236.1(d), while noncitizens who have been arrested, charged with, or convicted of certain crimes are subject to mandatory detention, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c).

22. Second, the INA provides for mandatory detention of noncitizens subject to expedited removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and for other recent arrivals seeking admission referred to under § 1225(b)(2).

23. Last, the INA also provides for detention of noncitizens who have been ordered removed, including individuals in withholding-only proceedings, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)–(b).

24. This case concerns the detention provisions at §§ 1226(a) and 1225(b)(2).

25. The detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) were enacted as part of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-–208, Div. C, §§ 302–03, 110 Stat. 3009-546, 3009–582 to 3009–583, 3009–585. Section 1226(a) was most recently amended earlier this year by the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No.119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025).

26. Following the enactment of the IIRIRA, EOIR drafted new regulations explaining that, in general, people who entered the country without inspection were not considered detained under § 1225 and that they were instead detained under § 1226(a). *See* Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum Procedures, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997).

27. Thus, in the decades that followed, most people who entered without inspection and were placed in standard removal proceedings received bond hearings, unless their criminal history rendered them ineligible pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c). That practice was consistent with many more decades of prior practice, in which noncitizens who were not deemed "arriving" were entitled to a custody hearing before an IJ or other hearing officer. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a) (1994); *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 229 (1996) (noting that § 1226(a) simply "restates" the detention authority previously found at § 1252(a)).

28. On May 15, 2025, the BIA issued a precedent decision, binding on all IJs, holding that IJ has no authority to consider bond requests for any person who was released from detention pursuant to a grant of parole under section 212(d)(5)(a). *See Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 66 (BIA 2025). The Board determined that such individuals are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond.

29. On July 8, 2025, ICE, "in coordination with" DOJ, announced a new policy that rejected well-established understanding of the statutory framework and reversed decades of practice. The new policy, entitled "Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission,"[2] claims that all persons who entered the United States without inspection shall now be subject to mandatory detention provision under § 1225(b)(2)(A). The policy applies regardless of when a person is apprehended, and it affects those who have resided in the United States for months, years, and even decades.

30. On September 5, 2025, the BIA adopted this same position in a published decision, *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*. There, the Board held that all noncitizens who entered the United States without admission or parole are subject to detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A) and are ineligible for IJ bond hearings.

31. Since Respondents adopted their new policies, thousands of federal courts have rejected their new interpretation of the INA's detention authorities. *See, e.g.*, *Cantu Cortes v. O'Neill et al.*, No. 25-CV-6338-CFK, 2025 WL 3171639 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 13, 2025) ("ICE's mandatory detention of Petitioner under U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) violates the laws of the United States and Petitioner's rights under the Due Process Clause."); *Kashranov v. Jamison, et al.*, No. 2:25-CV-05555-JDW, 2025 WL 3188399 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 14, 2025) (same); *Morocho v. Jamison et al.*, No. 5:25-CV-05930-JMG, 2025 WL 3296300 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 26, 2025) (same). In over

[2] *Available at* https://www.aila.org/library/ice-memo-interim-guidance-regarding-detention-authority-for-applications-for-admission.

2,400 cases[3] decided by over 400 different judges sitting in roughly 60 different courts[4] across the United States, the Respondents' arguments, their policy.

32. The Fifth Circuit and the Eighth Circuit have both ruled against the tidal wave of District Court decisions, both in 2-1 decision. *See Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi,* No. 25-cv-20496, 2026 WL 323330 (5th Cir. Feb. 6, 2026); and *Avila v. Bondi*, No. 25-3248, 2026 WL 819258 (8th Cir. Mar. 25, 2026). These cases focused *solely* on the statutory interpretation of § 1226(a) and § 1225(b), and did not address any due process issues;[5] further neither of these cases are controlling in this Court.

33. Section 1226(a) applies by default to all persons "pending a decision on whether the [noncitizen] is to be removed from the United States." These removal hearings are held under § 1229a, to "decid[e] the inadmissibility or deportability of a[] [noncitizen]."

