Taylor S. Adams, Esq.
Global Immigration Legal Team, LLC
150 Strafford Avenue, Suite 115
Wayne, PA 19087
p. 610-975-4599
f. 610-687-2100
taylor@giltlaw.com

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

GURDEEP SINGH

Petitioner,

v.

John E. RIFE, Acting Field Office Director of Enforcement and Removal Operations, Philadelphia Field Office, IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT;

Markwayne MULLIN, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY;

Todd BLANCHE, Acting U.S. Attorney General; EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW;

Jamal LAWRENCE, Warden of PHILADELPHIA FEDERAL DETENTION CENTER.

Respondents.

Case No. 2:26-cv-2778

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner Gurdeep Singh 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. Prior to his detention, he had lived in Pennsylvania for 3 years after entering the United States without inspection in approximately 2023.

2. Petitioner is charged with, inter alia, having entered the United States without admission or inspection. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i).

3. Based on this allegation in Petitioner's removal proceedings, DHS denied Petitioner's release from immigration custody, consistent with a new 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.

4. Petitioner is detained pending his removal proceedings without access to a hearing conducted by a neutral decisionmaker—a federal judge or an immigration judge—to determine whether his detention is warranted based on danger or flight risk, pursuant to the BIA's recent decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).

5. 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.

6. 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 were previously detained under § 1226(a) at their initial apprehension by ICE, were released on their own recognizance pursuant to the same portion of the statute and are now residing in the United States. Instead, upon re-arrest and detention by ICE, such individuals are still subject to § 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 and are residing inside the United States.

7. 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.

8. In the alternative, if the statute does authorize Petitioner's detention without a bond hearing, it violates his rights to substantive and procedural due process. Detention of all noncitizens who are subject to inadmissibility grounds, like Petitioner, without any individualized hearing does not "bear a reasonable relation to the purpose for which the individual was committed." *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001). Moreover, application of the *Mathews v. Eldridge* balancing test shows that a bond hearing is necessary to protect Petitioner from an unnecessary deprivation of liberty. 424 U.S. 319, 335 (1976).

9. Accordingly, Petitioner seeks a writ of habeas corpus requiring that he be released unless Respondents provide a bond hearing under § 1226(a) within seven days.

JURISDICTION

10. Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents. Petitioner is detained at the 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.

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 Singh is a citizen of India who has been in immigration detention since April 24, 2026. After arresting Petitioner at the Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) office in Philadelphia, when Petitioner was appearing for a regularly scheduled check-in, ICE did not set bond, and Petitioner is unable to obtain review of his custody by an IJ, pursuant to the Board's decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).

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

19. Respondent Markwayne Mullin is the Acting Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. He is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), and oversees ICE, which is responsible for Petitioner's detention. Mr. Mullin has ultimate custodial authority over Petitioner and is sued in his official capacity.

20. Respondent Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is the federal agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA, including the detention and removal of noncitizens.

21. Respondent Todd Blanche is the Acting Attorney General of the United States. He is responsible for the Department of Justice, of which the Executive Office for Immigration

Review and the immigration court system it operates is a component agency. He is sued in her official capacity.

22. Respondent Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) is the federal agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA in removal proceedings, including for custody redeterminations in bond hearings.

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

FACTS

24. Petitioner has resided in the United States since approximately April 7, 2023 and lives in Upper Darby, Pennsylvania.

25. On April 24, 2026, Petitioner was arrested while attending his routine check-in with ICE at the Philadelphia ERO office.

26. When Petitioner was initially apprehended by ICE at the border on April 7, 2023, he was classified as a noncitizen who entered the United States without admission or parole, and was released from immigration custody and required to attend routine check-ins with ICE. Petitioner has attended his check-ins as required. At his most recent check-in on April 24, 2026, he was detained. Petitioner is now detained at the Federal Detention Center in Philadelphia, PA.

27. DHS placed Petitioner in removal proceedings before the Philadelphia Immigration Court pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a on or about April 25, 2023, shortly after Petitioner was initially apprehended by immigration officials at the southern border. ICE has charged Petitioner with, *inter alia*, being inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) as someone who entered the United States without inspection. He timely filed an asylum

application with the Philadelphia Immigration Court on or about July 5, 2023 that remains pending with the court.

28. ICE detained him without explanation on Apri 24, 2026, and based on information and belief that arrest was pursuant to a § 1226(a) arrest warrant. Respondent's removal proceedings remain pending with the immigration court.

29. Petitioner has lived in the greater Philadelphia area for the past three years since his arrival in the United States. He has never been criminally arrested or apprehended by law enforcement, apart from his immigration arrest, and has become a valued member of his community. Petitioner filed a timely application for asylum on or about July 5, 2023, evincing his eligibility for relief before the immigration court. His final hearing on his asylum case is currently scheduled for April 26, 2028, before the Philadelphia Immigration Court. Petitioner is neither a flight risk nor a danger to the community.

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

31. Pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, the immigration judge is unable to consider Petitioner's bond request because he entered the United States without inspection.

32. 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 community.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

I. Section 1226(a) Governs the Detention of People Like Petitioner Who are Detained in the United States and Have Not Previously Been Admitted

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

34. 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).

35. 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).

36. 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).

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

38. 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).

39. 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).

40. 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). *Diaz Martinez v. Hyde*, No. 25-11613, 2025 WL 2084238, -- F. Supp. 3d --, at *4 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025). 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)). Even individuals who were apprehended at the border and not immediately detained but placed in standard removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a, would historically have been considered detained under § 1226(a) should they alter been detained in the interior of the U.S., and thus eligible for bond before an immigration judge.

41. On July 8, 2025, ICE, "in coordination with" DOJ, abruptly changed course and announced a new policy that rejected well-established understanding of the statutory framework and reversed decades of practice, stating the agency has "revisited" its legal position and believed that § 1225, not § 1226, governs the detention of noncitizens who are present in the United States without having been admitted. *Diaz Martinez*, 2025 WL 2084238, at *4.

42. The new policy, entitled "Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission,"[1] 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 affects those who have resided in the United States for months, years, and even decades.

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

43. 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.

44. This followed a May 15, 2025, decision by the BIA holding an applicant for admission arrested without a warrant while arriving in the United States and subsequently placed into removal proceedings is detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). *Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. 66 (BIA 2025).

45. Since Respondents adopted their new policies, dozens of federal courts have rejected their new interpretation of the INA's detention authorities. Courts have likewise rejected *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, which adopts the same reading of the statute as ICE.

46. Subsequently, court after court has adopted the same reading of the INA's detention authorities and rejected ICE and EOIR's new interpretation. *See, e.g.*, *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239 (W.D. Wash. 2025); *Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11571-JEK, 2025 WL 1869299 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025); *Diaz Martinez v. Hyde*, No. CV 25-11613-BEM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 2084238 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025); *Rosado v. Figueroa*, No. CV 25-02157 PHX DLR (CDB), 2025 WL 2337099 (D. Ariz. Aug. 11, 2025), *report and recommendation adopted*, No. CV-25-02157-PHX-DLR (CDB), 2025 WL 2349133 (D. Ariz. Aug. 13, 2025); *Lopez Benitez v. Francis*, No. 25 CIV. 5937 (DEH), 2025 WL 2371588 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2025); *Maldonado v. Olson*, No. 0:25-cv-03142-SRN-SGE, 2025 WL 2374411 (D. Minn. Aug. 15, 2025); *Arrazola-Gonzalez v. Noem*, No. 5:25-cv-01789-ODW (DFMx), 2025 WL 2379285 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2025); *Romero v. Hyde*, No. 25-11631-BEM, 2025 WL 2403827 (D. Mass. Aug. 19, 2025); *Samb v. Joyce*, No. 25 CIV. 6373 (DEH), 2025

WL 2398831 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 19, 2025); *Ramirez Clavijo v. Kaiser*, No. 25-CV-06248-BLF, 2025 WL 2419263 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2025); *Leal-Hernandez v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-02428-JRR, 2025 WL 2430025 (D. Md. Aug. 24, 2025); *Kostak v. Trump*, No. 3:25-cv-01093-JE-KDM, 2025 WL 2472136 (W.D. La. Aug. 27, 2025); *Jose J.O.E. v. Bondi*, No. 25-CV-3051 (ECT/DJF), --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 2466670 (D. Minn. Aug. 27, 2025) *Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft*, No. 2:25-cv-12486-BRM-EAS, 2025 WL 2496379 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025); *Vasquez Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02180-DMS-MM, 2025 WL 2549431 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025); *Zaragoza Mosqueda v. Noem*, No. 5:25-CV-02304 CAS (BFM), 2025 WL 2591530 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2025); *Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft*, No. 25-CV-12546, 2025 WL 2609425 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9, 2025); *Sampiao v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11981-JEK, 2025 WL 2607924 (D. Mass. Sept. 9, 2025); *see also, e.g.*, *Palma Perez v. Berg*, No. 8:25CV494, 2025 WL 2531566, at *2 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025) (noting that "[t]he Court tends to agree" that § 1226(a) and not § 1225(b)(2) authorizes detention); *Jacinto v. Trump*, No. 4:25-cv-03161-JFB-RCC, 2025 WL 2402271 at *3 (D. Neb. Aug. 19, 2025) (same); *Anicasio v. Kramer*, No. 4:25-cv-03158-JFB-RCC, 2025 WL 2374224 at *2 (D. Neb. Aug. 14, 2025) (same). This is just a sample of the courts who have ruled on this issue. To date, there are at least 283 judges in courts across the country who have found in favor of the petitioner on this issue. *See also* Exh. C.

