UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FILED

JUL 10 2026

CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY _____ DEPUTY CLERK

JUAN DE LA CRUZ DABOIN MARTÍNEZ,

[redacted]

Petitioner,

v.

THE WARDEN OF CENTRAL VALLEY ANNEX;
THE ACTING DIRECTOR OF U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT;
THE SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY,

Respondents.

1:26-CV-5337-JLT-SAB

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241

INTRODUCTION

I respectfully petition this Court for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 because my continued detention by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

This case does not concern the merits of my pending asylum application. Nor does it concern the Government's authority to enforce the immigration laws. Instead, this Petition presents a narrower and fundamental constitutional question: whether the Government may continue to deprive me of my physical liberty through civil immigration detention without demonstrating that such detention remains necessary to serve a legitimate governmental purpose.

I have never been convicted of a crime, I have no criminal history, and I have consistently complied with my obligations under the immigration laws of the United States. I timely filed my application for asylum, obtained employment authorization issued by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services ("USCIS"), maintained lawful employment, filed tax returns, and established significant ties to my community while my immigration proceedings have remained pending.

Despite these undisputed facts, I remain detained without any individualized determination that I present a danger to the community or a risk of flight. My continued confinement bears no reasonable relationship to the legitimate purposes of civil immigration detention and has therefore become arbitrary, excessive, and inconsistent with the protections guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment.

The writ of habeas corpus exists to protect individuals against unlawful restraints on liberty. Through this Petition, I respectfully ask this Court to exercise its jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, review the legality of my continued detention, and order my immediate release or, alternatively, direct Respondents to provide a constitutionally adequate individualized custody determination consistent with the requirements of due process.

I. JURISDICTION

1. I bring this Petition pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 2241**, which authorizes federal courts to grant habeas corpus relief to individuals who are in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States.
2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction because I am presently confined by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") within the Eastern District of California. My challenge is directed solely to the legality of my present physical detention and does not seek review of the merits of my pending immigration proceedings.
3. Venue is proper in this District because my immediate custodian, the Warden of Central Valley Annex, exercises physical custody over me within the territorial jurisdiction of this Court.
4. This Court possesses the authority to determine whether my continued detention complies with the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment and the applicable provisions of federal immigration law.
5. Through this Petition, I seek only judicial review of the legality of my continued detention. I do not request that this Court adjudicate my asylum claim, terminate my removal proceedings, or otherwise interfere with the jurisdiction of the Immigration Court. My asylum application remains pending, and I intend to continue complying with all future immigration proceedings.

II. PARTIES

6. I, **Juan de la Cruz Daboin Martínez**, A-Number [redacted] am the Petitioner in this action. I am currently detained by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement at **Central Valley Annex**, located in McFarland, California.
7. Respondent **The Warden of Central Valley Annex** is my immediate custodian and is responsible for my day-to-day physical confinement. Because the Warden has direct custody over me, the Warden is a proper respondent in this habeas proceeding.
8. Respondent **The Acting Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement** is responsible for the administration and execution of ICE detention policies and exercises legal authority over my continued detention.
9. Respondent **The Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security** is responsible for the administration and enforcement of the immigration laws under which I remain detained and is a proper respondent because the Department of Homeland Security exercises ultimate authority over my custody.

III. STATEMENT OF FACTS

10. I am a native and citizen of Venezuela. I entered the United States seeking protection from persecution and timely filed an application for asylum within the one-year period prescribed by federal law.
11. My asylum application remains pending before the Executive Office for Immigration Review ("EOIR"). I have complied with every stage of my immigration proceedings, and my next Master Calendar Hearing is scheduled for July 21, 2026.
12. While my asylum application has been pending, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services ("USCIS") authorized me to work in the United States by issuing me an Employment Authorization Document. I also obtained a valid Texas driver's license, maintained lawful employment, and filed federal income tax returns.
13. Since my arrival in the United States, I have continuously resided in this country, maintained a stable residence, complied with the immigration process, and made every effort to obey the laws of the United States.

14. On June 2, 2026, at approximately 11:00 a.m., I was stopped by a law enforcement officer in Oklahoma. The officer informed me that I had been stopped for allegedly exceeding the speed limit.
15. Although the officer stated that the stop was based on a traffic violation, I was never issued a citation, arrested for a criminal offense, or charged with violating any criminal law.
16. Approximately twenty to thirty minutes after initiating the traffic stop, the officer contacted U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE"). Shortly thereafter, ICE officers arrived at the scene.
17. The ICE officers instructed me to exit my vehicle and informed me that I was not authorized to remain in the United States.
18. My partner immediately brought my immigration documents to the scene, including my valid Employment Authorization Document, my Texas driver's license, and documentation demonstrating that my asylum application had been timely filed and remained pending.
19. Despite being presented with those documents, the officers informed me that they were not valid and took me into immigration custody.
20. I was transported to the Cimarron Detention Center in Oklahoma, where I remained for approximately ten days before being transferred to the Central Valley Annex in McFarland, California, where I remain detained today.
21. During my transfer between detention facilities, I was transported while restrained in handcuffs and leg shackles for extended periods of time. Although my detention is civil rather than criminal in nature, I was treated in the same manner as individuals convicted of serious criminal offenses.
22. The manner in which I was transported was degrading, humiliating, and emotionally traumatic. At no time was I accused or convicted of any criminal offense that would justify such treatment.
23. I have never been convicted of a crime in the United States or in any other country. Throughout my time in the United States, I have sought to comply with the law, maintain lawful employment, support myself through honest work, and cooperate fully with the immigration process.