34. The text of § 1226 also explicitly applies to people charged as being inadmissible, including those who entered without inspection. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E). Subparagraph (E)'s reference to such people makes clear that, by default, such people are afforded a bond hearing under subsection (a).

35. Section 1226 therefore leaves no doubt that it applies to people who face charges of being inadmissible to the United States, including those who are present without admission or parole.

---

[3] A January 26, 2026, Politico article notes that, as of that date, "347 judges across the county… have rejected the administration's detention policy – in more than 2,400 cases – while just 20 judges have sided with the administration." *See https://www.politico.com/news/2026/01/26/ minnesota-immigration-cases-ice-00746275* (last accessed March 24, 2026).

[4] An ongoing tally by Politico of federal district court decisions on this legal question lists 402 judges in 59 districts who have ruled against the Respondents' position as of March 12, 2026. *See https://www.politico.com/news/2026/01/05/trump-administration-immigrants-mandatory-detention-00709494* (last accessed March 24, 2026).

[5] *See eg, Avila v. Bondi*, No. 25-3248, 2026 WL 819258, at *8 (8th Cir. Mar. 25, 2026) (dissent) ["After the Fifth Circuit's decision in *Buenrostro-Mendez*, multiple district courts in the Fifth Circuit have granted similar habeas petitions on due process grounds."].

36. By contrast, § 1225(b) applies to people arriving at U.S. ports of entry or who recently entered the United States. The statute's entire framework is premised on inspections at the border of people who are "seeking admission" to the United States. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Indeed, the Supreme Court has explained that this mandatory detention scheme applies "at the Nation's borders and ports of entry, where the Government must determine whether a[] [noncitizen] seeking to enter the country is admissible." *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287 (2018).

37. Accordingly, the mandatory detention provision of § 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to people like Petitioner, who have already entered and were residing in the United States at the time they were apprehended.

FACTS

38. Petitioner incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1-8, *supra*.

39. Following Petitioner's arrest and transfer to the Philadelphia Federal Detention Center, ICE presumptively issued a custody determination to continue Petitioner's detention without an opportunity to post bond or be released on other conditions.

40. Pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* and *Matter of Q. Li*, the immigration judge is unable to consider Petitioner's bond request.

41. As a result, Petitioner remains in detention. Without relief from this court, he faces the prospect of months, or even years, in immigration custody, separated from his family and community.

IMMEDIATE RELEASE IS WARRANTED

42. This Court should not correct Respondents' unlawful application of § 1225(b)(2) and detention of Petitioner by converting Petitioner's detention to a potentially lawful alternate

form of detention under a different statute with different procedural requirements and rules. It is not the duty of the Court to *correct Respondents' unlawful actions*, rather it is the duty of the Court to rectify Petitioner's unlawful detention. Rectifying Petitioner's unlawful detention would be achieved only by immediate release.

43. The Supreme Court has recognized that "Habeas has traditionally been a means to secure *release* from unlawful detention." *Dep't of Homeland Sec. v. Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 107, 140 S.Ct. 1959, 207 L.Ed.2d 427 (2020) (emphasis in original). Several decisions from the Eastern District have ordered immediate release in similar cases. *See, e.g., Bhatia v. O'Neill, et al,* No. 25-6809, Dkt. 8 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 10, 2025); *Rodrigues Pereira v. O'Neill*, et al. No. 25-6543, Dkt. 11 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 8, 2025); *Morocho v. Jamison, et al*., No. 25-05930, 2025 WL 3296300, at *3 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 26, 2025); *Diallo v. O'Neill, et al.*, 25-06358, Dkt. 10 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 26, 2025); *Patel v. McShane, et al.,* 25-05975 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 20, 2025). The Court should not depart from this norm.