47. This includes at least seven judges sitting in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, where this case arises. *See Demirel v. FDC Philadelphia*, et al., No. 25-cv-05488 at *6 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 18, 2025) (Diamond, J.); *Kashranov v. Jamison*, No. 25-cv-5555, 2025 WL 3188399 at *4 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 14, 2025) (Wolson, J.); *Cantu-Cortes v. O'Neill, et al.*, No. 25-cv-6338, 2025 WL 3171639, at *1 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 13, 2025) (Kenney, J.); *Patel v. McShane, et al.*, No. 25-cv-5975 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 20, 2025) (Brody, J.); *Ndiaye v. Jamison, et al.*, No. 25-cv-6007 (E.D. Pa. Nov.

19, 2025) (Sanchez, J.); *Centeno-Ibarra v. Warden of the Federal Detention Center Philadelphia, et al.*, No. 25-cv-06312 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 25, 2025) (Rufe, J.); *Juarez Velasquez v. O'Neill, et al.*. Np. 25-cv-06191 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 3, 2025) (Henry, J.).

48. Courts have uniformly rejected DHS's and EOIR's new interpretation because it defies the INA. As these decisions explain, the BIA's decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* defies the INA. The plain text of the statutory provisions demonstrates that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to people like Petitioner. DHS and DOJ's longstanding practice or providing bond hearing to individuals in this position further counsels against the BIA's abrupt change in policy. *Maldonado*, 2025 WL 2374411, at *11.

49. Section 1226(a) applies by default to all persons "pending a decision on whether the [noncitizen] is to be removed from the United States." *See Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 288 (2018) (describing 1226(a) as the "default rule" for detention of noncitizens pending removal). These removal hearings are held under § 1229a, to "decid[e] the inadmissibility or deportability of a[] [noncitizen]."

50. 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]."

51. 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). Just this year, Congress enacted subparagraph (E) in the Laken Riley Act to exclude certain noncitizens who entered without inspection from § 1226(a)'s default bond provision. Subparagraph (E)'s reference to such people makes clear that, by default, such people are afforded a bond hearing under subsection (a). As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court explained, "[w]hen Congress creates

'specific exceptions' to a statute's applicability, it 'proves' that absent those exceptions, the statute generally applies." *Rodriguez Vazquez*, 779 F. Supp. 3d at 1257 (citing *Shady Grove Orthopedic Assocs., P.A. v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 559 U.S. 393, 400 (2010)); *see also Gomes*, 2025 WL 1869299, at *7.

52. 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.

53. Under the BIA's interpretation, all noncitizens subject to inadmissibility grounds are detained without the opportunity for a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 220; *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6) (making people who are present without having been admitted inadmissible); 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(14) (defining an admission). Therefore, this interpretation would render all the grounds of mandatory detention in § 1226(c) applying to inadmissible noncitizens, including the recently passed Laken Riley Act, superfluous. *Gomes*, 2025 WL 1869299, at *7; *Rodriguez*, 779 F. Supp. 3d at 1258; *see Marx v. Gen. Revenue Corp.*, 568 U.S. 371, 386 (2103) ("[T]he canon against surplusage is strongest when an interpretation would render superfluous another part of the same statutory scheme."). This statutory structure demonstrates that Congress did not intend to make § 1226(a) inapplicable to all inadmissible noncitizens, but rather viewed it as the default bond provision for people arrested within the United States.

54. 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).

55. The BIA's interpretation "would render the phrase 'seeking admission' in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) mere surplusage." *Lopez Benitez*, 2025 WL 2371588, at *6. That section applies to people who are (1) applicants for admission; (2) seeking admission; and (3) not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A); *Lopez Benitez*, 2025 WL 2371588, at *6; *Diaz Martinez*, 2025 WL 2084238, at *2. The BIA's interpretation makes all applicants for admission subject to mandatory detention, leaving the "seeking admission" criterion unnecessary and violating the rule against surplusage. *Lopez Benitez*, 2025 WL 2371588, at *6; *Diaz Martinez*, 2025 WL 2084238, at *6.

56. Accordingly, the mandatory detention provision of § 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to people like Petitioner, who were detained and released by ICE on their own recognizance pursuant to § 1226(a) before being re-detained by ICE sometime later while living in the United States.

57. Instead, the phrase "seeking admission" indicates that § 1225(b)(2)(A) applies to people who are taking "some sort of present-tense action," in other words, coming or attempting to come into the United States. *Diaz Martinez*, 2025 WL 2084238, at *6; *see also Matter of M-C-D-V-*, 28 I&N Dec. 18, 23 (BIA 2020) (stating that "the use of the present progressive tense . . . denotes an ongoing process"). Therefore, § 1226(a), not § 1225(b)(2)(A), governs the detention of people detained within the United States who are not actively seeking admission, as required by the statute.

58. Applying § 1226(a), rather than § 1225(b), to people detained in the interior who had previously entered without inspection is consistent with the government's longstanding practice, which "can inform a court's determination of what the law is." *Loper Bright Enter. v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369, 386 (2024). This longstanding practice further counsels against the BIA's abrupt change in policy. *Maldonado*, 2025 WL 2374411, at *11.

59. This petition is not affected by the recent class certification in *Maldonado Bautista et al. v. Santacruz Jr et al.*, 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM (C.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2025). *Maldonado Bautista* certified a class defined as: "[a]ll noncitizens in the United States without lawful status who (1) have entered or will enter the United States without inspection; (2) were not or will not be apprehended upon arrival; and (3) are not or will not be subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231 at the time the Department of Homeland Security makes an initial custody determination. *Id.* at *15. As Petitioner was apprehended at the border, it does not appear that he is included in the class. Accordingly, Petitioner's only relief remains this petition.

60. Finally, as discussed below, the BIA's interpretation of § 1225(b)(2)(A) to mandate detention without a bond hearing for all noncitizens present in the United States without having been admitted presents serious constitutional concerns. Therefore, to the degree that the statute remains ambiguous, the Court should presume that Congress "did not intend the alternative which raises serious constitutional doubts" and reject that construction. *Clark v. Martinez*, 543 U.S. 371, 381-82 (2005). Therefore, § 1226(a), which permits bond hearings, not § 1225(b)(2)(A), which does not, governs the detention of people like Petitioner.

II. The BIA's Application of Mandatory Detention to Noncitizens Like Petitioner Violates Substantive and Procedural Due Process

61. "It is well established that the Fifth Amendment entitles [noncitizens] to due process of law in deportation proceedings." *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 523 (2003) (quoting *Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 306 (1993)). "Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty" that the Due Process Clause protects. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001); *see also id*. at 718 (Kennedy, J., dissenting) ("Liberty under the Due Process Clause includes protection against unlawful or arbitrary personal restraint or detention."). This fundamental due process protection applies to all noncitizens within the United States, including both removable and inadmissible noncitizens. *See id*. at 693; *Plyler v. Doe*, 457 U.S. 202, 212 (1982); *Wong Wing v. United States*, 163 U.S. 228, 238 (1896).

62. Absent adequate procedural protections, substantive due process requires a "special justification" that "outweighs the individual's constitutionally protected interest in avoiding physical restraint." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690; *accord, e.g.*, *Torralba v. Knight*, No. 2:25-cv-1366, 2025 WL 2581792, at *12 (D. Nev. Sept. 5, 2025) (describing the standard for a substantive due process violation); *Fernandez v. Lyons*, No. 8:25-cv-506, 2025 WL 2531539, at *4 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025) (same). In the immigration context, the Supreme Court has recognized only two valid purposes for civil detention—to mitigate the risks of danger to the community and to prevent flight. *Id*.; *Demore*, 538 U.S. at 528. Thus, to withstand constitutional scrutiny, the nature and duration of mandatory immigration detention must be reasonably related to these purposes.

63. In *Demore*, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of § 1226(c) against a facial challenge, specifically citing evidence that had been before Congress about noncitizens with criminal convictions. 538 U.S. at 518-520. This justification does not apply, however, to

noncitizens with no criminal record whatsoever who have lived in the community for years. The broad policy set forth in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* is not reasonably related to the purposes of prevent danger to the community or flight risk and violates substantive due process.

64. Additionally, procedural due process protects noncitizens against deprivation of liberty without adequate procedural protections, including notice and the opportunity to be heard. *A.A.R.P. v. Trump*, 145 S. Ct. 1364, 1367 (2025); *Trump v. J.G.G.*, 145 S. Ct. 1003, 1006 (2025); *Velasco Lopez v. Decker*, 978 F.3d 842, 851 (2d Cir. 2020). In determining the proper procedure to protect a detained noncitizen's procedural due process rights under the Fifth Amendment, courts apply the three-part balancing test in *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 335 (1976), weighing (1) "the private interest that will be affected by the official action;" (2) "the risk of an erroneous deprivation of such interest through the procedures used, and the probable value, if any, of additional or substitute procedural safeguards;" and (3) "the Government's interest, including the function involved and the fiscal and administrative burdens that the additional or substitute procedural requirement would entail." *Black v. Decker*, 103 F.4th 133, 147-48 (2d Cir. 2024); *Gayle v. Warden Monmouth C'ty Corr. Facility*, 12 F. 4th 321, 331 (3d Cir. 2021); *Hernandez-Lara*, 10 F.4th at 28; *Velasco Lopez*, 978 F.3d at 851 (all quoting *Mathews*, 424 U.S. at 335). Here, the BIA's interpretation of the statute to require detention of all people in the United States without having been admitted deprives them of their liberty without any individualized process to determine whether such detention is necessary to prevent flight risk or danger to the community, and violates due process.

65. First, the "importance and fundamental nature" of an individual's liberty interest is well-established. *United States v. Salerno*, 481 U.S. 739, 750 (1987); *see also Ashley*, 288 F. Supp. at 670 ("[F]reedom from confinement is a liberty interest of the highest constitutional

import."). For people "who can face years of detention before resolution of their immigration proceedings, 'the individual interest at stake is without doubt particularly important.'" *Linares Martinez v. Decker*, No. 18-cv-6527 (JMF), 2018 WL 5023946 at *3 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 17, 2018).