24. My continued detention has caused significant emotional and financial hardship to both me and my family. My loved ones depend on my emotional support and financial assistance, and my prolonged detention has disrupted every aspect of our lives.
25. Throughout my time in the United States, I have established strong ties to my community. Friends, neighbors, and members of my community have submitted letters attesting to my honesty, integrity, strong moral character, work ethic, and commitment to my family.
26. At no point before or after my detention has any government official informed me that I was being detained because I posed a danger to the community or because I represented a risk of flight. To my knowledge, no individualized determination has been made that my continued detention is necessary to accomplish the legitimate purposes of civil immigration detention.
27. At all relevant times, I have been willing to comply with any lawful condition of release that would reasonably ensure my appearance before the Immigration Court while my removal proceedings remain pending.

IV. LEGAL STANDARD

28. The writ of habeas corpus is one of the oldest and most fundamental safeguards of individual liberty recognized under the Constitution of the United States. As the Supreme Court explained in *Boumediene v. Bush*, 553 U.S. 723, 739 (2008), "[t]he Framers viewed freedom from unlawful restraint as a fundamental precept of liberty," and habeas corpus serves as the essential mechanism through which federal courts review the legality of executive detention. Through 28 U.S.C. § 2241, Congress has authorized this Court to determine whether a person's continued detention violates the Constitution or the laws of the United States.
29. The Fifth Amendment provides that no person shall be deprived of liberty without due process of law. The Supreme Court has made clear that these constitutional protections extend to all persons physically present within the United States, including noncitizens. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001). Accordingly, immigration detention remains subject to the protections of the Due Process Clause regardless of a person's immigration status.
30. Immigration detention is civil rather than criminal in nature. Because civil detention results in a significant deprivation of physical liberty, it may not become punitive or arbitrary. As the Supreme Court explained in *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001), civil detention

remains constitutionally permissible only so long as it bears a reasonable relationship to its legitimate regulatory purposes. Once detention no longer serves those purposes, continued confinement raises serious constitutional concerns under the Due Process Clause.

31. Although Congress has established statutory authority governing immigration detention, the Supreme Court has recognized that constitutional challenges to continued detention remain available through habeas corpus. *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 302-03 (2018). Accordingly, this Court retains the authority to determine whether my continued detention complies with the Constitution, independent of the merits of my immigration proceedings.

32. Federal courts have long served as the constitutional safeguard against unlawful executive detention. As the Supreme Court emphasized in *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507, 525 (2004), meaningful judicial review is essential whenever the Executive deprives an individual of liberty. Habeas corpus therefore provides the appropriate mechanism for this Court to determine whether my continued detention remains constitutionally permissible.

33. Accordingly, when a petitioner demonstrates that his continued civil detention is arbitrary, excessive, or unsupported by an adequate constitutional justification, a federal court has both the authority and the responsibility to grant appropriate habeas relief.

V. ARGUMENT

A. My Continued Detention Violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

34. My detention is civil rather than criminal. Nevertheless, I continue to be deprived of my physical liberty despite the absence of any evidence that I present a danger to the community or a risk of flight.

35. Before my arrest, I complied with every significant obligation imposed upon me under the immigration laws. I timely filed my asylum application, obtained employment authorization issued by USCIS, maintained lawful employment, paid taxes, and remained available to participate in my pending immigration proceedings.

36. My immigration case remains pending before the Immigration Court, and I have an upcoming hearing at which I intend to appear.

37. Nothing in my conduct demonstrates an intent to evade immigration proceedings. To the contrary, my actions consistently reflect respect for the legal process and a willingness to comply with every requirement imposed upon me.

38. Likewise, there is no evidence that I pose a danger to the community. I have no criminal convictions, have maintained lawful employment, and have established meaningful ties to my family and community.
39. Under these circumstances, my continued detention no longer serves the legitimate purposes that justify civil immigration detention. Instead, it has become an unnecessary and arbitrary deprivation of my liberty in violation of the Fifth Amendment. As the Supreme Court recognized in *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001), civil detention is constitutionally permissible only while it remains reasonably related to its legitimate regulatory purposes. My continued confinement no longer satisfies that constitutional standard.