44. As noted above, thousands of district court decisions addressing the legal issues presented in the underlying Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus have rejected the government's position. Those Courts have roundly rejected Government's interpretation of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA); the interpretation that is part of the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) policy issued on July 8, 2025, instructing all Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) employees to consider anyone inadmissible under § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i)—i.e., those who entered the United States without admission or inspection—to be subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond; and the interpretation is part of the Board of Immigration Appeals' (BIA or Board) September 5, 2025 precedent decision, binding on all immigration judges, holding that an immigration judge has no authority to consider bond

requests for any person who entered the United States without admission. *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), which determined that such individuals are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond.

45. Many of these decisions have found that Respondents' erroneous application of the law violates the respective detainees constitutional right to Due Process. *See, e.g., Cantu-Cortes v. O'Neill*, No. 25-6338, 2025 317639 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 13, 2025); *Bethancourt Soto v. Soto*, 2025 WL 2976572 (D.N.J. Oct. 22, 2025); *Sanchez Ballestros v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2880831 (W.D. Ky. Oct. 9, 2025); *Hernandez-Alonso v. Tindall*, 2025 WL 3083920 (W.D. Ky. Nov. 4, 2025); *Rodriguez Serrano v. Noem*, 2025 WL 3122825 (W.D. Mich. Nov. 7, 2025); *Ochoa Ochoa v. Noem*, No. 25 CV 10865, 2025 WL 2938779, (N.D. Ill. Oct. 16, 2025); *Rosales Ponce v. Olson*, 2025 WL 3049785 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 31, 2025); *Loza Valencia v. Noem*, 2025 WL 3042520 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 31, 2025); *Rosado v. Figueroa*, 2025 WL 2337099 (D. Ariz. Aug. 11, 2025); *Cuevas Guzman v. Andrews*, 2025 WL 2617256 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025); *Guerrero Lepe v. Andrews*, 2025 WL 2716910 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2025); *E.C. v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2916264 (D. Nev. Oct. 14, 2025); *Garcia Domingo v. Castro*, 2025 WL 2941217 (D.N.M. Oct. 15, 2025); *Artiga v. Genalo*, 2025 WL 2829434 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 5, 2025).

46. Despite this *overwhelming rejection* of Respondents' new policies and *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, and hundreds of decisions finding that Respondents are violating the constitutional rights, Respondents refuse to relent and continue act in defiance of the law and the Constitution. It has been reported that ICE agents inform detainees that they "have to sue us [ICE] to get out."

47. Petitioner is now one of the approximately 61,000 people detained by Respondents.[6] Respondents' unlawful behavior is pervasive and defies decision after decision from the Courts. As Petitioner's arrest and detention were blatantly unlawful from the start, the only commensurate and appropriate equitable remedy to even partially restore Petitioner is to immediate release him and enjoin the Government from further similar transgressions. *See, e.g., Martinez v. McAleenan*, 385 F. Supp. 3d 349, 373 (S.D.N.Y. 2019).

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I
Violation of the INA

48. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

49. The mandatory detention provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to all noncitizens residing in the United States who are subject to the grounds of inadmissibility. As relevant here, it does not apply to those who previously entered the country and have been residing in the United States prior to being apprehended and placed in removal proceedings by Respondents. Such noncitizens are detained under § 1226(a), unless they are subject to § 1225(b)(1), § 1226(c), or § 1231.

50. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates his continued detention and violates the INA.

COUNT II
Violation of the Bond Regulations

51. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in preceding paragraphs.

[6] *See* ICE's publicly available detention data, available at: https://www.ice.gov/detain/detention-management

52. In 1997, after Congress amended the INA through IIRIRA, EOIR and the then-Immigration and Naturalization Service issued an interim rule to interpret and apply IIRIRA. Specifically, under the heading of "Apprehension, Custody, and Detention of [Noncitizens]," the agencies explained that "[d]espite being applicants for admission, [noncitizens] who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as [noncitizens] who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination." 62 Fed. Reg. at 10323 (emphasis added). The agencies thus made clear that individuals who had entered without inspection were eligible for consideration for bond and bond hearings before IJs under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and its implementing regulations.

