AO 242 (Rev. 09/17) Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Middle District of Georgia

Harry José Lacayo Aguirre

Petitioner

v.

Warden, Stewart Detention Center

Respondent
(name of warden or authorized person having custody of petitioner)

Case No. _____
(Supplied by Clerk of Court)

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

Personal Information

1. (a) Your full name: Harry José Lacayo Aguirre
   (b) Other names you have used: NONE
2. Place of confinement:
   (a) Name of institution: Warden, Stewart Detention Center
   (b) Address: 146 CCA Road,Lumpkin, GA 31815
   (c) Your identification number: A# [redacted]
3. Are you currently being held on orders by:
   ☑ Federal authorities ☐ State authorities ☐ Other - explain:
4. Are you currently:
   ☐ A pretrial detainee (waiting for trial on criminal charges)
   ☐ Serving a sentence (incarceration, parole, probation, etc.) after having been convicted of a crime
   If you are currently serving a sentence, provide:
   (a) Name and location of court that sentenced you:
   (b) Docket number of criminal case:
   (c) Date of sentencing:
   ☑ Being held on an immigration charge
   ☐ Other *(explain)*:

Decision or Action You Are Challenging

5. What are you challenging in this petition:
   ☐ How your sentence is being carried out, calculated, or credited by prison or parole authorities (for example, revocation or calculation of good time credits)

☐ Pretrial detention
☑ Immigration detention
☐ Detainer
☐ The validity of your conviction or sentence as imposed (for example, sentence beyond the statutory maximum or improperly calculated under the sentencing guidelines)
☐ Disciplinary proceedings
☐ Other *(explain)*:

6. Provide more information about the decision or action you are challenging:

(a) Name and location of the agency or court: Immigration Court
5701 Executive Center Drive, Suite 400, Charlotte, NC 28212

(b) Docket number, case number, or opinion number: A# [redacted]

(c) Decision or action you are challenging *(for disciplinary proceedings, specify the penalties imposed)*:
Continued immigration detention following arrest at a scheduled immigration appointment on May 5, 2026, without adequate individualized review, and ongoing detention under unconstitutional conditions.

(d) Date of the decision or action: 05/05/2026

Your Earlier Challenges of the Decision or Action

7. **First appeal**

Did you appeal the decision, file a grievance, or seek an administrative remedy?
☑ Yes ☐ No

(a) If "Yes," provide:

(1) Name of the authority, agency, or court: Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA)

(2) Date of filing: 03/27/2026

(3) Docket number, case number, or opinion number: A [redacted]

(4) Result: Pending

(5) Date of result:

(6) Issues raised: Challenge to removal order and request for review of Immigration Judge's decision.

(b) If you answered "No," explain why you did not appeal:

8. **Second appeal**

After the first appeal, did you file a second appeal to a higher authority, agency, or court?
☐ Yes ☑ No

(a) If "Yes," provide:

(1) Name of the authority, agency, or court:

(2) Date of filing:

(3) Docket number, case number, or opinion number:

(4) Result:

(5) Date of result:

(6) Issues raised:

(b) If you answered "No," explain why you did not file a second appeal: The appeal before the Board of Immigration Appeals remains pending and no final decision has been issued.

9. **Third appeal**

After the second appeal, did you file a third appeal to a higher authority, agency, or court?

☐ Yes ☑ No

(a) If "Yes," provide:

(1) Name of the authority, agency, or court:

(2) Date of filing:

(3) Docket number, case number, or opinion number:

(4) Result:

(5) Date of result:

(6) Issues raised:

(b) If you answered "No," explain why you did not file a third appeal: No second-level appellate decision has been issued.

10. **Motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255**

In this petition, are you challenging the validity of your conviction or sentence as imposed?

☐ Yes ☑ No

If "Yes," answer the following:

(a) Have you already filed a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 that challenged this conviction or sentence?

☐ Yes ☑ No

If "Yes," provide:

(1) Name of court:

(2) Case number:

(3) Date of filing:

(4) Result:

(5) Date of result:

(6) Issues raised:

(b) Have you ever filed a motion in a United States Court of Appeals under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A), seeking permission to file a second or successive Section 2255 motion to challenge this conviction or sentence?

☐ Yes ☑ No

If "Yes," provide:

(1) Name of court:

(2) Case number:

(3) Date of filing:

(4) Result:

(5) Date of result:

(6) Issues raised:

(c) Explain why the remedy under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 is inadequate or ineffective to challenge your conviction or sentence: Petitioner is not challenging a criminal conviction or sentence. He is challengin unlawful civil immigration detention under 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

11 **Appeals of immigration proceedings**

Does this case concern immigration proceedings?

☑ Yes ☐ No

If "Yes," provide:

(a) Date you were taken into immigration custody: 05/05/2026

(b) Date of the removal or reinstatement order: 03/17/2026

(c) Did you file an appeal with the Board of Immigration Appeals?

☑ Yes ☐ No

If "Yes," provide:

(1) Date of filing: 03/27/2026

(2) Case number: A[redacted]

(3) Result: Pending

(4) Date of result:

(5) Issues raised: Challenge to removal order and continued detention

(d) Did you appeal the decision to the United States Court of Appeals?

☐ Yes ☑ No

If "Yes," provide:

(1) Name of court:

(2) Date of filing:

(3) Case number:

(4) Result:

(5) Date of result:

(6) Issues raised:

12. **Other appeals**

Other than the appeals you listed above, have you filed any other petition, application, or motion about the issues raised in this petition?

☐ Yes ☑ No

If "Yes," provide:

(a) Kind of petition, motion, or application:

(b) Name of the authority, agency, or court:

(c) Date of filing:

(d) Docket number, case number, or opinion number:

(e) Result:

(f) Date of result:

(g) Issues raised:

Grounds for Your Challenge in This Petition

13. State every ground (reason) that supports your claim that you are being held in violation of the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. Attach additional pages if you have more than four grounds. State the facts supporting each ground. Any legal arguments must be submitted in a separate memorandum.

GROUND ONE: Unlawful detention without adequate due process.

(a) Supporting facts *(Be brief. Do not cite cases or law.)*:

Petitioner was arrested on May 5, 2026 after voluntarily appearing at a scheduled immigration appointment and remains detained without adequate individualized review of necessity for detention.

(b) Did you present Ground One in all appeals that were available to you?