B. Respondents Have Never Made an Individualized Determination Justifying Petitioner's Continued Detention

40. Even where Congress authorizes civil immigration detention, the exercise of that authority remains subject to the limitations imposed by the Fifth Amendment. Continued detention must remain reasonably related to the legitimate purposes of civil immigration detention and may not become arbitrary or excessive.
41. At the time of my arrest, I possessed documentation reflecting that I had timely filed an asylum application, that my immigration proceedings remained pending, and that I had been granted authorization to work by USCIS. My partner presented those documents to the officers at the scene before I was taken into ICE custody.
42. Despite those circumstances, I was detained and have remained in ICE custody while my immigration proceedings continue.
43. Throughout my time in the United States, I have complied with the immigration process, maintained lawful employment, established substantial community ties, and remained willing to appear before immigration authorities as required.
44. I have never been convicted of a criminal offense, and I am unaware of any individualized determination concluding that my continued detention is necessary because I present either a danger to the community or a risk of flight.
45. Under these circumstances, my continued detention no longer bears a reasonable relationship to the legitimate regulatory purposes of civil immigration detention and has become an arbitrary deprivation of liberty prohibited by the Fifth Amendment. Because habeas corpus

remains the traditional mechanism through which federal courts review executive detention, *Boumediene v. Bush*, 553 U.S. 723 (2008), this Court has the authority to remedy that constitutional violation. See also Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, 542 U.S. 507, 525 (2004) (recognizing the essential role of judicial review whenever executive detention is challenged).

C. Habeas Corpus Is the Appropriate Vehicle to Challenge My Continued Unconstitutional Detention

46. Habeas corpus has long served as the principal means by which federal courts protect individuals from unlawful executive detention.
47. The sole issue presented by this Petition is whether my continued detention complies with the Constitution.
48. My immigration proceedings remain pending and will continue independently of this action.
49. Unless this Court grants relief, I will continue to suffer an ongoing deprivation of my physical liberty without the constitutional protections guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment.
50. Accordingly, habeas corpus provides the appropriate mechanism through which this Court may review the legality of my continued detention and order appropriate relief.

D. Habeas Corpus Provides the Appropriate Remedy for My Continued Unconstitutional Detention

51. My Petition does not challenge the Government's authority to adjudicate my immigration case. My asylum application will continue to be resolved through the ordinary immigration process, and I remain fully prepared to appear at every hearing scheduled by the Immigration Court.
52. The only issue presented in this proceeding is whether my continued physical detention complies with the Constitution. For the reasons set forth above, it does not.
53. My continued confinement has imposed significant emotional, financial, and personal hardship upon me and my family. More importantly, it has deprived me of my physical liberty without an adequate constitutional justification.
54. Because my continued detention is no longer reasonably related to the legitimate purposes of civil immigration detention, I respectfully request that this Court grant my Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus and order appropriate relief.

55. The continued deprivation of physical liberty is among the most serious exercises of governmental authority. As the Supreme Court explained in *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507, 525 (2004), meaningful judicial review is indispensable whenever executive detention is challenged. Because my detention is civil in nature and because Respondents have failed to demonstrate that continued confinement remains constitutionally justified, habeas relief is both appropriate and necessary to vindicate the protections guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment.

VI. NATURE OF THE RELIEF REQUESTED

56. I respectfully emphasize that I do not ask this Court to decide whether I am ultimately entitled to asylum or any other form of immigration relief.
57. I also do not request that this Court terminate or interfere with my pending removal proceedings.
58. The sole issue presented by this Petition is whether my continued detention complies with the requirements of the Constitution.
59. My immigration proceedings may continue in the ordinary course regardless of whether I remain detained or am released under reasonable conditions established by this Court or by the appropriate immigration authorities.
60. The Constitution permits the Government to enforce the immigration laws. It does not permit the Government to continue depriving an individual of liberty in a manner inconsistent with the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

VII. CONCLUSION

For these reasons, I respectfully request that this Court grant this Petition and restore the liberty that the Constitution protects unless the Government can demonstrate a lawful and constitutionally sufficient basis for my continued detention.

My Petition does not challenge the Government's authority to adjudicate my immigration case, nor does it seek review of the merits of my pending asylum application. I seek only the protection guaranteed by the Constitution against continued deprivation of liberty that is no longer constitutionally justified.

Because my detention is civil rather than criminal, and because Respondents have continued to deprive me of my liberty without an individualized constitutional justification, I respectfully request that this Court grant the relief requested in this Petition.

VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court:

A. Grant this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus;

B. Declare that Petitioner's continued detention violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment;

C. Order Petitioner's immediate release from the custody of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

D. Alternatively, if the Court determines that immediate release is not warranted, order Respondents to provide a prompt constitutionally adequate individualized custody hearing within a period established by this Court;

E. Grant such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

IX. VERIFICATION

I, **Juan de la Cruz Daboin Martínez**, declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 1746** that I am the Petitioner in this action; that I have read the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus; and that the factual allegations contained herein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

I further declare that this Petition is submitted in good faith for the purpose of challenging the legality of my continued detention and not for the purpose of delay.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

I respectfully certify that this Petition is filed in good faith and solely for the purpose of seeking judicial review of the legality of my continued detention.

Executed on July 7, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

[redacted]
Juan de la Cruz Daboin Martinez
[redacted]
Central Valley Annex
254 Taylor Avenue
McFarland, California 93250
Petitioner, Pro Se