53. Nonetheless, pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, EOIR has a policy and practice of applying § 1225(b)(2) to individual like Petitioner.

54. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates his continued detention and violates 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1, 1236.1, and 1003.19.

COUNT III
Violation of Due Process

55. Petitioner repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

56. The government may not deprive a person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. U.S. Const. amend. V. "Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that the Clause protects." *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).

57. Petitioner has a fundamental interest in liberty and being free from official restraint.

58. The government's detention of Petitioner without a bond redetermination hearing to determine whether he is a flight risk or danger to others violates his right to due process.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that this Court grant the following relief:

a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;

b. Order that Petitioner shall not be transferred outside the Eastern District of Pennsylvania while this habeas petition is pending;

c. Issue an Order to Show Cause ordering Respondents to show cause why this Petition should not be granted within three days;

d. Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus requiring that Respondents **immediately release Petitioner;**

e. Declare that Petitioner's detention is unlawful; and

f. Grant any other and further relief that this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: April 27, 2026

s/ Christopher M. Casazza, Esq.

Christopher M. Casazza, Esquire
Palladino, Isbell & Casazza, LLC
1528 Walnut St, Suite 1701
Philadelphia, PA 19102
p. (215) 576-9000
f. (215) 689-3531
chris@piclaw.com

Attorney for Petitioner

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

NOTICE TO APPEAR

In removal proceedings under section 240 of the Immigration and Nationality Act:

Subject ID: [redacted] FINS #: [redacted] File No: [redacted]

DOB: [redacted] Event No: [redacted]

In the Matter of:

Respondent: LEONTI SANAIA currently residing at:

[redacted]

(Number, street, city, state and ZIP code) (Area code and phone number)

☐ You are an arriving alien.

☒ You are an alien present in the United States who has not been admitted or paroled.

☐ You have been admitted to the United States, but are removable for the reasons stated below.

The Department of Homeland Security alleges that you:

1. You are not a citizen or national of the United States;
2. You are a native of GEORGIA and a citizen of GEORGIA ;
3. You arrived in the United States at or near SAN LUIS, AZ , on or about January 7, 2023 ;
4. You were not then admitted or paroled after inspection by an Immigration Officer.

On the basis of the foregoing, it is charged that you are subject to removal from the United States pursuant to the following provision(s) of law:

212(a)(6)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, in that you are an alien present in the United States without being admitted or paroled, or who arrived in the United States at any time or place other than as designated by the Attorney General.

☐ This notice is being issued after an asylum officer has found that the respondent has demonstrated a credible fear of persecution or torture.

☐ Section 235(b)(1) order was vacated pursuant to: ☐ 8CFR 208.30 ☐ 8CFR 235.3(b)(5)(iv)

YOU ARE ORDERED to appear before an immigration judge of the United States Department of Justice at:

900 MARKET STREET, SUITE 504 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19107

(Complete Address of Immigration Court, including Room Number, if any)

on February 20, 2024 *(Date)* at 08:30 AM *(Time)* to show why you should not be removed from the United States based on the charge(s) set forth above.

KIRK AILI Acting/Patrol Agent in Charge

(Signature and Title of Issuing Officer) (Sign in ink)

Date: January 07, 2023 Yuma, Arizona

(City and State)

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Order of Release on Recognizance

File No: [redacted]
Date: January 07, 2023
Event No: [redacted]

Name: LEONTI SANAIA

You have been arrested and placed in removal proceedings. In accordance with section 236 of the Immigration and Nationality Act and the applicable provisions of Title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations, you are being released on your own recognizance provided you comply with the following conditions:

☒ You must report for any hearing or interview as directed by the Department of Homeland Security or the Executive Office for Immigration Review.