☐ Yes ☑ No

GROUND TWO: Unconstitutional conditions of confinement.

(a) Supporting facts *(Be brief. Do not cite cases or law.)*:

Petitioner has been subjected to inadequate food, water restrictions, unsanitary conditions, overcrowding, and denial of adequate medical care.

(b) Did you present Ground Two in all appeals that were available to you?

☐ Yes ☑ No

GROUND THREE: Denial of medical care and mental health deterioration.

(a) Supporting facts *(Be brief. Do not cite cases or law.)*:

Petitioner has suffered anxiety, depression, dehydration, and illness while detained and has not received adequate medical treatment.

(b) Did you present Ground Three in all appeals that were available to you?

☐ Yes ☑ No

GROUND FOUR: Threat of retaliatory transfer, removal, or interference with access to courts.

(a) Supporting facts *(Be brief. Do not cite cases or law.)*:

Petitioner fears transfer, isolation, or removal during the pendency of this action, which could interfere with access to judicial review and cause irreparable harm

(b) Did you present Ground Four in all appeals that were available to you?

☐ Yes ☑ No

14. If there are any grounds that you did not present in all appeals that were available to you, explain why you did not: The Board of Immigration Appeals does not provide an adequate remedy for the constitutional detention issues and conditions of confinement challenged in this habeas petition. Immediate judicial review is necessary to prevent irreparable harm.

Request for Relief

15. State exactly what you want the court to do: Issue a writ of habeas corpus, order Respondents to justify Petitioner's detention, prohibit retaliatory transfer or removal while this case is pending, order a constitutionally adequate custody review, and grant immediate release or any other relief the Court deems just and proper.

Declaration Under Penalty Of Perjury

If you are incarcerated, on what date did you place this petition in the prison mail system:

_____

I declare under penalty of perjury that I am the petitioner, I have read this petition or had it read to me, and the information in this petition is true and correct. I understand that a false statement of a material fact may serve as the basis for prosecution for perjury.

Date: 06/08/2026

Harry José Lacayo Aguirre

Signature of Petitioner

06/08/2026

Signature of Attorney or other authorized person, if any

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

Instructions

1. **Who Should Use This Form.** You should use this form if
   - you are a federal prisoner and you wish to challenge the way your sentence is being carried out *(for example, you claim that the Bureau of Prisons miscalculated your sentence or failed to properly award good time credits)*;
   - you are in federal or state custody because of something other than a judgment of conviction *(for example, you are in pretrial detention or are awaiting extradition)*, or
   - you are alleging that you are illegally detained in immigration custody.

2. **Who Should Not Use This Form.** You should not use this form if
   - you are challenging the validity of a federal judgment of conviction and sentence *(these challenges are generally raised in a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255)*;
   - you are challenging the validity of a state judgment of conviction and sentence *(these challenges are generally raised in a petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2254)*; or
   - you are challenging a final order of removal in an immigration case *(these challenges are generally raised in a petition for review directly with a United States Court of Appeals)*.

3. **Preparing the Petition.** The petition must be typed or neatly written, and you must sign and date it under penalty of perjury. **A false statement may lead to prosecution.**

4. **Answer all the questions.** You do not need to cite law. You may submit additional pages if necessary. If you do not fill out the form properly, you will be asked to submit additional or correct information. If you want to submit any legal arguments, you must submit them in a separate memorandum. Be aware that any such memorandum may be subject to page limits set forth in the local rules of the court where you file this petition. If you attach additional pages, number the pages and identify which section of the petition is being continued. All filings must be submitted on paper sized 8½ by 11 inches. **Do not use the back of any page.**

5. **Supporting Documents.** In addition to your petition, you must send to the court a copy of the decisions you are challenging and a copy of any briefs or administrative remedy forms filed in your case.

6. **Required Filing Fee.** You must include the $5 filing fee required by 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a). If you are unable to pay the filing fee, you must ask the court for permission to proceed in forma pauperis – that is, as a person who cannot pay the filing fee – by submitting the documents that the court requires.

7. **Submitting Documents to the Court.** Mail your petition and ____ copies to the clerk of the United States District Court for the district and division in which you are confined. For a list of districts and divisions, see 28 U.S.C. §§ 81-131. All copies must be identical to the original. Copies may be legibly handwritten.

   If you want a file-stamped copy of the petition, you must enclose an additional copy of the petition and ask the court to file-stamp it and return it to you.

8. **Change of Address.** You must immediately notify the court in writing of any change of address. If you do not, the court may dismiss your case.

FILED IN CLERK'S OFFICE
U.S.D.C. - Macon, GA
2026 JUN 17 PM 3:15

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
COLUMBUS DIVISION

HARRY JOSÉ LACAYO AGUIRRE,

A No. [redacted]

Petitioner,

v.

WARDEN, STEWART DETENTION CENTER;

U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT;

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY;

and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

Civil Action No.: _____

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2241

EMERGENCY RELIEF REQUESTED

Pro Se Immigration Detention Case

VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2241 AND REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE JUDICIAL PROTECTION AGAINST UNLAWFUL DETENTION, RETALIATORY TRANSFER, ISOLATION, REMOVAL, OR THIRD-COUNTRY TRANSFER

I. INTRODUCTION AND NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Petitioner, Harry José Lacayo Aguirre, A No. [redacted], is a Nicaraguan national detained at Stewart Detention Center, 146 CCA Road, Lumpkin, Georgia 31815. He files this Petition pro se under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 to challenge his present physical custody and the ongoing constitutional violations connected to that custody.

2. This case concerns the arrest and detention of a noncitizen who appeared responsibly and voluntarily for a regular immigration appointment on May 5, 2026. Instead of being treated as a compliant individual with family ties and no serious criminal history, Petitioner was taken into custody without a judicial warrant, without a neutral probable-cause determination, and without an individualized assessment of flight risk or danger adequate to satisfy the Constitution.

3. The detention has not been merely technical or administrative. Petitioner alleges that his confinement has exposed him to extreme rationing of food and water, repeated access to spoiled or unsafe food, denial or delay of medical attention when ill, verbal abuse by detention officers, inadequate sanitation, overcrowded conditions, dehydration, anxiety, depression, and fear of retaliation if he seeks court protection

4. Petitioner further alleges a concrete fear that the facility or federal officials may retaliate against him by transferring him away from Stewart Detention Center, placing him in isolation, or removing him or sending him to a third country without meaningful notice or authorization, thereby frustrating this Court's habeas jurisdiction and causing irreparable harm to Petitioner and his family.