66. Weighing this factor in *Velasco Lopez*, the Second Circuit found the private interest to be "on any calculus, substantial," observing that the petitioner, "could not maintain employment or see his family or friends or others outside normal visiting hours. The use of a cell phone was prohibited, and he had no access to the internet or email and limited access to the telephone." 978 F.3d at 851-52. Similarly, the First Circuit found a substantial private liberty interest for the petitioner in *Hernandez-Lara*, noting that the petitioner there was incarcerated "alongside criminal inmates" at a jail where "she was separated from her fiancé and unable to maintain her employment." 10 F.4th at 28.

67. Second, absent any individualized bond hearing, people will be detained despite not being a danger to the community or a flight risk, because there is no mechanism to determine whether their detention is necessary. *See, e.g.*, *Günaydin v. Trump*, No. 25-cv-1151, 2025 WL 1459154, -- F. Supp. 3d --, at *8 (D. Minn. May 21, 2025) (noting that lack of consideration of "individualized or particularized facts . . . increases the potential for erroneous deprivation of individuals' private rights"); *Ashley*, 28 F. Supp. 2d at 670 (finding a procedural due process violation because "the Government has not proved that Petitioner presents an identified and articulable threat to an individual or the community so as to justify his continued detention"). A bond hearing would have significant value because it is designed to assess the individualized facts of each case and determine whether less restrictive measures can fulfill the same goals.

68. Finally, the burden on the government of returning to the longstanding practice of holding bond hearings for people like Petitioner does not outweigh the liberty interest at stake.

To the contrary, the government has an interest in "minimizing the enormous impact of incarceration in cases where it serves no purpose." *Velasco Lopez*, 978 F.3d at 854; *see also Hernandez-Lara*, 10 F.4th at 33 (noting that "limiting the use of detention to only those noncitizens who are dangerous or a flight risk may save the government, and therefore the public, from expending substantial resources on needless detention"). Additionally, "unnecessary detention imposes substantial societal costs. . . . The needless detention of those individuals thus separates families and removes from the community breadwinners, caregivers, parents, siblings and employees. Those ruptures in the fabric of communal life impact society in intangible ways that are difficult to calculate in dollars and cents." *Hernandez-Lara*, 10 F.4th at 33 (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). The cost to the government and society of detaining people unnecessarily for long periods of time is greater than the cost of providing individualized hearings, and weighs in favor of additional procedural protections.

69. At these bond hearings, due process requires that the Government bear the burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence. *See Gayle*, 12 F.4th at 332 ("[W]hen such a severe deprivation is at issue, the Government must bear the burden of proof."). "A standard of proof serves to allocate the risk of error between the litigants and reflects the relative importance attached to the ultimate decision." *German Santos v. Warden Pike C'ty Corr. Facility*, 965 F.3d 203, 213 (citing *Addington v. Texas*, 441 U.S. 418, 423 (1979)). Therefore, when the Third Circuit has ordered a constitutionally required bond hearing, it is placed the burden on the government by clear and convincing evidence. *German Santos*, 965 F.3d at 214; *Guerrero-Sanchez v. Warden York C'ty Prison*, 905 F.3d 208, 224 & n.12 (3d Cir. 2018), *abrogated on other grounds by Johnson v. Arteaga-Martinez*, 596 U.S. 572 (2022). Other circuit courts have similarly held that due process requires this allocation of the burden in bond hearings for

noncitizens like petitioner, who were then detained under § 1226(a). *Hernandez-Lara*, 10 F.4th at 39-40; *Velasco Lopez*, 978 F.3d at 855-56. Thus, even if the statute requires detention without a bond hearing, due process requires a hearing at which the government bears the burden by clear and convincing evidence.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I
Violation of the INA

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

71. 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 Petitioner, who has been living in the United States since for three years prior to being apprehended and detained by Respondents on April 24, 2026.

72. Respondents made a discretionary custody determination to release him from immigration custody when he was first apprehended in April 2023, through either release on his own recognizance or DHS's parole authority. Respondents now essentially seek to *ex post facto* redetermine the statute under which they are detaining Petitioner based on ICE's July 8, 2025 policy change, that is at direct odds with the plain language of the statute. They now argue that Petitioner is detained under § 1225(b)(2) despite previously arresting him pursuant to § 1226(a) and making a custody determination to release him pursuant to their authority under that section.

73. Additionally, on information and belief, Respondents' arrest of Petitioner on April 24, 2026, was pursuant to an administrative warrant DHS issued at the time of his arrest, pursuant to § 1226(a). This further supports the position that Petitioner is detained pursuant to §1226(a).

74. Accordingly, Petitioner is detained under § 1226(a) and is eligible for release on bond. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates his continued detention and violates the INA.

COUNT II
Violation of the Bond Regulations, 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1, 1236.1, and 1003.19

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

76. 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.

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

78. 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 Substantive Due Process under the Fifth Amendment

79. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference the above paragraphs.

80. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment forbids the government from depriving any "person" of liberty "without due process of law." U.S. Const. amend. V. Substantive due process requires that immigration detention without a bond hearing be reasonably related to the goals of ensuring the appearance of noncitizens at future proceedings and preventing danger to the community. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690.

81. The BIA's application of mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2) is not reasonably related to those goals and thus violates substantive due process. Petitioner is not a danger to the community or a flight risk. He has never been criminally arrested in the United States or abroad and has become a valued member of his community. He is not a risk of flight, as he has created deep roots in the greater Philadelphia area, and on information and belief has attended all check ins and court hearings required of him.

82. Since Petitioner is neither a risk of flight nor a danger to the community, his continued detention is not reasonably related to the only two goals of civil immigration detention. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690.

COUNT IV
Violation of Procedural Due Process under the Fifth Amendment

83. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference the above paragraphs.

84. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment forbids the government from depriving any "person" of liberty "without due process of law." U.S. Const. amend. V. Courts apply the *Mathews v. Eldridge* balancing test to determine what procedures the due process clause requires. *Gayle*, 12 F.4th at 331.

85. The first factor is the private interest that will be affected by the official action. *Id.* Here, the deprivation of Petitioner's liberty is a particularly weighty interest. It is well established that individuals have a liberty interest in their continued liberty and freedom from

restraint. *Salerno*, 481 U.S. at 750; *see also Ashley*, 288 F. Supp. at 670. This is especially true given the fact that Petitioner was already determined to not be a danger to the community or a risk of flight when he was initially released from ICE detention in April 2023. He relied on this interest in his liberty by finding gainful employment at Sunoco, renting a house to live in, and becoming a value member of his community. This freedom from unlawful restraint is the heart of the liberty interest protected by the Fifth Amendment.

86. The second factor is the risk of erroneous deprivation of such interest through the procedures used, and the probable value, if any, of additional safeguards. *Id.* Here, there is a great risk of unnecessary detention because the BIA's interpretation of the statute does not permit any individualized determination of whether detention during removal proceedings is necessary. *See Ashley*, 288 F. Supp. 2d at 670. At a hearing, Petitioner could show that his detention is not necessary because he is not a danger to the community and is not a flight risk. He has never been criminally arrested in the United States and there is no indication he possesses any danger at all to the community. As described throughout this petition, Petitioner has created ties to his community in the United States. He is gainfully employed at Sunoco and has viable relief from removal in the form of asylum, and thus has every incentive to appear at all future hearings scheduled. There is no indication in the record that he is a risk of flight. A hearing at which the government bears the burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence would protect the substantial liberty interest at stake. *German Santos*, 965 F.3d at 213-14.

87. The final factor is the Government's interest. *Gayle*, 12 F.4th at 331. The government has no legitimate interest in detaining Petitioner when detention is not necessary to ensure appearance at future hearings or protect the community, and less restrictive measures like a reasonable bond would serve those purposes. *Hernandez-Lara*, 10 F.4th at 32-33; *see Ousman*

D. v. Decker, No. 20-9646, 2020 WL 5587441, at *4 (holding that due process requires consideration of less restrictive alternatives to detention that would address the government's legitimate purpose); *Hechavarria v. Whitaker*, 358 F. Supp. 3d 227, 241-42 (W.D.N.Y. 2019) (same). Therefore, the government does not have an interest in detaining Petitioner without a bond hearing that outweighs his substantial liberty interest in such an individualized determination.

88. Respondents deprived Petitioner of liberty without providing him a meaningful opportunity to be heard by neutral decisionmaker regarding his detention. The detention of Petitioner without any hearing to determine whether that detention is necessary violates procedural 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 release Petitioner or, in the alternative, provide Petitioner with a bond hearing pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven days;

e. Declare that Petitioner is detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a);

f. Declare that Petitioner's detention is unlawful;

g. Award Petitioner attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA"), as amended, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and on any other basis justified under law; and

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

DATED this 27th of April 2026.

/s/ Taylor S. Adams

Taylor S. Adams, Esq. (PA 324161)
Global Immigration Legal Team
150 Strafford Avenue, Suite 115
Wayne, PA 19087
Telephone: 610-975-4599
Fax: 610-687-2100
E-mail: taylor@giltlaw.com

Attorney for Petitioner

Taylor S. Adams, Esq.
Global Immigration Legal Team, LLC
150 Strafford Avenue, Suite 115
Wayne, PA 19087
p. 610-975-4599
f. 610-687-2100
taylor@giltlaw.com

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

GURDEEP SINGH v. RIFE, ET AL.	Case No. 2:26-cv-2778 **PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS**

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit		Page
A.	Notice to Appear in Immigration Court, evincing Petitioner was placed into 8 U.S.C. § 1229a proceedings and is not an arriving alien;	1-3
B.	Printout of ICE and BOP Detainee Locators, evincing Petitioner is housed at the Federal Detention Center in Philadelphia, PA;	4-5
C.	Appendix of District Court Cases having heard this issue.	6-19

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

GURDEEP SINGH

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

(c) Attorneys *(Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)*
GLOBAL IMMIGRATION LEGAL TEAM, 150 STRAFFORD AVE, SUITE 115, WAYNE, PA 19087 610-975-4599

DEFENDANTS JOHN E. RIFE, FOD of Philadelphia ERO, MARKWAYNE MULLIN, Acting Sec. of DHS, Todd BLANCHE, Acting Atty Gen., JAMAL LAWRENCE, Warden of PDC; ED IRS DHS

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)*

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)*:
22 USC 2241

Brief description of cause:
Habeas corpus challenging detention of noncitizen

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

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

10/2024

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.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
NOTICE TO APPEAR

DOB: [redacted]

Event No: [redacted]

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

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

In the Matter of:

Respondent: GURDEEP SINGH 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 INDIA and a citizen of INDIA ;

3. You arrived in the United States at or near SAN LUIS, AZ , on or about April 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 November 16, 2023 (*Date*) at 8:30 AM (*Time*) to show why you should not be removed from the United States based on the charge(s) set forth above.