☒ You must surrender for removal from the United States if so ordered.

☒ You must report in (~~writing~~) (person) to NON DETAINED UNIT (267) 857-8070
(Name and Title of Case Officer)
at 1015 Chestnut Street Mezzanine Level Philadelphia, PA 19107 (Location of DHS Office) on 01/24/2023 (Day of each week or month) at 09:00 AM (Time)

If you are allowed to report in writing, the report must contain your name, alien registration number, current address, place of employment, and other pertinent information as required by the officer listed above.

☒ You must not change your place of residence without first securing written permission from the immigration officer listed above.
☒ You must not violate any local, State, or Federal laws or ordinances.
☒ You must assist the Department of Homeland Security in obtaining any necessary travel documents.
☒ Other: Employment not authorized

☐ See attached sheet containing other specified conditions (Continue on separate sheet if required)

NOTICE: Failure to comply with the conditions of this order may result in revocation of your release and your arrest and detention by the Department of Homeland Security.

(Signature of DHS Official)
KIRK AILI
Acting/Patrol Agent in Charge
(Printed Name and Title of Official)

Alien's Acknowledgment of Conditions of Release on Recognizance

I hereby acknowledge that I have (read) (had interpreted and explained to me in the GEORGIAN - SOVIET REPUBLIC language) and understand the conditions of my release as set forth in this order. I further understand that if I do not comply with these conditions, the Department of Homeland Security may revoke my release without further notice.

(Signature of Immigration Officer Serving Order) (Signature of Alien) 1/8/23 (Date)

Cancellation of Order

I hereby cancel this order of release because: ☐ The alien failed to comply with the conditions of release.
☐ The alien was taken into custody for removal.

(Signature of Immigration Officer Canceling Order) (Date)

Form I-220A (Rev. 08/01/07) N

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

ORDER OF RELEASE ON RECOGNIZANCE (ADDENDUM)

File No.: [redacted]

Name: SANAIA, LEONTI

Date: January 7, 2023

☒ That you do not associate with known gang members, criminal associates, or be associated with any such activity.

☐ That you register in a substance abuse program within 14 days and provide ICE with written proof of such within 30 days. The proof must include the name, address, duration, and objectives of the program as well as the name of a counselor.

☐ That you register in a sexual deviancy counseling program within 14 days and provide ICE with written proof of such within 30 days. You must provide ICE with the name of the program, the address of the program, duration and objectives of the program as well as the name of a counselor.

☐ That you register as a sex offender, if applicable, within 7 days of being released, with the appropriate agency(s) and provide ICE with written proof of such within 10 days.

☒ That you do not commit any crimes while on this Order of Release on Recognizance.

☐ That you report to any parole or probation officer as required within 5 business days and provide ICE with written verification of the officer's name, address, telephone number, and reporting requirements.

☐ That you continue to follow any prescribed doctor's orders whether medical or psychological including taking prescribed medication.

☒ That you provide ICE with written copies of requests to Embassies or Consulates requesting the issuance of a travel document.

☒ That you provide ICE with written responses from the Embassy or Consulate regarding your request.

☒ Any violation of the above conditions will result in revocation of your employment authorization document.

☒ Any violation of these conditions may result in you being taken into ICE custody and you being criminally prosecuted.

■ Other: Your release is contingent upon your enrollment and successful participation in an Alternatives to Detention (ATD) program as designated by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. As part of the ATD program, you will be subject to electronic monitoring and may be subject to a curfew. Failure to comply with the requirements of the ATD program will result in a redetermination of your release conditions or your arrest and detention.
If fitted with a U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement GPS tracking ankle bracelet, do not tamper with or remove the device. Under federal law, it is a crime to willfully damage or attempt to damage property of the United States. Damaging or attempting to damage the GPS tracking ankle bracelet or any of its associated equipment (including, but not limited to, the charging station, batteries, power cords, etc.) may result in your arrest, detention, and prosecution under 18 U.S.C. § 1361 and/or 18 U.S.C. § 641, each punishable by a fine, up to ten years imprisonment, or both.