5. This Petition seeks immediate judicial review because habeas corpus protects against executive detention that is unlawful, arbitrary, punitive, retaliatory, or constitutionally excessive. The Suspension Clause and 28 U.S.C. § 2241 preserve this Court's authority to test the legality of custody and to order meaningful relief when custody violates the Constitution or laws of the United States.

6. Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court issue the writ, require Respondents to show cause, prohibit retaliation, transfer, isolation, removal, or third-country transfer while this matter is pending, order a constitutionally adequate individualized custody hearing before a neutral decisionmaker, and grant immediate release or such other relief as justice requires.

II. PARTIES

7. Petitioner Harry José Lacayo Aguirre is a detained noncitizen, born [redacted] and a national of Nicaragua. His Alien Registration Number is A [redacted]. He entered the United States on or about March 22, 2022.

8. Petitioner is presently confined at Stewart Detention Center in Lumpkin, Georgia. Stewart Detention Center is located within Stewart County, Georgia, which falls within the Columbus Division of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia.

9. Respondent Warden of Stewart Detention Center is Petitioner's immediate physical custodian for habeas purposes and is responsible for producing Petitioner before the Court and complying with any order concerning Petitioner's custody.

10. Respondent U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement is the federal agency exercising immigration detention authority over Petitioner.

11. Respondent U.S. Department of Homeland Security is the department responsible for ICE and for the detention, transfer, and removal decisions challenged herein.

12. Respondent United States of America is named because the challenged custody is federal custody executed under color of federal law.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

13. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 because Petitioner is in custody under the authority of the United States and challenges the legality and conditions-related basis of that custody.

14. This Court also has jurisdiction under Article I, Section 9, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution, which protects the writ of habeas corpus, and under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because the Petition raises federal constitutional and statutory questions.

15. Venue is proper in the Columbus Division of the Middle District of Georgia because Petitioner is detained at Stewart Detention Center in Stewart County, Georgia, and because his immediate custodian is located within this District and Division.

16. The Supreme Court has recognized that the proper respondent in a core habeas challenge is ordinarily the immediate custodian, and the proper district is the district of confinement. Rumsfeld v. Padilla, 542 U.S. 426 (2004). Petitioner is confined within this District; therefore this Court has territorial habeas jurisdiction.

17. The official Columbus divisional courthouse information lists the U.S. Post Office and Courthouse at 120 12th Street, Columbus, Georgia 31902, with a mailing address of U.S. Post Office & Court House, P.O. Box 124, Columbus, Georgia 31902

IV. EXHAUSTION AND NEED FOR IMMEDIATE JUDICIAL REVIEW

18. To the extent Respondents argue that Petitioner should pursue additional administrative processes before filing, exhaustion is excused because this Petition challenges present physical custody, constitutional detention defects, punitive and unsafe conditions connected to the legality of confinement, and imminent irreparable harm.

19. Administrative remedies are inadequate where they cannot provide timely release, cannot prevent retaliatory transfer, cannot preserve the Court's jurisdiction, cannot stop imminent removal or third-country transfer, and cannot remedy ongoing denial of basic human needs such as water, food, sanitation, and medical attention.

20. Exhaustion is also futile where the agency whose conduct is challenged controls the detention, transfer, and removal mechanisms that create the threat. Habeas jurisdiction exists precisely so a neutral Article III court can test executive custody before the harm becomes irreversible.

21. Petitioner does not seek to bypass ordinary process for strategic reasons. He seeks immediate review because his liberty, health, family stability, and access to the Court are at risk now.

V. STATEMENT OF FACTS

22. Petitioner is Harry José Lacayo Aguirre, A No. [redacted], born [redacted] and a citizen and national of Nicaragua.

23. Petitioner entered the United States on or about March 22, 2022.

24. On May 5, 2026, Petitioner appeared responsibly and voluntarily for a regular immigration appointment. Petitioner did not flee, hide, disobey, or avoid immigration supervision. His appearance demonstrated compliance, stability, and respect for the process.

25. During that appointment, Petitioner was taken into custody. The arrest was not supported by a judicial warrant issued by a neutral magistrate, and Petitioner was not provided a meaningful individualized probable-cause determination before the deprivation of liberty.

26. Petitioner alleges that the arrest was executed without constitutionally sufficient cause and without a contemporaneous individualized inquiry into whether detention was actually necessary.

27. Since his detention, Petitioner has been housed at Stewart Detention Center, 146 CCA Road, Lumpkin, Georgia 31815.

28. Petitioner alleges extreme rationing of food and water. He has experienced dehydration as a result of the rationing and fears serious medical harm if the practice continues.

29. Petitioner alleges that he has repeatedly been forced to eat food that was spoiled, unsafe, or in bad condition. Access to minimally safe food and water is not a discretionary privilege; it is a constitutional baseline.

30. Petitioner alleges that when he has felt ill or become sick, he has been denied adequate medical attention or treatment. This denial is especially dangerous in the context of dehydration, anxiety, depression, and unsafe food conditions.

31. Petitioner alleges verbal abuse and mistreatment by officers at the detention facility. Such abuse worsens the punitive nature of confinement and contributes to emotional deterioration.

32. Petitioner alleges poor hygiene, overcrowding, and unsanitary conditions inside the facility. These conditions increase risk of illness and further demonstrate that his civil immigration detention is being administered in a punitive manner.

33. Petitioner has developed or suffered severe anxiety and depression because of his irregular detention and the conditions he has experienced. His psychological distress is intensified by uncertainty, separation from family, and fear of retaliation.

34. Petitioner fears that if he presents this Petition, detention officials may retaliate by transferring him to another facility, isolating him, punishing him, or otherwise interfering with his ability to litigate.

35. Petitioner specifically fears retaliatory transfer designed to defeat or complicate this Court's jurisdiction. Transfer during pending habeas litigation can severely impair access to legal materials, family assistance, mail, evidence, and court communications.

36. Petitioner also fears deportation or transfer to a third country without meaningful advance notice, lawful authorization, or opportunity to seek emergency judicial protection. Such action could cause irreparable harm to Petitioner and his family.