TONY LEUNG - SDDO
(Signature and Title of Issuing Officer)

Date: April 25, 2023

Philadelphia, PA
(City and State)

This Notice to Appear Supersedes the Notice to Appear issued on April 9, 2023

EOIR – 1 of 3

Uploaded on: 4/27/2026 at 2:26:37 PM (Eastern Daylight Time) Case 2:26-cv-02778-PD Document 1-3 Filed 04/27/26 Page 2 of 3

Notice to Respondent

Warning: Any statement you make may be used against you in removal proceedings.

Alien Registration: This copy of the Notice to Appear served upon you is evidence of your alien registration while you are in removal proceedings. You are required to carry it with you at all times.

Representation: If you so choose, you may be represented in this proceeding, at no expense to the Government, by an attorney or other individual authorized and qualified to represent persons before the Executive Office for Immigration Review, pursuant to 8 CFR 1003.16. Unless you so request, no hearing will be scheduled earlier than ten days from the date of this notice, to allow you sufficient time to secure counsel. A list of qualified attorneys and organizations who may be available to represent you at no cost will be provided with this notice.

Conduct of the hearing: At the time of your hearing, you should bring with you any affidavits or other documents that you desire to have considered in connection with your case. If you wish to have the testimony of any witnesses considered, you should arrange to have such witnesses present at the hearing. At your hearing you will be given the opportunity to admit or deny any or all of the allegations in the Notice to Appear, including that you are inadmissible or removable. You will have an opportunity to present evidence on your own behalf, to examine any evidence presented by the Government, to object, on proper legal grounds, to the receipt of evidence and to cross examine any witnesses presented by the Government. At the conclusion of your hearing, you have a right to appeal an adverse decision by the immigration judge. You will be advised by the immigration judge before whom you appear of any relief from removal for which you may appear eligible including the privilege of voluntary departure. You will be given a reasonable opportunity to make any such application to the immigration judge.

One-Year Asylum Application Deadline: If you believe you may be eligible for asylum, you must file a Form I-589, Application for Asylum and for Withholding of Removal. The Form I-589, Instructions, and information on where to file the Form can be found at **www.uscis.gov/i-589**. Failure to file the Form I-589 within one year of arrival may bar you from eligibility to apply for asylum pursuant to section 208(a)(2)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Failure to appear: You are required to provide the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), in writing, with your full mailing address and telephone number. You must notify the Immigration Court and the DHS immediately by using Form EOIR-33 whenever you change your address or telephone number during the course of this proceeding. You will be provided with a copy of this form. Notices of hearing will be mailed to this address. If you do not submit Form EOIR-33 and do not otherwise provide an address at which you may be reached during proceedings, then the Government shall not be required to provide you with written notice of your hearing. If you fail to attend the hearing at the time and place designated on this notice, or any date and time later directed by the Immigration Court, a removal order may be made by the immigration judge in your absence, and you may be arrested and detained by the DHS.

Mandatory Duty to Surrender for Removal: If you become subject to a final order of removal, you must surrender for removal to your local DHS office, listed on the internet at **http://www.ice.gov/contact/ero**, as directed by the DHS and required by statute and regulation. Immigration regulations at 8 CFR 1241.1 define when the removal order becomes administratively final. If you are granted voluntary departure and fail to depart the United States as required, fail to post a bond in connection with voluntary departure, or fail to comply with any other condition or term in connection with voluntary departure, you must surrender for removal on the next business day thereafter. If you do not surrender for removal as required, you will be ineligible for all forms of discretionary relief for as long as you remain in the United States and for ten years after your departure or removal. This means you will be ineligible for asylum, cancellation of removal, voluntary departure, adjustment of status, change of nonimmigrant status, registry, and related waivers for this period. If you do not surrender for removal as required, you may also be criminally prosecuted under section 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

U.S. Citizenship Claims: If you believe you are a United States citizen, please advise the DHS by calling the ICE Law Enforcement Support Center toll free at (855) 448-6903.

Sensitive locations: To the extent that an enforcement action leading to a removal proceeding was taken against Respondent at a location described in 8 U.S.C. § 1229(e)(1), such action complied with 8 U.S.C. § 1367.

Request for Prompt Hearing

To expedite a determination in my case, I request this Notice to Appear be filed with the Executive Office for Immigration Review as soon as possible. I waive my right to a 10-day period prior to appearing before an immigration judge and request my hearing be scheduled.

Before: _____

_____ *(Signature of Respondent)*

_____ Date: _____

(Signature and Title of Immigration Officer)

Certificate of Service

This Notice To Appear was served on the respondent by me on April 25, 2023, in the following manner and in compliance with section 239(a)(1) of the Act.

☒ in person ☐ by certified mail, returned receipt # _____ requested ☐ by regular mail

☐ Attached is a credible fear worksheet.

☒ Attached is a list of organization and attorneys which provide free legal services.

The alien was provided oral notice in the ENGLISH language of the time and place of his or her hearing and of the consequences of failure to appear as provided in section 240(b)(7) of the Act.

Gurlp Singh — JOSE 9037 MARTINEZ-CONTES - DO

(Signature of Respondent if Personally Served) *(Signature and Title of officer)*

EOIR – 2 of 3

Uploaded on: 4/27/2023 at 3:26:54 p.m. (Eastern Daylight Time) Base City - PHL

Privacy Act Statement

Authority:
The Department of Homeland Security through U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), U.S Customs and Border Protection (CBP), and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) are authorized to collect the information requested on this form pursuant to Sections 103, 237, 239, 240, and 290 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended (8 U.S.C. 1103, 1229, 1229a, and 1360), and the regulations issued pursuant thereto.

Purpose:
You are being asked to sign and date this Notice to Appear (NTA) as an acknowledgement of personal receipt of this notice. This notice, when filed with the U.S. Department of Justice's (DOJ) Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR), initiates removal proceedings. The NTA contains information regarding the nature of the proceedings against you, the legal authority under which proceedings are conducted, the acts or conduct alleged against you to be in violation of law, the charges against you, and the statutory provisions alleged to have been violated. The NTA also includes information about the conduct of the removal hearing, your right to representation at no expense to the government, the requirement to inform EOIR of any change in address, the consequences for failing to appear, and that generally, if you wish to apply for asylum, you must do so within one year of your arrival in the United States. If you choose to sign and date the NTA, that information will be used to confirm that you received it, and for recordkeeping.

Routine Uses:
For United States Citizens, Lawful Permanent Residents, or individuals whose records are covered by the Judicial Redress Act of 2015 (5 U.S.C. § 552a note), your information may be disclosed in accordance with the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. § 552a(b), including pursuant to the routine uses published in the following DHS systems of records notices (SORN): DHS/USCIS/ICE/CBP-001 Alien File, Index, and National File Tracking System of Records, DHS/USCIS-007 Benefit Information System, DHS/ICE-011 Criminal Arrest Records and Immigration Enforcement Records (CARIER), and DHS/ICE-003 General Counsel Electronic Management System (GEMS), and DHS/CBP-023 Border Patrol Enforcement Records (BPER). These SORNs can be viewed at https://www.dhs.gov/system-records-notices-sorns. When disclosed to the DOJ's EOIR for immigration proceedings, this information that is maintained and used by DOJ is covered by the following DOJ SORN: EOIR-001, Records and Management Information System, or any updated or successor SORN, which can be viewed at https://www.justice.gov/opcl/doj-systems-records. Further, your information may be disclosed pursuant to routine uses described in the abovementioned DHS SORNs or DOJ EOIR SORN to federal, state, local, tribal, territorial, and foreign law enforcement agencies for enforcement, investigatory, litigation, or other similar purposes.

For all others, as appropriate under United States law and DHS policy, the information you provide may be shared internally within DHS, as well as with federal, state, local, tribal, territorial, and foreign law enforcement; other government agencies; and other parties for enforcement, investigatory, litigation, or other similar purposes.

Disclosure:
Providing your signature and the date of your signature is voluntary. There are no effects on you for not providing your signature and date; however, removal proceedings may continue notwithstanding the failure or refusal to provide this information.

Official Website of the Department of Homeland Security

Report Crimes: Email or Call 1-866-DHS-2-ICE

Home | Who We Are | **What We Do** | Newsroom | Information Library | Contact ICE

Search Results: 1

GURDEEP SINGH

Country of Birth : India
A-Number: [redacted]
Status : In ICE Custody
State: PA
Current Detention Facility: Philadelphia Federal Detention Center

** Click on the Detention Facility name to obtain facility contact information*

BACK TO SEARCH >

Related Information

Helpful Info

Status of a Case

About the Detainee Locator

Brochure

ICE ERO Field Offices

ICE Detention Facilities

Privacy Notice

External Links

Bureau of Prisons Inmate Locator

DHS.gov USA.gov OIG Open Gov FOIA Metrics No Fear Act Site Map Site Policies & Plug-Ins

An official website of the United States government. Here's how you know

A-Z Topics Site Map FOIA

Search bop.gov

Home | About Us | Inmates | Locations | Careers | Business | Resources | Contact Us

Find an inmate.