☐ At time of enrollment technology is not available, or available technology is not appropriate for a non-citizen due to the circumstances that surround the participant.
In lieu of technology enrollment, you are advised to contact the Participant Access Center (PAC) within 7 days of release from custody.
The PAC phone number is 1-877-495-1195. Call between 8 am and 4 pm, Monday through Friday, to continue enrollment into ISAP.

JS 44 (Rev. 04/21)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. *(SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)*

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

LEONTI SANAIA

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Philadelphia
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys *(Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)*

Christopher M. Casazza, Palladino, Isbell, & Casazza,
1528 Walnut St, Suite 1701 Philadelphia, PA 19102

DEFENDANTS

JAMAL L. JAMISON, JOHN RIFE

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys *(If Known)*

US Attorney's Office

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION *(Place an "X" in One Box Only)*

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
- ☐ 3 Federal Question *(U.S. Government Not a Party)*
- ☒ 2 U.S. Government Defendant
- ☐ 4 Diversity *(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)*

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES *(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)*

(For Diversity Cases Only)

	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF
Citizen of This State	☐ 1	☐ 1	Incorporated *or* Principal Place of Business In This State	☐ 4	☐ 4
Citizen of Another State	☐ 2	☐ 2	Incorporated *and* Principal Place of Business In Another State	☐ 5	☐ 5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	☐ 3	☐ 3	Foreign Nation	☐ 6	☐ 6

IV. NATURE OF SUIT *(Place an "X" in One Box Only)*

Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

CONTRACT
- ☐ 110 Insurance
- ☐ 120 Marine
- ☐ 130 Miller Act
- ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument
- ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment
- ☐ 151 Medicare Act
- ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)
- ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits
- ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits
- ☐ 190 Other Contract
- ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability
- ☐ 196 Franchise

REAL PROPERTY
- ☐ 210 Land Condemnation
- ☐ 220 Foreclosure
- ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment
- ☐ 240 Torts to Land
- ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability
- ☐ 290 All Other Real Property

TORTS

PERSONAL INJURY
- ☐ 310 Airplane
- ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability
- ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander
- ☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability
- ☐ 340 Marine
- ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability
- ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle
- ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability
- ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury
- ☐ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice

PERSONAL INJURY
- ☐ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability
- ☐ 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability
- ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability

PERSONAL PROPERTY
- ☐ 370 Other Fraud
- ☐ 371 Truth in Lending
- ☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage
- ☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability

CIVIL RIGHTS
- ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights
- ☐ 441 Voting
- ☐ 442 Employment
- ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations
- ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment
- ☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other
- ☐ 448 Education

PRISONER PETITIONS

Habeas Corpus:
- ☒ 463 Alien Detainee
- ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence
- ☐ 530 General
- ☐ 535 Death Penalty

Other:
- ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other
- ☐ 550 Civil Rights
- ☐ 555 Prison Condition
- ☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement

FORFEITURE/PENALTY
- ☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881
- ☐ 690 Other

LABOR
- ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act
- ☐ 720 Labor/Management Relations
- ☐ 740 Railway Labor Act
- ☐ 751 Family and Medical Leave Act
- ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation
- ☐ 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act

IMMIGRATION
- ☐ 462 Naturalization Application
- ☐ 465 Other Immigration Actions

BANKRUPTCY
- ☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158
- ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS
- ☐ 820 Copyrights
- ☐ 830 Patent
- ☐ 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application
- ☐ 840 Trademark
- ☐ 880 Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016

SOCIAL SECURITY
- ☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)
- ☐ 862 Black Lung (923)
- ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))
- ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI
- ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))

FEDERAL TAX SUITS
- ☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)
- ☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609