37. Petitioner has no serious criminal record identified in the facts presented to this Court. He is not alleged here to present a danger to the community.

38. Petitioner has substantial ties in the United States and family support. His wife is gravely affected by his detention because he was the head of household and an economic provider.

39. Petitioner's compliance with immigration supervision, his voluntary appearance at a scheduled appointment, his absence of serious criminal history, and his family responsibilities all demonstrate that detention is not reasonably necessary to prevent flight or protect the community.

40. Less restrictive alternatives exist, including release on recognizance, bond, reporting, supervision, electronic check-ins, or any other narrowly tailored condition the Court deems proper.

VI. LEGAL FRAMEWORK

41. Habeas corpus remains the traditional and fundamental mechanism for testing the legality of executive detention. The writ is not limited to criminal imprisonment. It extends to immigration custody when a petitioner is detained under federal authority and alleges that custody violates the Constitution or laws of the United States.

42. In INS v. St. Cyr, 533 U.S. 289 (2001), the Supreme Court emphasized the historic availability of habeas review over executive detention and immigration-related custody decisions. In Boumediene v. Bush, 553 U.S. 723 (2008), the Court confirmed that habeas must provide a meaningful opportunity to challenge detention before a neutral decisionmaker.

43. Immigration detention is civil, not criminal punishment. Because it is civil, it must remain reasonably related to legitimate governmental purposes and cannot become excessive, arbitrary, retaliatory, or punitive. Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678 (2001); Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520 (1979).

44. The Due Process Clause protects all persons within the United States, including noncitizens, from deprivation of liberty without constitutionally adequate process. Zadvydas, 533 U.S. at 693; Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976).

45. The Government's interest in immigration enforcement does not eliminate the requirement of individualized process. Detention must be justified in the particular case, especially when a person complied with supervision and appeared voluntarily for an appointment.

46. The Supreme Court has rejected indefinite, arbitrary, or excessive civil detention. Zadvydas held that post-removal-period detention is limited by serious constitutional concerns. Jennings v. Rodriguez, 583 U.S. 281

(2018), addressed statutory interpretation but did not eliminate constitutional due process challenges to immigration detention.

47. Demore v. Kim, 538 U.S. 510 (2003), upheld certain brief mandatory detention in a narrow context, but it did not authorize detention that becomes prolonged, retaliatory, medically dangerous, or punitive. Demore also relied on the premise that detention would be limited and connected to legitimate proceedings.

48. The Fifth Amendment requires a balancing of the private interest, risk of erroneous deprivation, probable value of additional safeguards, and the Government's interest. Mathews, 424 U.S. at 335. Petitioner has the highest private interest: physical liberty, bodily integrity, family unity, and safety.

49. The Eighth Amendment's deliberate indifference cases, while arising in penal settings, inform constitutional standards regarding serious medical needs and basic human necessities. Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97 (1976); Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825 (1994). Civil detainees are entitled to at least comparable protection under the Due Process Clause.

50. The First Amendment protects the right to petition the courts, and the Due Process Clause protects meaningful access to judicial review. Retaliatory transfer, isolation, intimidation, or removal designed to punish or obstruct habeas litigation would violate core constitutional protections.

51. The All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651, empowers federal courts to issue orders necessary or appropriate in aid of their jurisdiction. Where a transfer or removal would frustrate habeas jurisdiction, protective orders are appropriate to preserve the Court's ability to decide the case.

COUNT ONE: UNLAWFUL SEIZURE AND DETENTION WITHOUT JUDICIAL WARRANT, PROBABLE CAUSE, OR ADEQUATE PROCESS

52. Petitioner incorporates all prior paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

53. Petitioner was seized while complying with a regular immigration appointment. The fact that he appeared voluntarily undercuts any claim that immediate custodial arrest was necessary.

54. A custodial arrest that removes a person from liberty must rest on constitutionally adequate authority and individualized justification. The absence of a judicial warrant and neutral probable-cause determination is especially troubling when the person was not attempting to flee and had submitted himself to supervision.

55. Respondents' conduct violates the Fourth and Fifth Amendments because Petitioner was deprived of liberty without adequate cause, without a neutral decisionmaker, and without prompt individualized review sufficient to justify continued detention.

56. The remedy should include immediate release or, at minimum, a prompt constitutionally adequate custody hearing where the Government bears the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that detention is necessary and that no less restrictive alternative can reasonably protect governmental interests.

COUNT TWO: VIOLATION OF SUBSTANTIVE AND PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS THROUGH ARBITRARY, EXCESSIVE, AND PUNITIVE CIVIL DETENTION

57. Petitioner incorporates all prior paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

58. Civil immigration detention cannot be punishment. It must be tied to legitimate, nonpunitive purposes and must remain reasonably necessary in the individual case.

59. Petitioner is not alleged in the facts presented here to have a serious criminal record or to pose a danger to the community. His voluntary appearance for an immigration appointment is strong evidence that he is not a flight risk.

60. Detaining a compliant head-of-household with family ties, no serious criminal history, and available alternatives to detention is excessive when Respondents have not provided a meaningful individualized explanation for why liberty-restricting alternatives would be insufficient.

61. The detention has become punitive in operation because Petitioner is subjected to unsafe food, water rationing, denial of medical care, verbal abuse, overcrowding, and unsanitary conditions. These conditions are not reasonably related to immigration processing and shock the conscience when imposed on a civil detainee.

62. Respondents' conduct violates the Fifth Amendment's substantive and procedural due process guarantees.

COUNT THREE: UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONDITIONS OF CIVIL DETENTION AND DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE TO BASIC HUMAN NEEDS

63. Petitioner incorporates all prior paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

64. Petitioner alleges extreme rationing of food and water, repeated spoiled or unsafe food, dehydration, poor sanitation, overcrowding, and denial of medical treatment when ill.

65. Food, water, sanitation, and medical care are foundational human needs. The Constitution does not permit the Government to hold a person in civil custody while disregarding conditions that threaten health, bodily integrity, and human dignity.

66. Where officials know of serious risks and fail to take reasonable steps to address them, the Constitution is violated. Estelle and Farmer establish that deliberate indifference to serious medical needs and health risks is constitutionally intolerable; civil detainees are entitled to protection under the Fifth Amendment at least as strong as that available to convicted prisoners.