Locate the whereabouts of a federal inmate incarcerated from 1982 to the present. Due to the First Step Act, sentences are being reviewed and recalculated to address pending Federal Time Credit changes. As a result, an inmate's release date may not be up-to-date. Website visitors should continue to check back periodically to see if any changes have occurred.

If an individual is listed as "Released" or "Not in BOP Custody" and no facility location is indicated, the inmate is no longer in BOP custody, however, the inmate may still be in the custody of some other correctional/criminal justice system/law enforcement entity, or on parole or supervised release.

Find By Number | Find By Name

Type of Number: INS Number

Number: [redacted]

Search

Result using number [redacted]

Clear Form



GURDEEP SINGH

Register Number: [redacted]

Age: 36
Race: White
Sex: Male

Located at: Philadelphia FDC

Release Date: UNKNOWN

Related Links

- Facility Information
- Call or email
- Send mail/package
- Send money
- Visit
- Voice a concern

About the inmate locator & record availability

About Us
About Our Agency
About Our Facilities
Historical Information
Statistics

Inmates
Find an Inmate
First Step Act
Communications
Custody & Care
Report a Concern
Visiting
Support Coordinators

Locations
List of our Facilities
Map of our Locations
Search for a Facility

Careers
Life at the BOP
Explore Opportunities
Current Openings
Application Process
Our Hiring Process

Business
Acquisitions
Solicitations & Awards
Residential Reentry
Contracting

Resources
Policy & Forms
News Stories
Press Releases
Publications
Research & Reports
Records Available Online

Resources For ...
Attorney Resources
Congressional/Media Reps
Employees
Family/Stakeholders
Former Adults in Custody
Health Management
Victims & Witnesses
Volunteers

APPENDIX

FIRST CIRCUIT

District of Maine

1. Chogllo Chafla v. Scott, No. 25-00437, 2025 WL 2688541 (D. Me. Sept. 22, 2025)
2. Chang Barrios v. Shepley, No. 25-00406, 2025 WL 2772579 (D. Me. Sept. 29, 2025)
3. Chiliquinga Yumbillo v. Stamper, No. 25-00479, 2025 WL 2783642 (D. Me. Sept. 30, 2025)
4. Aguilar Guerra v. Joyce, No. 25-00534, 2025 WL 2999042 (D. Me. Oct. 24, 2025)
5. Petion v. Hyde, No. 25-00535, 2025 WL 3072567 (D. Me. Nov. 3, 2025)

District of Massachusetts

6. Gomes v. Hyde, No. 25-11571, 2025 WL 1869299 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025)
7. Martinez v. Hyde, No. 25-11613, — F. Supp. 3d ——, 2025 WL 2084238 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025)
8. dos Santos v. Lyons, No. 25-12052, 2025 WL 2370988 (D. Mass. Aug. 14, 2025)
9. Romero v. Hyde, No. 25-11631, — F. Supp. 3d ——, 2025 WL 2403827 (D. Mass. Aug. 19, 2025)
10. Diaz Diaz v. Mattivelo, No. 25-12226, 2025 WL 2457610 (D. Mass. Aug. 27, 2025)
11. Doe v. Moniz, No. 25-12094, 2025 WL 2576819 (D. Mass. Sept. 5, 2025)
12. Encarnacion v. Moniz, No. 25-12237, Doc. No. 5 (D. Mass. Sept. 5, 2025)
13. Sampiao v. Hyde, No. 25-11981, 2025 WL 2607924 (D. Mass. Sept. 9, 2025)
14. Hilario Rodriguez v. Moniz, No. 12-12358, Doc. No. 22 (D. Mass Sept. 18, 2025)
15. Locon Cordero v. Hyde, No. 25-12802, Doc. No. 15 (D. Mass. Sept. 28, 2025)
16. Inlago Tocagon v. Moniz, No. 25-12453, — F. Supp. 3d ——, 2025 WL 2778023 (D. Mass. Sept. 29, 2025)
17. Romero-Nolasco v. McDonald, No. 25-12492, 2025 WL 2778036 (D. Mass. Sept. 29, 2025)
18. Romero-Nolasco v. McDonald, No. 25-12584, Doc. No. 9 (D. Mass. Oct. 2, 2025)
19. Elias Escobar v. Hyde, No. 25-12620, 2025 WL 2823324 (D. Mass. Oct. 3, 2025)
20. Guerrero Orellana v. Moniz, No. 25-12664, — F. Supp. 3d ——, 2025 WL 2809996 (D. Mass. Oct. 3, 2025)
21. Pereira de Souza v. Hyde, No. 25-12532, Doc. No. 13 (D. Mass. Oct. 6, 2025)
22. de Andrade v. Moniz, No. 25-12455, 2025 WL 2841844 (D. Mass. Oct. 7, 2025)

23. de Los Reyes Gonzalez v. McDonald, No. 25-12644, Doc. No. 10 (D. Mass. Oct. 9, 2025)

24. Landaverde v. Hyde, No. 25-12552, Doc. No. 16 (D. Mass Oct. 10, 2025)

25. Pineda-Chavez v. Hyde, No. 25-12932, Doc. No. 9 (D. Mass. Oct. 16, 2025)

26. Garcia Guaman v. Hyde, No. 25-12879, Doc. No. 7 (D. Mass. Oct. 17, 2025)

27. Nogueira da Silva v. Hyde, No. 25-12931, Doc. No. 10 (D. Mass. Oct. 17, 2025)

28. Lema Zamora v. Noem, No. 25-12750, 2025 WL 2958879 (D. Mass. Oct. 17, 2025)

29. Custodio de Souza v. Muniz, No. 25-12636, Doc. No. 14 (D. Mass. Oct. 18, 2025)

30. Hercules Acosta v. Hyde, No. 25-13011, Doc. No. 10 (D. Mass. Oct. 20, 2025)

31. Monzon v. Hyde, No. 25-12594, Doc. No. 15 (D. Mass. Oct. 20, 2025)

32. da Silva v. Bondi, No. 25-12672, 2025 WL 2969163 (D. Mass. Oct. 21, 2025)

33. Coelho Gomes v. Moniz, No. 25-13021, Doc. No. 8 (D. Mass. Oct. 22, 2025)

34. Cortez Rivera v. Hyde, No. 25-12390, 2025 WL 2977900 (D. Mass. Oct. 22, 2025)

35. Moreira Aguiar v. Moniz, No. 25-12706, 2025 WL 2987656 (D. Mass. Oct. 22, 2025)

36. Maza Maza v. Hyde, No. 25-13013, Doc. No. 8 (D. Mass. Oct. 23, 2025)

37. Cesario Souza v. Hyde, No. 25-12461, 2025 WL 2997670 (D. Mass. Oct. 24, 2025)

38. Chavez Castillo v. Moniz, No. 25-13091, Doc. No. 8 (D. Mass. Oct. 27, 2025)

39. de Moura v. Moniz, No. 25-13058, Doc. No. 10 (D. Mass. Oct. 27, 2025)

40. Mejia Arias v. Moniz, No. 25-13019, Doc. No. 8 (D. Mass. Oct. 27, 2025)

41. Zolakio v. Hyde, No. 25-13040, Doc. No. 8 (D. Mass. Oct. 28, 2025)

42. Ramirez Ramirez v. Moniz, No. 25-13048, Doc. No. 23 (D. Mass. Oct. 29, 2025)

43. Gamez Martinez v. Moniz, No. 25-13008, Doc. No. 8 (D. Mass. Oct. 30, 2025)

44. Zavala Rivera v. McDonald, No. 25-13070, Doc. No. 8 (D. Mass. Nov. 3, 2025)

45. de Souza Filho v. Hyde, No. 25-13207, Doc. No. 8 (D. Mass. Oct. 30, 2025)

46. Orrego Marin v. Moniz, No. 25-13032, Doc. No. 9 (D. Mass. Nov. 4, 2025)

47. Portillo Martinez, No. 25-11909, 2025 WL 3152847 (D. Mass. Nov. 12, 2025)

48. Anselmo v. Moniz, No. 25-13309, 2025 WL 3171137 (D. Mass. Nov. 13, 2025)

49. Caguana-Caguana v. Moniz, No. 25-13142, 2025 WL 3171043 (D. Mass. Nov. 13, 2025)

District of New Hampshire

50. Jimenez v. FCI Berlin, Warden, No. 25-00326, 2025 WL 2639390 (D.N.H. Sept. 8, 2025)

51. Malan Quizhpi v. Brackett, No. 25-389, Doc. No. 2 (D.N.H. Oct. 9, 2025)

52. Lamidi v. FCI Berlin, Warden, No. 25-00297, Doc. No. 14 (D.N.H. Sept. 15, 2025)

District of Rhode Island

53. Rodriguez v. Bondi, No. 25-406, 2025 WL 2899769 (D.R.I. Oct. 10, 2025)

54. Tomas Elias v. Hyde, No. 25-540, 2025 WL 3004437 (D.R.I. Oct. 27, 2025)

55. Astudillo v. Hyde, No. 25-551, 2025 WL 3035083 (D.R.I. Oct. 30, 2025)

56. Herrera Martinez v. Hyde, No. 25-575, 2025 WL 3124025 (D.R.I. Nov. 7, 2025)

SECOND CIRCUIT

Eastern District of New York

57. J.U. v. Maldonado, No. 25-04836, 2025 WL 2772765 (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 29, 2025)

58. Artiga v. Genalo, No. 25-5208, 2025 WL 2829434 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 5, 2025)

59. Hyppolite v. Noem, No. 25-4304, 2025 WL 2829511 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 6, 2025)

Southern District of New York

60. Lopez Benitez v. Francis, No. 25-5937, —— F. Supp. 3d ——, 2025 WL 2371588 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2025)