OTHER STATUTES
- ☐ 375 False Claims Act
- ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))
- ☐ 400 State Reapportionment
- ☐ 410 Antitrust
- ☐ 430 Banks and Banking
- ☐ 450 Commerce
- ☐ 460 Deportation
- ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
- ☐ 480 Consumer Credit (15 USC 1681 or 1692)
- ☐ 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act
- ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV
- ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
- ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions
- ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
- ☐ 893 Environmental Matters
- ☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act
- ☐ 896 Arbitration
- ☐ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision
- ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes

V. ORIGIN *(Place an "X" in One Box Only)*

☒ 1 Original Proceeding ☐ 2 Removed from State Court ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened ☐ 5 Transferred from Another District *(specify)* ☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer ☐ 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing ***(Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity)***:
28 U.S.C. § 2241, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)

Brief description of cause:
Respondent's are unlawfully Detaining Petitioner

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A **CLASS ACTION** UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.

DEMAND $

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND: ☐ Yes ☒ No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE _____ DOCKET NUMBER _____

DATE
04/27/2026

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD
/s/ Christopher M. Casazza

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # _____ AMOUNT _____ APPLYING IFP _____ JUDGE _____ MAG. JUDGE _____

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DESIGNATION FORM

Place of Accident, Incident, or Transaction: Philadelphia, PA

RELATED CASE IF ANY: Case Number:_____ Judge:_____

1. Does this case involve property included in an earlier numbered suit? Yes ☐
2. Does this case involve a transaction or occurrence which was the subject of an earlier numbered suit? Yes ☐
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent which was the subject of an earlier numbered suit? Yes ☐
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus petition, social security appeal, or pro se case filed by the same individual? Yes ☐
5. Is this case related to an earlier numbered suit even though none of the above categories apply? If yes, attach an explanation. Yes ☐

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the within case ☐ **is** / ☑ **is not** related to any pending or previously terminated action in this court.

Civil Litigation Categories

A. Federal Question Cases:

- ☐ 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts)
- ☐ 2. FELA
- ☐ 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury
- ☐ 4. Antitrust
- ☐ 5. Wage and Hour Class Action/Collective Action
- ☐ 6. Patent
- ☐ 7. Copyright/Trademark
- ☐ 8. Employment
- ☐ 9. Labor-Management Relations
- ☐ 10. Civil Rights
- ☒ 11. Habeas Corpus
- ☐ 12. Securities Cases
- ☐ 13. Social Security Review Cases
- ☐ 14. Qui Tam Cases
- ☐ 15. Cases Seeking Systemic Relief ***see certification below***
- ☐ 16. All Other Federal Question Cases. *(Please specify)*:_____

B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:

- ☐ 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
- ☐ 2. Airplane Personal Injury
- ☐ 3. Assault, Defamation
- ☐ 4. Marine Personal Injury
- ☐ 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
- ☐ 6. Other Personal Injury (*Please specify*):_____
- ☐ 7. Products Liability
- ☐ 8. All Other Diversity Cases: *(Please specify)*_____

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, that the remedy sought in this case ☐ **does** / ☑ **does not** have implications beyond the parties before the court and ☐ **does** / ☑ **does not** seek to bar or mandate statewide or nationwide enforcement of a state or federal law including a rule, regulation, policy, or order of the executive branch or a state or federal agency, whether by declaratory judgment and/or any form of injunctive relief.

ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (CHECK ONLY ONE BOX BELOW)

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief:

☒ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2(3), this case is not eligible for arbitration either because (1) it seeks relief other than money damages; (2) the money damages sought are in excess of $150,000 exclusive of interest and costs; (3) it is a social security case, includes a prisoner as a party, or alleges a violation of a right secured by the U.S. Constitution, or (4) jurisdiction is based in whole or in part on 28 U.S.C. § 1343.

☐ None of the restrictions in Local Civil Rule 53.2 apply and this case is eligible for arbitration.

NOTE: A trial de novo will be by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.