67. These conditions also bear directly on the legality of custody because detention administered under dangerous, punitive, or medically indifferent conditions exceeds lawful civil detention authority.

COUNT FOUR: DENIAL OF MEDICAL CARE FOR ANXIETY, DEPRESSION, ILLNESS, AND DEHYDRATION

68. Petitioner incorporates all prior paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

69. Petitioner suffers anxiety and depression caused or aggravated by detention, and he alleges dehydration from extreme rationing. He has also become ill or felt ill and has been denied adequate medical attention or treatment.

70. Mental health deterioration, dehydration, and untreated illness are serious medical concerns. The Constitution requires reasonable medical evaluation and treatment, particularly when the Government itself controls every aspect of Petitioner's access to care.

71. Denial or delay of care in these circumstances is not a mere disagreement over treatment. It is the deprivation of basic medical access to a person fully dependent on the Government for survival and health.

COUNT FIVE: RETALIATION, ACCESS TO COURTS, AND THREAT OF TRANSFER OR ISOLATION

72. Petitioner incorporates all prior paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

73. Petitioner fears retaliation for filing this habeas action, including unjustified transfer, isolation, punishment, or other interference.

74. Retaliation for seeking judicial relief violates the First Amendment right to petition and the Fifth Amendment right to due process. Civil detainees do not lose the right to access courts by virtue of immigration detention.

75. A transfer designed to frustrate habeas review would undermine this Court's jurisdiction and Petitioner's ability to litigate. It would also interfere with family assistance, evidence gathering, mail, and communication.

76. Petitioner requests an order prohibiting Respondents and their agents from retaliating, transferring, isolating, punishing, or otherwise interfering with Petitioner's access to this Court during the pendency of this case absent advance notice and leave of Court.

COUNT SIX: THREAT OF REMOVAL OR THIRD-COUNTRY TRANSFER WITHOUT MEANINGFUL NOTICE OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

77. Petitioner incorporates all prior paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

78. Petitioner fears deportation or transfer to a third country without meaningful notice, authorization, or opportunity to seek judicial protection

79. Removal during pending habeas proceedings can cause irreparable harm by separating Petitioner from family, exposing him to danger, destroying the practical value of habeas relief, and mooting or complicating judicial review.

80. The Court should preserve its jurisdiction by ordering Respondents not to remove Petitioner from the United States or transfer him to a third country while this matter is pending unless the Court first permits such action after notice and an opportunity to be heard.

COUNT SEVEN: FAILURE TO USE LESS RESTRICTIVE ALTERNATIVES AND FAILURE TO CONSIDER FAMILY HARDSHIP

81. Petitioner incorporates all prior paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

82. Petitioner has substantial family and community ties. His wife is gravely affected by his detention because he was the head of household and a source of economic support.

83. The Government cannot constitutionally detain a person merely because detention is administratively convenient. It must consider whether less restrictive alternatives can reasonably satisfy its interests.

84. Alternatives available here include release on recognizance, bond, reporting, check-ins, supervision, address reporting, or other narrowly tailored conditions. Respondents have not shown that these alternatives are insufficient.

85. Continued detention without meaningful consideration of alternatives violates due process and is excessive in relation to any legitimate governmental purpose.

VII. REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY PROTECTIVE RELIEF

86. Petitioner respectfully requests immediate protective relief because the harms alleged are ongoing and irreparable. Liberty, bodily integrity, medical care, access to courts, family unity, and jurisdictional preservation cannot be adequately restored after unconstitutional custody, retaliation, removal, or third-country transfer occurs.

87. Petitioner requests that the Court order Respondents to maintain Petitioner's current location at Stewart Detention Center pending review unless the Court authorizes transfer after notice; prohibit isolation or punitive segregation for filing this Petition; require preservation of Petitioner's legal mail and access to court materials; prohibit removal or third-country transfer while this matter is pending; and require Respondents to provide adequate food, water, sanitation, and medical care pending final resolution.

88. Petitioner also requests that Respondents be ordered to produce all custody records, arrest documents, warrant documents, appointment records, medical requests, grievance records, transfer notes, and any removal or third-country transfer plans relevant to Petitioner's detention.

VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court:

- A. Assume jurisdiction over this Petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241;
- B. Issue an Order to Show Cause requiring Respondents to justify Petitioner's arrest and continued detention;

- C. Declare Petitioner's arrest and continued detention unlawful to the extent they violate the Constitution, 28 U.S.C. § 2241, and federal law;
- D. Order Petitioner's immediate release under appropriate conditions, or alternatively order a prompt constitutionally adequate bond or custody hearing before a neutral decisionmaker at which the Government bears the burden of proving detention is necessary;
- E. Prohibit Respondents from transferring Petitioner away from Stewart Detention Center while this case is pending absent advance notice and leave of Court;
- F. Prohibit Respondents from retaliating against Petitioner, placing him in isolation, punishing him, interfering with his mail, or restricting access to this Court because he filed this Petition;
- G. Prohibit Respondents from removing Petitioner from the United States or sending him to any third country while this Petition is pending unless the Court first authorizes such action after notice and opportunity to be heard,
- H. Order Respondents to provide constitutionally adequate food, water, sanitation, and medical care;
- I. Order Respondents to preserve and produce custody, arrest, medical, grievance, transfer, and removal-related records;
- J. Award reasonable costs if permitted by law; and
- K. Grant any further relief the Court deems just, equitable, and necessary to protect habeas jurisdiction and Petitioner's constitutional rights.