61. Samb v. Joyce, No. 25-6373, 2025 WL 2398831 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 19, 2025)

62. Gonzalez v. Joyce, No. 25-8250, 2025 WL 2961626 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 19, 2025)

63. Romero Perez v. Francis, No. 25-8112, 2025 WL 3110459 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 6, 2025)

64. Rueda Torres v. Francis, No. 25-8408, 2025 WL 3168759 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 13, 2025)

Western District of New York

65. Barbosa da Cunha v. Moniz, No. 25-06532, Doc. No. 25 (W.D.N.Y. Oct. 20, 2025)

66. Alvarez Ortiz v. Freden, No. 25-960, —— F. Supp. 3d ——, 2025 WL 3085032 (W.D.N.Y. Nov. 4, 2025)

THIRD CIRCUIT

District of New Jersey

67. Zumba v. Bondi, No. 25-14626, 2025 WL 2753496 (D.N.J. Sept. 26, 2025)

68. Castillo v. Lyons, No. 25-16219, 2025 WL 2940990 (D.N.J. Oct. 10, 2025)

69. Buestan v. Chu, 2025 WL 2972252 (D.N.J. Oct. 21, 2025)

70. Bethancourt Soto v. Soto, No. 25-16200, —— F. Supp. 3d ——, 2025 WL 2976572 (D.N.J. Oct. 22, 2025)

71. Contreras Maldonado v. Cabezas, No. 25-13004, 2025 WL 2985256 (D.N.J. Oct. 23, 2025)

72. Lomeu v. Soto, No. 25-16589, 2025 WL 2981296 (D.N.J. Oct. 23, 2025)

73. Contreras Amaya v. Bondi, No. 25-16742, Doc. No. 7 (D.N.J. Oct. 26, 2025)

74. Patel v. Almodovar, No. 25-15345, 2025 WL 3012323 (D.N.J. Oct. 28, 2025)

75. Alaya Amaya v. Bondi, No. 25-16428, 2025 WL 3033880 (D.N.J. Oct. 30, 2025)

76. Mboup v. Field Off. Dir. of New Jersey Immigr. & Customs Enf't, No. 25-16882, 2025 WL 3062791 (D.N.J. Nov. 3, 2025)

77. Vincenz-Marquez v. Soto, No. 25-16906, 2025 WL 3097496 (D.N.J. Nov. 6, 2025)

78. Guaman Naula v. Noem, No. 25-16792, 2025 WL 3158490 (D.N.J. Nov. 12, 2025

79. Moreira da Silva v. LaForge., No. 25-17095, 2025 WL 3173859 (D.N.J. Nov. 13, 2025)

Eastern District of Pennsylvania

80. Cantu-Cortes v. O'Neill, No. 25-6338, 2025 WL 3171639 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 13, 2025)

81. Kashranov v. Jamison, No. 25-05555, 2025 WL 3188399 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 14, 2025)

Western District of Pennsylvania

82. del Cid v. Bondi, No. 25-00304, 2025 WL 2985150 (W.D. Pa. Oct. 23, 2025)

FOURTH CIRCUIT

District of Maryland

83. Leal-Hernandez v. Noem, No. 25-02428, 2025 WL 2430025 (D. Md. Aug. 24, 2025)

84. Maldonado de Leon v. Baker, No. 25-3084, 2025 WL 2968042 (D. Md. Oct. 21, 2025)

85. Pineda Velasquez v. Sec'y Noem, No. 25-3215, 2025 WL 3003684 (D. Md. Oct. 27, 2025)

Middle District of North Carolina

86. S.D.B.B. v. Johnson, No. 25-882, 2025 WL 2845170 (M.D.N.C. Oct. 7, 2025)

Eastern District of Virginia

87. Hasan v. Crawford, No. 25-01408, —— F. Supp. 3d ——, 2025 WL 2682255 (E.D. Va. Sept. 19, 2025)

88. Quispe v. Crawford, No. 25-01471, 2025 WL 2783799 (E.D. Va. Sept. 29, 2025)

89. Diaz Gonzalez v. Lyons, No. 25-01583, Doc. No. 8 (E.D. Va. Oct. 1, 2025)

90. Gomez Alonzo v. Simon, No. 25-01587, Doc. No. 16 (E.D. Va. Oct. 1, 2025)

91. Perez Bibiano v. Lyons, No. 25-01590, Doc. No. 8 (E.D. Va. Oct. 1, 2025)

92. Vargas Nunez v. Lyons, No. 25-01574, Doc. No. 10 (E.D. Va. Oct. 1, 2025)

93. Ibarra Garcia v. Simon, No. 25-01663, Doc. No. 6 (E.D. Va. Oct. 3, 2025)

94. Guerra Leon v. Noem, No. 25-01634, Doc. No. 12 (E.D. Va. Oct. 8, 2025)

95. Maldonado Merlos v. Noem, No. 25-01645, Doc. No. 11 (E.D. Va. Oct. 9, 2025)

96. Singh v. Lyons, No. 25-01606, 2025 WL 2932635 (E.D. Va. Oct. 14, 2025)

97. Hernandez v. Crawford, No. 25-01565, 2025 WL 2940702 (E.D. Va. Oct. 16, 2025)

98. Flores Pineda v. Simon, No. 25-01616, 2025 WL 2980729 (E.D. Va. Oct. 21, 2025)

99. Gregorio Lapop v. Noem, No. 25-01666, 2025 WL 2997507 (E.D. Va. Oct. 24, 2025)

100. Duarte Escobar, v. Perry, No. 25-00758, 2025 WL 3006742 (E.D. Va. Oct. 27, 2025)

101. Sanchez-Lopez v. Crawford, No. 25-01721, Doc. No. 6 (E.D. Va. Oct. 27, 2025)

102. Sanchez Saire v. Elliston, No. 25-01808, Doc. No. 7 (E.D. Va. Oct. 27, 2025)

103. Garcia Guardado v. Lyons, No. 25-01741, Doc. No. 5 (E.D. Va. Oct. 28, 2025)

104. Montejo v. Lyons, No. 25-01751, Doc. No. 7 (E.D. Va. Oct. 28, 2025)

105. Velasquez Lozano v. Simon, No. 25-01731, Doc. No. 5 (E.D. Va. Oct. 28, 2025)

106. Torres Torres v. Noem, No. 25-01866, Doc. No. 10 (E.D. Va. Nov. 3, 2025)

107. Vicente v. U.S. Immigr. & Customs Enf't, No. 25-01836, Doc. No. 6 (E.D. Va. Nov. 3, 2025)

108. Lopez Sarmiento v. Perry, No. 25-01644, 2025 WL 3091140 (E.D. Va. Nov. 5, 2025)

109. Diaz Garcia v. Noem, No. 25-1712, 2025 WL 3111223 (E.D. Va. Nov. 6, 2025)

110. Servellon Martinez v. Lyons, No. 25-01792, Doc. No. 7 (E.D. Va. Nov. 7, 2025)

FIFTH CIRCUIT

Western District of Louisiana

111. Kostak v. Trump, No. 25-01093, 2025 WL 2472136 (W.D. La. Aug. 27, 2025)

112. Lopez Santos v. Noem, No. 25-01193, 2025 WL 2642278 (W.D. La. Sept. 11, 2025)

113. Barrios Sandoval v. Acuna, No. 25-01467, 2025 WL 3048926 (W.D. La. Oct. 31, 2025)

114. Silva Oliveira v. Patterson, No. 25-01463, 2025 WL 3095972 (W.D. La. Nov. 4, 2025)

Southern District of Texas

115. Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi, No. 25-3726, 2025 WL 2886346 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 7, 2025)

116. Covarrubias v. Vergara, No. 25-112, 2025 WL 2950097 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 8, 2025)

117. Angel Fuentes v. Lyons, No. 25-00153, Doc. No. 15 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 16, 2025)

118. Almanzan Tapia v. Vergara, No. 25-00174, Doc. No. 3 (S.D. Tex Oct. 17, 2025)

119. Torres-Rodriguez v. Noem, No. 25-05035, Doc. No. 5 (S.D. Tex. Nov. 3, 2025)

120. Montoya Cabanas v. Bondi, No. 25-04830, 2025 WL 3171331 (S.D. Tex. Nov. 13, 2025)

121. Cruz Gutierrez v. Warden Thompson, No. 25-4695, 2025 WL 3187521 (S.D. Tex. Nov. 14, 2025)

SIXTH CIRCUIT

Western District of Kentucky

122. Barrera v. Tindall, No. 25-00541, 2025 WL 2690565 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 19, 2025)

123. Singh v. Lewis, No. 25-00096, 2025 WL 2699219 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 22, 2025)

124. Ballestros v. Noem, No. 25-594, 2025 WL 2880831 (W.D. Ky. Oct. 9, 2025)

125. Martinez-Elvir v. Olson, No. 25-589, — F. Supp. 3d ——, 2025 WL 3006772 (W.D. Ky. Oct. 27, 2025)

126. Orellana v. Noem, No. 25-112, — F. Supp. 3d ——, 2025 WL 3006763 (W.D. Ky. Oct. 27, 2025)

127. Hernandez Alonso v. Tindall, No. 25-652, 2025 WL 3083920 (W.D. Ky. Nov. 4, 2025)

Eastern District of Michigan

128. Lopez-Campos v. Raycroft, No. 25-12486, 2025 WL 2496379 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025)

129. Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft, No. 25-12546, 2025 WL 2609425 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9, 2025)

130. Diaz Sandoval v. Raycraft, No. 25-12987, 2025 WL 2977517 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 17, 2025)

131. Pacheco Mayen, v. Raycraft, No. 25-13056, 2025 WL 2978529 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 17, 2025)

132. Casio-Mejia v. Raycraft, No. 25-13032, 2025 WL 2976737 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 21, 2025)

133. Santos Franco v. Raycraft, No. 25-13188, 2025 WL 2977118 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 21, 2025)