IX. SELECTED AUTHORITIES

- 28 U.S.C. § 2241 — federal habeas jurisdiction for persons in custody under authority of the United States.
- 28 U.S.C. § 1331 — federal question jurisdiction.
- 28 U.S.C. § 1651 — All Writs Act, authorizing orders in aid of jurisdiction.
- U.S. Const. art. I, § 9, cl. 2 — Suspension Clause.
- U.S. Const. amend. I — right to petition and access the courts.
- U.S. Const. amend. IV — protection against unreasonable seizures.
- U.S. Const. amend. V — due process protection for all persons.
- Boumediene v. Bush, 553 U.S. 723 (2008) — habeas must provide meaningful review of executive detention.
- INS v. St. Cyr, 533 U.S. 289 (2001) — historic availability of habeas review in immigration detention contexts.
- Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678 (2001) — immigration detention is constrained by due process and cannot become indefinite or constitutionally excessive.
- Jennings v. Rodriguez, 583 U.S. 281 (2018) — statutory holding does not foreclose constitutional challenges to immigration detention.
- Demore v. Kim, 538 U.S. 510 (2003) — narrow detention holding premised on brief detention and legitimate immigration purposes.
- Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520 (1979) — civil detention may not amount to punishment.
- Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976) — due process balancing framework.
- Rumsfeld v. Padilla, 542 U.S. 426 (2004) — immediate custodian and district-of-confinement rules for core habeas petitions.
- Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97 (1976) — deliberate indifference to serious medical needs violates the Constitution.
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825 (1994) — officials may not disregard known substantial risks to health or safety.
- United States v. Salerno, 481 U.S. 739 (1987) — liberty restrictions require strong procedural safeguards and cannot be punitive.

IX-A. SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF THE WRIT

89. Petitioner includes this supplemental memorandum within the Petition because the facts alleged demonstrate several independent and mutually reinforcing grounds for habeas relief. The Court need not accept an abstract challenge to immigration enforcement to grant relief; it need only determine that this particular custody, under these facts, has crossed constitutional boundaries.

90. The constitutional problem begins with the manner of seizure. A person who voluntarily appears for a scheduled immigration appointment has provided evidence of compliance. When the Government converts that appearance into custodial detention without a judicial warrant, without a neutral probable-cause determination, and without a meaningful individualized necessity finding, the risk of arbitrary deprivation is substantial.

91. The constitutional problem then continues through the conditions of custody. Civil detention becomes unlawful when the conditions imposed are incompatible with civil detention and resemble punishment, coercion, retaliation, or deliberate indifference. Extreme rationing of water and food, spoiled meals, denial of medical attention, overcrowding, poor sanitation, and verbal abuse are not ordinary inconveniences of detention; they are facts that bear on whether custody is being administered lawfully.

92. Finally, the constitutional problem is aggravated by the threat of jurisdictional interference. Habeas review must be meaningful, not theoretical. If a detainee can be transferred, isolated, removed, or sent to a third country after invoking the writ, the right to habeas becomes hollow. This Court has authority to preserve its jurisdiction and to prevent irreparable harm while it determines legality.

A. Habeas Relief Is Proper Because Petitioner Challenges Present Physical Custody

93. Petitioner is not asking this Court to supervise every aspect of immigration policy. He challenges present physical custody at Stewart Detention Center and alleges that custody is unlawful because it began without adequate process, continues without individualized justification, and is administered under punitive and unsafe conditions.

94. Section 2241 has historically been available where a person is in federal custody and asserts that custody violates the Constitution, statutes, or treaties of the United States. The writ reaches immigration detention because immigration detention is executive detention, and executive detention is exactly the kind of restraint that habeas courts have long tested.

95. The legality of custody cannot be separated from the facts that make custody constitutionally excessive. When custody exposes a civil detainee to dehydration, spoiled food, medical neglect, and fear of retaliatory transfer or isolation, the Court may consider those facts in deciding whether custody is lawful, whether immediate release is warranted, and whether protective relief is necessary.

96. The Court should therefore reject any attempt to characterize this Petition as merely a conditions complaint. Petitioner seeks release from unlawful custody and protective orders that preserve the Court's ability to decide that custody. The conditions allegations are not collateral; they show why continued civil detention is punitive, dangerous, and constitutionally excessive.

B. The Arrest at a Voluntary Appointment Requires Heightened Judicial Scrutiny

97. Petitioner's arrest occurred while he appeared for a regular appointment. That fact matters. A person who appears for supervision demonstrates a willingness to comply with the law and reduces the Government's claim that detention is necessary to prevent flight.

98. Using a scheduled appointment as the occasion for custodial arrest, without a judicial warrant or neutral probable-cause review, creates a coercive dilemma: comply and risk detention, or avoid appointments and be accused of flight. Due process does not permit the Government to transform compliance into a trap without meaningful safeguards.

99. Petitioner's voluntary appearance also undermines any categorical assertion that he is a danger or flight risk. The Government must provide individualized proof. It cannot rely on generalized immigration enforcement interests to detain a compliant person without considering less restrictive alternatives.

100. The Constitution does not require this Court to accept administrative convenience as a substitute for individualized justification. Where liberty is at stake, the Government must show why detention is necessary for this person, under these facts, at this time.

C. Continued Detention Is Excessive Because Petitioner Is Not Shown To Be Dangerous Or A Flight Risk

101. Petitioner has no serious criminal record identified in the facts presented. He is not alleged to have committed violent conduct, to present a public-safety threat, or to have disobeyed supervision. The available facts point in the opposite direction.

102. Petitioner has substantial family ties and a wife who depends on him emotionally and economically. Family ties are relevant because they reduce flight risk and demonstrate that release under reasonable conditions would serve, rather than undermine, legitimate interests.

103. The Government has many tools short of detention: recognizance, bond, reporting, check-ins, address updates, telephonic or electronic monitoring, ICE supervision, and other conditions tailored to the case. Due process requires consideration of such alternatives before imposing the most severe civil restraint.

104. Civil detention cannot rest on speculation. If the Government believes Petitioner must remain confined, it should be required to prove necessity with evidence before a neutral decisionmaker, and Petitioner should have a meaningful opportunity to present evidence, contest allegations, and propose alternatives.

D. The Conditions Alleged Are Punitive And Incompatible With Civil Detention

105. Civil detainees are not serving criminal sentences. They may not be subjected to restrictions or conditions that amount to punishment. A condition is suspect when it is not reasonably related to a legitimate nonpunitive purpose or when it is excessive in relation to that purpose.

106. Extreme rationing of water and food is not a mere inconvenience. Water is essential to life, and intentional or reckless deprivation can rapidly cause dehydration, kidney problems, confusion, anxiety, and serious medical emergencies. Petitioner alleges that he has already suffered dehydration.

107. Spoiled or decomposed food threatens gastrointestinal illness, infection, and other harm. Repeated exposure to unsafe food is incompatible with any legitimate civil detention purpose and indicates a failure to provide basic necessities.

108. Overcrowding and poor hygiene magnify the dangers of unsafe food and inadequate water. In a detention setting, detainees cannot simply leave, buy safe food, seek independent medical care, or avoid unsanitary spaces. The Government's control creates a corresponding constitutional duty.

109. Verbal abuse by officers is relevant because it shows the environment is coercive and punitive rather than civil. In combination with deprivation of basic needs, verbal abuse contributes to fear, psychological harm, and the perception that filing grievances or court papers will trigger retaliation.

110. These facts, taken together, support immediate judicial intervention. Even if any single condition might be disputed, the combined allegations show a pattern of civil detention administered in a manner that is dangerous, punitive, and excessive.

E. Denial Of Medical Care And Mental-Health Deterioration Support Release Or Immediate Court Intervention

111. Petitioner alleges denial of medical attention when ill, dehydration from water rationing, and anxiety and depression caused or aggravated by detention. These are serious concerns, particularly where detention officials control all access to evaluation and treatment.

112. The Constitution does not allow officials to ignore serious medical needs simply because the person is an immigration detainee. Civil detention increases the Government's duty because the detainee is entirely dependent on the facility for water, food, medication, appointments, transport, and emergency response.

113. Anxiety and depression are not legally irrelevant. Mental-health deterioration can become severe, especially when combined with isolation, uncertainty, family separation, verbal abuse, and fear of retaliation. A meaningful custody review must consider the psychological harm of continued confinement.

114. Dehydration is a concrete physical harm. If a person in custody reports dehydration caused by rationing, the appropriate response is medical evaluation and correction of the underlying deprivation, not continued confinement under the same conditions.

115. Because medical harm can worsen quickly and because post-harm remedies are inadequate, protective habeas relief is appropriate now. The Court can order release, medical evaluation, adequate water, adequate food, and preservation of medical records while the legality of custody is litigated.

F. Retaliatory Transfer, Isolation, Or Removal Would Frustrate Habeas Jurisdiction

116. Petitioner's fear of retaliation is not speculative in the abstract; it is tied to the practical realities of detention. A detained person who files against custodial authorities depends on those same authorities for mail, movement, housing, medical care, and access to legal materials.

117. A transfer can impair habeas litigation by changing physical custody, delaying mail, separating the detainee from family assistance, disrupting access to documents, and creating confusion over where emergency filings should be directed. Even when jurisdiction might technically survive, the practical ability to litigate can be severely harmed.

118. Isolation or punitive segregation can also obstruct access to courts. It can limit communication, intensify mental-health symptoms, and signal to the detainee and other detainees that court access will be punished.

119. Removal or third-country transfer is the most severe jurisdictional threat. Once Petitioner is removed, the harm to family unity, access to court, and practical relief may be irreversible. The Court should not permit Respondents to defeat meaningful review through unilateral executive action while the writ is pending.

120. The All Writs Act and the Court's inherent authority allow protective orders necessary to preserve jurisdiction. Such orders are especially appropriate where the requested restraint is temporary, targeted, and designed only to maintain the status quo while legality is adjudicated.

G. The Balance Of Equities Favors Immediate Protection

121. Petitioner faces loss of liberty, deterioration of physical and mental health, family hardship, possible retaliation, possible transfer, and possible removal. These harms are immediate and irreparable.

122. The Government's interest can be protected through less restrictive measures. Release under conditions, reporting, supervision, or a prompt bond hearing would preserve immigration interests without exposing Petitioner to unconstitutional confinement.

123. The public interest favors lawful detention practices, meaningful habeas review, humane custody standards, and faithful adherence to constitutional limits. The public has no legitimate interest in civil detention that is arbitrary, punitive, retaliatory, or medically dangerous.

124. The Court can tailor relief to the facts. It can order immediate release, a constitutionally adequate hearing, temporary anti-transfer protection, anti-removal protection, medical evaluation, or production of records. Each remedy is connected to the harms alleged and to preservation of the writ.

H. The Court Should Require The Government To Bear A Meaningful Burden

125. When physical liberty is at stake, a hearing is meaningful only if the Government bears a meaningful burden of proof. Requiring Petitioner to disprove danger or flight risk while detained, medically vulnerable, and without equal access to records would create an unacceptable risk of erroneous deprivation.

126. The Government controls the arrest records, custody classification, medical records, transfer communications, and removal plans. It is therefore best positioned to justify detention with evidence if detention is truly necessary

127. A clear and convincing evidence standard is appropriate because detention is a severe deprivation of liberty and because the private interest is extraordinarily weighty. At minimum, the Government should be required to present individualized evidence and explain why alternatives are insufficient.

128. The hearing should permit Petitioner to present testimony, family support evidence, medical concerns, proof of compliance, and proposed release conditions. A paper-only or conclusory review would not cure the constitutional defects alleged here.

IX-B. FACT-SPECIFIC APPLICATION OF THE MATHEWS DUE PROCESS FACTORS

129. The first Mathews factor, the private interest, overwhelmingly favors Petitioner. Physical liberty is one of the most fundamental interests protected by the Constitution. Detention also affects bodily integrity, mental health, family unity, employment, access to counsel or legal help, and the ability to gather evidence.

130. The second Mathews factor, the risk of erroneous deprivation, is high. Petitioner was detained after voluntarily appearing for an appointment. Without a neutral decisionmaker, without a judicial warrant, and without a robust opportunity to contest detention, compliant conduct can be misread as irrelevant and detention can become automatic

131. The value of additional safeguards is substantial. A prompt hearing, Government burden, access to records, consideration of alternatives, and protection against retaliation would directly reduce the risk of erroneous and unnecessary custody.

132. The third Mathews factor, the Government's interest, does not outweigh Petitioner's liberty. The Government has legitimate interests in immigration proceedings and appearance, but those interests can be served through less restrictive alternatives. Administrative efficiency cannot justify constitutionally defective detention.

133. Balancing these factors, due process requires immediate release or a prompt and meaningful custody hearing with safeguards. It also requires interim protection so that Petitioner is not transferred, isolated, removed, or deprived of basic necessities before review occurs.

IX-C. FACT-SPECIFIC APPLICATION OF BELL V. WOLFISH

134. Under Bell, the central question is whether the conditions and restrictions imposed on a civil detainee amount to punishment or are reasonably related to a legitimate governmental objective. Petitioner's allegations show punishment in practical effect.