134. Gimenez Gonzalez v. Raycraft, No. 25-13094, 2025 WL 3006185 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 27, 2025)

135. Hernandez Capote v. Sec'y of U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec., No. 25-13128, 2025 WL 3089756 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 5, 2025)

136. Diego v. Raycraft, No. 25-13288, 2025 WL 3159106 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 12, 2025)

Western District of Michigan

137. Sanchez Alvarez v. Noem, No. 25-1090, 2025 WL 2942648 (W.D. Mich. Oct. 17, 2025)

138. Rodriguez Carmona v. Noem, No. 25-1131, 2025 WL 2992222 (W.D. Mich. Oct. 24, 2025)

139. Puerto-Hernandez v. Lynch, No. 25-1097, 2025 WL 3012033 (W.D. Mich. Oct. 28, 2025)

140. Marin Garcia v. Noem, No. 25-1271, 2025 WL 3017200 (W.D. Mich. Oct. 29, 2025)

141. Rodriguez v. Noem, No. 25-1196, 2025 WL 3022212 (W.D. Mich. Oct. 29, 2025)

142. de Jesus Ramirez v. Noem, No. 25-1261, 2025 WL 3039266 (W.D. Mich. Oct. 31, 2025)

143. Escobar-Ruiz v. Raycraft, No. 25-1232, 2025 WL 3039255 (W.D. Mich. Oct. 31, 2025)

144. Salgado Mendoza v. Noem, No. 25-1252, 2025 WL 3077589 (W.D. Mich. Nov. 4, 2025)

145. Hernandez Garcia v. Raycraft, No. 25-1281, 2025 WL 3122800 (W.D. Mich. Nov. 7, 2025)

146. Rodriguez Serrano v. Noem, No. 25-1320, 2025 WL 3122825 (W.D. Mich. Nov. 7, 2025)

147. Contreras Alvarez v. Noem, No. 25-1313, 2025 WL 3151948 (W.D. Mich. Nov. 12, 2025)

148. Lucero Lucero v. Noem, No. 25-1295, 2025 WL 3165235 (W.D. Mich. Nov. 12, 2025)

149. Ginez Hernandez v. Noem, No. 25-1307, 2025 WL 3170872 (W.D. Mich. Nov. 13, 2025)

150. Madrid Gonzalez v. Noem, No. 25-1315, 2025 WL 3170879 (W.D. Mich. Nov. 13, 2025)

151. Mora Lara v. Noem, No. 25-1332, 2025 WL 3170876 (W.D. Mich. Nov. 13, 2025)

152. Singh v. Noem, No. 25-1251, 2025 WL 3170855 (W.D. Mich. Nov. 13, 2025)

153. Amigon Cardona v. Unknown Party #1, No. 25-1297, 2025 WL 3200682 (W.D. Mich. Nov. 17, 2025)

154. Sevilla v. Noem, No. 25-1325, 2025 WL 3200698 (W.D. Mich. Nov. 17, 2025)

155. Silva Orellana v. Noem, No. 12-1333, 2025 WL 3198685 (W.D. Mich. Nov. 17, 2025)

Northern District of Ohio

156. Laguna Espinoza v. Dir. of Detroit Field Off., No. 25-02107, 2025 WL 2878173 (N.D. Ohio Oct. 9, 2025)

157. Moraiez Chavez v. Dir. of Detroit Field Off., No. 25-02061, 2025 WL 2959617 (N.D. Ohio Oct. 20, 2025)

158. E.V. v. Raycraft, No. 25-02069, 2025 WL 3122837 (N.D. Ohio Nov. 7, 2025)

159. Morales Chavez v. Dir. of Detroit Field Off., No. 25-02061, 2025 WL 3187080 (N.D. Ohio Nov. 14, 2025)

Western District of Tennessee

160. Godinez-Lopez v. Ladwig, No. 25-02962, 2025 WL 3047889 (W.D. Tenn. Oct. 31, 2025)

SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Northern District of Illinois

161. Ochoa Ochoa v. Noem, No. 25-10865, 2025 WL 2938779 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 16, 2025)

162. H.G.V.U. v. Smith, No. 25-10931, 2025 WL 2962610 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 20, 2025)

163. G.Z.T. v. Smith, No. 25-12802, Doc. No. 14 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 21, 2025)

164. Miguel v. Noem, No. 25-11137, 2025 WL 2976480 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 21, 2025)

165. Padilla v. Noem, No. 25-12462, 2025 WL 2977742 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 22, 2025)

166. Maldonado v. Crowley, No. 25-12762, Doc. No. 16 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 24, 2025)

167. Patel v. Crowley, No. 25-11180, 2025 WL 2996787 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 24, 2025)

168. Amigon Sanchez v. Olson, No. 25-12453, 2025 WL 3004580 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 27, 2025)

169. Corona Diaz v. Olson, No. 25-12141, 2025 WL 3022170 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 29, 2025)

170. Rosales Ponce v. Olson, No. 25-13037, 2025 WL 3049785 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 31, 2025)

171. Valencia v. Noem, No. 25-12829, 2025 WL 3042520 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 31, 2025)

172. D.E.C.T. v. Noem, No. 25-12463, 2025 WL 3063650 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 3, 2025)

173. Flores v. Olson, No. 25-12916, 2025 WL 3063540 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 3, 2025)

174. Galvis Cortes v. Olsen, No. 25-6293, 2025 WL 3063636 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 3, 2025)

175. Reyes Arizmendi v. Noem, No. 25-13041, 2025 WL 3089107 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 5, 2025)

176. Mirzoev v. Olson, No. 25-12969, 2025 WL 3101969 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 6, 2025)

177. Pacheco Carrillo v. Noem, No. 25-12963, 2025 WL 3101993 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 6, 2025)

178. Garcia Rios v. Olson, No. 25-13180, 2025 WL 3124173 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 7, 2025)

179. Munoz Arredondo v. Olson, No. 25-12882, 2025 WL 3124149 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 7, 2025)

180. Perez v. Noem, No. 25-13441, 2025 WL 3140692 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 10, 2025)

181. Ramirez Martinez v. Noem, No. 25-12029, 2025 WL 3145103 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 11, 2025)

182. Vasquez Gonzalez v. Olson, No. 25-13162, 2025 WL 3158191 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 12, 2025)

183. Cabrera v. Noem, No. 25-12160, 2025 WL 3171288 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 13, 2025)

184. Mariscal Serrano v. Salazar, No. 23-13170, 2025 WL 3171354 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 13, 2025)

185. Rodriguez Loredo v. Forestal, No. 25-12758, 2025 WL 3187319 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 14, 2025)

Southern District of Indiana

186. Campos Leon v. Forestal, No. 25-01774, 2025 WL 2694763 (S.D. Ind. Sept. 22, 2025)

187. Alejandro v. Olson, No. 25-02027, 2025 WL 2896348 (S.D. Ind. Oct. 11, 2025)

188. Singh v. Bondi, No. 25-02101, 2025 WL 3029524 (S.D. Ind. Oct. 30, 2025)

189. Delgado Avila v. Crowley, No. 25-00533, — F. Supp. 3d —, 2025 WL 3171175 (S.D. Ind. Nov. 13, 2025)

190. Quishpe-Guaman v. Noem, No. 25-00211, 2025 WL 3201072 (S.D. Ind. Nov. 17, 2025)

EIGHTH CIRCUIT

Northern District of Iowa

191. Giron Reyes v. Lyons, No. 25-04048, 2025 WL 2712427 (N.D. Iowa Sept. 23, 2025)

192. Garcia Picazo v. Sheehan, No. 25-4057, 2025 WL 3006188 (N.D. Iowa Oct. 27, 2025)

193. Chilel Chilel v. Sheehan, No. 25-4053, 2025 WL 3158617 (N.D. Iowa Nov. 12, 2025)

Southern District of Iowa

194. Barrajas v. Noem, No. 25-00322, 2025 WL 2717650 (S.D. Iowa Sept. 23, 2025)

195. Helbrum v. Williams Olson, No. 25-00349, 2025 WL 2840273 (S.D. Iowa Sept. 30, 2025)

District of Minnesota

196. Aguilar Maldonado v. Olson, No. 25-3142, — F. Supp. 3d —, 2025

WL 2374411 (D. Minn. Aug. 15, 2025)

197. J.O.E. v. Bondi, No. 25-03051, —— F. Supp. 3d ——, 2025 WL 2466670 (D. Minn. Aug. 27, 2025)

198. Francisco T. v. Bondi, No. 25-03219, 2025 WL 2629839 (D. Minn. Aug. 29, 2025)

199. Belsai D.S. v. Bondi, No. 25-03682, 2025 WL 2802947 (D. Minn. Oct. 1, 2025)

200. Eliseo A.A. v. Olson, No. 25-3381, 2025 WL 2886729 (D. Minn. Oct. 8, 2025)

201. Herrera Avila v. Bondi, No. 25-3741, 2025 WL 2976539 (D. Minn. Oct. 21, 2025)

202. E.M. v. Noem, No. 25-975, 2025 WL 3157839 (D. Minn. Nov. 12, 2025)

Eastern District of Missouri

203. Mejia Olalde v. Noem, No. 25-00168, 2025 WL 3131942 (E.D. Mo. Nov. 10, 2025)

District of Nebraska

204. Garcia Jimenez v. Kramer, No. 25-03162, 2025 WL 2374223 (D. Neb. Aug. 14, 2025)

205. Carmona-Lorenzo v. Trump, No. 25-3172, 2025 WL 2531521 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025)

206. Palma Perez v. Berg, No. 25-494, —– F. Supp. 3d ——, 2025 WL 2531566 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025)

207. Genchi Palma v. Trump, No. 25-3176, 2025 WL 2624385 (D. Neb. Sept. 11, 2025)

208. Ozuna Carlon v. Karmer, No. 25-3178, 2025 WL 2624386 (D. Neb. Sept. 11, 2025)

209. Perez v. Kramer, No. 25-03179, 2025 WL 2624387 (D. Neb. Sept. 11, 2025)

210. Duenas Arce v. Trump, No. 25-520, Doc. No. 33 (D. Neb. Sept. 18, 2025)

211. Vargas Lopez v. Trump, No. 25-526, 2025 WL 2780351 (D. Neb. Sept. 30, 2025)

NINTH CIRCUIT

District of Arizona

212. Rosado v. Figueroa, No. 25-02157, 2025 WL 2337099 (D. Ariz. Aug. 11, 2025)

213. Echevarria v. Bondi, No. 25-3252, 2025 WL 2821282 (D. Ariz. Oct. 3, 2025)

Central District of California

214. Bautista v. Santacruz, No. 25-01873, 2025 WL 2670875 (C.D. Cal. July 28, 2025)

215. Gonzalez v. Noem, No. 25-02054, 2025 WL 2633187 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 2025)

216. Benitez v. Noem, No. 25-02190, Doc. No. 11 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 26, 2025)

217. Mosqueda v. Noem, No. 25-02394, 2025 WL 2591530 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2025)

218. Arrazola-Gonzalez v. Noem, No. 25-1789, 2025 WL 2379285 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2025)

219. Santiago Flores v. Noem, No. 25-02490, 2025 WL 3050062 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2025)

220. Lopez Pop. v. Noem, No. 25-02589, 2025 WL 3050095 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2025)

221. Garcia v. Noem, No. 25-02771, 2025 WL 2986672 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 22, 2025)

222. Ruiz Yarleque v. Noem, No. 25-02836, 2025 WL 3043936 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 31, 2025)

Eastern District of California

223. Guzman v. Andrews, No. 25-01015, 2025 WL 2617256 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025)

224. Lepe v. Andrews, No. 25-01163, —— F. Supp. 3d ——, 2025 WL 2716910 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2025)

225. Ortiz Donis v. Chestnut, No. 25-01228, 2025 WL 2879514 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 9, 2025)

226. J.S.H.M v. Wofford, No. 25-01309, 2025 WL 2938808 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 16, 2025)

227. Sabi Polo v. Chestnut, No. 25-01342, 2025 WL 2959346 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2025)

228. C.A.R.V. v. Wofford, No. 25-01395, 2025 WL 3059549 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 3, 2025)

229. F.M.V. v. Wofford, No. 25-01381, 2025 WL 3083934 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2025)

230. Menjivar Sanchez v. Wofford, No. 25-1187, 2025 WL 3089712 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 5, 2025)

231. O.P.A.M. v. Wofford, No. 25-01423, 2025 WL 3120552 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2025)

232. M.V.I. v. Andrews, No. 25-01440, 2025 WL 3154403 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2025)

233. Estuardo Marin v. Andrews, No. 25-01422, 2025 WL 3171484 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2025)

234. Morillo v. Albarran, No. 25-01533, 2025 WL 3190899 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 15, 2025)

Northern District of California

235. Hernandez Nieves v. Kaiser, No. 25-6921, 2025 WL 2533110 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025)

236. Hinestroza v. Kaiser, No. 25-07559, 2025 WL 2606983 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025)

237. Salcedo Aceros v. Kaiser, No. 25-06924, 2025 WL 2637503 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 12, 2025)

238. Roa v. Albarran, No. 25-07802, 2025 WL 2732923 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2025)

239. Valencia Zapata v. Kaiser, No. 25-07492, —— F. Supp. 3d ——, 2025 WL 2741654 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 26, 2025)

240. Cordero Pelico v. Kaiser, No. 25-07286, 2025 WL 2822876 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2025)

241. Chavez v. Kaiser, No. 25-06984, 2025 WL 2909526 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 9, 2025)

242. Pablo Sequen v. Albarran, No. 25-06487, 2025 WL 2935630 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 15, 2025)

243. J.A.C.P. v. Wofford, No. 25-01354, 2025 WL 3013328 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 27, 2025)

244. J.A.E.M. v. Wofford, No. 25-01380, 2025 WL 3013377 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 27, 2025)

245. Ramandi v. Off. Dir., ICE ERO San Francisco, No. 25-01462, 2025 WL 3182732 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 14, 2025)

Southern District of California

246. Vasquez Garcia v. Noem, No. 25-02180, 2025 WL 2549431 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025)

247. Sixtos Chavez v. Noem, No. 25-2325, Doc. No. 8 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2025)

248. Esquivel-Ipina v. LaRose, No. 25-2672, 2025 WL 2998361 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2025)

249. Lopez v. Warden, Otay Mesa Det. Ctr., No. 25-2527, 2025 WL 3005346 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 27, 2025)

250. Martinez Lopez v. LaRose, No. 25-2717, 2025 WL 3030457 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2025)

251. Carmelo Beltran v. Noem, No. 25-2650, 2025 WL 3078837 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2025)

252. Garcia Magadan v. Noem, No 25-2889, 2025 WL 3090089 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 5, 2025)

253. Aquino v. LaRose, No. 25-2904, 2025 WL 3158676 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2025)

254. Pelico Calel v. LaRose, No. 25-02883, 2025 WL 3171898 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2025)

District of Hawaii

255. Rico-Tapia v. Smith, No. 25-00379, 2025 WL 2950089 (D. Haw. Oct. 10, 2025)

District of Nevada

256. Maldonado Vazquez v. Feeley, No. 25-01542, 2025 WL 2676082 (D. Nev. Sept. 17, 2025)

257. Sanchez Roman v. Noem, No. 25-01684, 2025 WL 2710211 (D. Nev. Sept. 23, 2025)

258. Carlos v. Noem, No. 25-01900, 2025 WL 2896156 (D. Nev. Oct. 10, 2025)

259. E.C. v. Noem, No. 25-01789, 2025 WL 2916264 (D. Nev. Oct. 14, 2025)

260. Aparicio v. Noem, No. 25-01919, 2025 WL 2998098 (D. Nev. Oct. 23, 2025)

261. Dominguez-Lara v. Noem, No. 25-01553, 2025 WL 2998094 (D. Nev. Oct. 24, 2025)

262. Bautista-Avalos v. Bernacke, No. 25-1987, 2025 WL 3014023 (D. Nev. Oct. 27, 2025)

263. Arce-Cervera v. Noem, No. 25-01895, 2025 WL 3017866 (D. Nev. Oct. 28, 2025)

264. Rodriguez Cabrera v. Mattos, No. 25-01551, 2025 WL 3072687 (D. Nev. Nov. 3, 2025)

265. Hernandez-Luna v. Noem, No. 25-01818, 2025 WL 3102039 (D. Nev. Nov. 6, 2025)

266. Mendez v. Noem, No. 25-02062, 2025 WL 3124285 (D. Nev. Nov. 7, 2025)

District of Oregon

267. L.A.E. v. Wamsley, No. 25-01975, 2025 WL 3037856 (D. Or. Oct. 30, 2025)

268. J.Y.L.C. v. Bostock, No. 25-02083, Doc. No. 15 (D. Or. Nov. 12, 2025)

Western District of Washington

269. Rodriguez v. Bostock, No. 25-05240, 2025 WL 2782499 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 30, 2025)

270. Torres v. Wamsley, No. 25-5772, 2025 WL 2855379 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 8, 2025)

271. Cantero Garcia v. Wamsley, No. 25-02092, 2025 WL 3123996 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 7, 2025)

272. Marcia Navarette v. Wamsley, No. 25-02150, 2025 WL 3134712 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 10, 2025)

TENTH CIRCUIT

District of Colorado

273. Garcia Cortes v. Noem, No. 25-02677, 2025 WL 2652880 (D. Colo. Sept. 16, 2025)

274. Mendoza Gutierrez, v. Baltazar, No. 25-2720, 2025 WL 2962908 (D. Colo. Oct. 17, 2025)

275. Loa Caballero v. Baltazar, No. 25-03120, 2025 WL 2977650 (D. Colo. Oct. 22, 2025)

276. Nava Hernandez v. Baltazar, No. 25-03094, 2025 WL 2996643 (D. Colo. Oct. 24, 2025)

District of New Mexico

277. Velasquez Salazar v. Dedos, No. 25-00835, — F. Supp. 3d —, 2025 WL 2676729, (D.N.M. Sept. 17, 2025)

278. Garcia Domingo v. Castro, No. 25-00979, — F. Supp. 3d —, 2025 WL 2941217 (D.N.M. Oct. 15, 2025)

279. Pu Sacvin v. de Anda-Ybarra, No. 25-01031, 2025 WL 3187432 (D.N.M. Nov. 14, 2025)

ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

Middle District of Florida

280. Garcia v. Noem, No. 25-00879, 2025 WL 3041895 (M.D. Fla. Oct. 31, 2025)

281. Hernandez Lopez v. Hardin, No. 25-00830, 2025 WL 3022245 (M.D. Fla. Oct. 29, 2025)

282. Vasquez Carcamo v. Noem, No. 25-00922, 2025 WL 3119263 (M.D. Fla. Nov. 7, 2025)

283. Erazo v. Hardin, No. 25-00891, 2025 WL 3187136 (M.D. Fla. Nov. 14, 2025)

Southern District of Florida

284. Merino v. Ripa, No. 25-23845, 2025 WL 2941609 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 15, 2025)

285. Puga v. Assistant Field Off. Dir., Krome N. Serv. Processing Ctr., No. 25-24535, 2025 WL 2938369 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 15, 2025)

Middle District of Georgia

286. J.A.M. v. Streeval, No. 25-342, 2025 WL 3050094 (M.D. Ga. Nov. 1, 2025)

Southern District of Georgia

287. Aguirre Villa v. Warden Normand, No. 25-89, 2025 WL 3095969 (S.D. Ga. Nov. 4, 2025)

288. Villa v. Warden Normand, No. 25-100, 2025 WL 3188406 (S.D. Ga. Nov. 14, 2025)