135. Rationing water to the point of dehydration is not reasonably related to immigration processing. Serving spoiled food is not reasonably related to appearance at proceedings. Denying medical care is not reasonably related to public safety. Overcrowded and unsanitary conditions are not reasonably related to any legitimate civil purpose when less restrictive alternatives exist.

136. The punitive inference is strengthened by the allegation of verbal abuse and fear of retaliation. Civil detention must not be used to break a person emotionally, discourage court access, or punish a detainee for asserting rights.

137. Even if Respondents claim resource constraints, resource limitations do not authorize unconstitutional conditions. A facility that cannot provide safe food, water, sanitation, and medical care cannot constitutionally justify continued civil detention under those conditions.

IX-D. IRREPARABLE HARM TO PETITIONER AND HIS FAMILY

138. Petitioner's wife is gravely affected by the detention. She is separated from her spouse, deprived of the household's economic support, and forced to endure uncertainty regarding his safety, health, and possible removal.

139. Family hardship is relevant not only as a humanitarian concern but also as evidence of community ties. A person with a spouse and household responsibilities has strong reasons to appear and comply if released under conditions.

140. The harm to Petitioner's family cannot be fully repaired later. Lost income, emotional trauma, medical decline, and family destabilization are not adequately compensated by a later declaration that custody was unlawful.

141. The Court should consider that detention is not occurring in a vacuum. It affects a household, not only one detainee. The Constitution requires individualized decision-making that accounts for the human consequences of unnecessary detention.

IX-E. REQUESTED RECORDS AND EVIDENCE NECESSARY FOR MEANINGFUL REVIEW

142. To ensure meaningful review, Petitioner requests that Respondents preserve and produce the following categories of records:

- All documents concerning the May 5, 2026 arrest or detention decision;
- Any administrative warrant, detainer, custody authorization, or probable-cause document relied upon;
- All records showing why Petitioner was considered a danger, flight risk, or detention priority;
- All records of Petitioner's compliance with appointments, reporting, and supervision;
- Medical requests, medical denials, sick-call requests, dehydration complaints, mental-health requests, and treatment notes;
- Food, water, sanitation, grievance, and housing records relevant to the allegations;
- Any transfer, isolation, segregation, discipline, or retaliation-related records concerning Petitioner;
- Any records or communications concerning removal, deportation, or third-country transfer plans;
- Any body-camera, surveillance, intake, or appointment records relevant to the arrest;
- Any classification records or internal risk assessments used to justify continued detention.

IX-F. NARROWLY TAILORED RELIEF REQUESTED

143. Petitioner's requested relief is narrow. He asks for release or, at minimum, a constitutionally adequate hearing. He asks for anti-retaliation and anti-transfer protections only while the Court reviews legality. He asks for anti-removal protection only to prevent irreparable harm and preserve jurisdiction.

144. The Court may order release under conditions rather than unconditional release if it believes conditions are necessary. Petitioner is willing to comply with reasonable conditions, including reporting, address updates, check-ins, bond, supervision, or other lawful requirements.

145. If the Court does not immediately order release, Petitioner requests an expedited show-cause order and a prompt hearing because delay itself deepens the constitutional injury. Each day of unnecessary detention is a new deprivation of liberty.

146. Petitioner further requests that any order expressly bind Respondents, their officers, agents, employees, contractors, and all persons acting in concert with them, including detention facility staff responsible for housing, medical care, transfer, mail, and transportation.

IX-G. CONCLUSION OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM

147. This case presents a detained person who complied with supervision, appeared voluntarily, was arrested without adequate neutral process, and is now confined under conditions alleged to be unsafe, punitive, and medically harmful.

148. Petitioner has no serious criminal record identified in the facts before the Court, has substantial family ties, and has available alternatives to detention. The Government's interests can be protected without continued confinement at Stewart Detention Center.

149. The writ of habeas corpus exists to prevent exactly this kind of unchecked executive custody: custody that begins without adequate process, continues without individualized justification, and threatens to become practically unreviewable through transfer, isolation, or removal.

150. For these reasons, Petitioner respectfully requests immediate relief, preservation of jurisdiction, and all remedies necessary to protect his liberty, health, family unity, and constitutional right of access to this Court.

X. VERIFICATION

I, Harry José Lacayo Aguirre, declare under penalty of perjury that I am the Petitioner in this action; that I have read, or have had read to me, the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus; and that the factual statements made herein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Executed on this 11 day of JUNE, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

Harry Lacayo

Harry José Lacayo Aguirre, Pro Se Petitioner

A No. [redacted]

Stewart Detention Center

146 CCA Road

Lumpkin, GA 31815

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this 11 day of JUNE, 2026, I placed a true and correct copy of this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus in the institutional/legal mail system or otherwise caused it to be mailed to the Clerk of Court and appropriate Respondents or government counsel as required by law.

Because Petitioner is detained and proceeding pro se, he respectfully requests that the Court construe this certificate liberally and permit service through the facility legal mail system or other method available to him.

Harry Lacayo

Harry José Lacayo Aguirre, Pro Se Petitioner

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
COLUMBUS DIVISION

HARRY JOSÉ LACAYO AGUIRRE, Petitioner,

v

WARDEN, STEWART DETENTION CENTER, et al., Respondents.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, Motion for Immediate Release, Emergency Motion to Expedite, Emergency Motion for Temporary Restraining Order, Proposed Order, Emergency Motion for Stay of Removal, and supporting documents were served upon the following parties by U.S. Mail and/or certified mail on this 11 day of JUNE, 2026.

Clerk of Court

United States District Court
Middle District of Georgia – Columbus Division
120 12th Street
Columbus, GA 31901

United States Attorney

Office of the United States Attorney
Middle District of Georgia
P.O. Box 1702
Macon, GA 31202-1702

Attorney General of the United States

U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Department of Homeland Security

Office of the Principal Legal Advisor (OPLA)
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement
180 Ted Turner Drive SW, Suite 522
Atlanta, GA 30303

Warden

Stewart Detention Center
146 CCA Road
Lumpkin, GA 31815

ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations

ICE ERO Atlanta Field Office
180 Ted Turner Drive SW, Suite 330
Atlanta, GA 30303

Respectfully submitted,

Harry Lacayo

Harry José Lacayo Aguirre
A# [redacted]
Pro Se Petitioner
Stewart Detention Center
146 CCA Road
Lumpkin, GA 31815