UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
COLUMBUS DIVISION

THU MINH LY,
A# [redacted]
Petitioner,

v.

Civil Action No:

TODD BLANCH
Attorney General,
MARK WAYNE MYLLEN
Secretary of Department of Homeland Security;
LA DEON FRANCIS
U.S. ICE Field Office Director For The Middle District of Georgia Field Office, and Warden **JASON STREEVAL** of Stewart Detention Center,
Respondent(s)

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C.§ 2241, BY A PERSON SUBJECT TO INDIFINATE IMMIGRATION DETENTION.

AND
MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. §3006A

Petitioner, **THU MINH LY**, hereby petitions this Court for a Writ of Habeas Corpus to remedy Petitioner's unlawful detention by Respondents, and to enjoin Petitioner's continued unlawful detention by the Respondents. In support of this petition and complaint for injunctive relief, Petitioner alleges as follows:

BACKGROUND

Petitioner is a Citizen of Vietnam. Detained and in the Custody of DHS/ICE in the United States, but has been ordered removed to Vietnam by a DOJ official on **7-21-2005**.
Petitioners removal order is Final, but the Petitioner cannot be removed to Vietnam, thus Petitioner remains detained in DHS/ICE custody, and has been confined for a period far longer than the law mandates , as he has been detained over 180+days in the past and has been on supervision with DHS/ICE for over 20-years and now has been detained for over 180 +Days yet again and recognized to be Un-Constitutional on Feb. 25, 2026 **Tai Tan Huynh v. Warden, Baker. Inst**. 2026 (U.S. Dist. M.D. of Ft. Myers DIV.), **Tu Quoc Pham v. Ripa**, 2026. (U.S Dist. .M.D. of Ft. Myers DIV). This has now become detention just for the sake of detention which has become Cruel and Unusual Punishment.

CUSTODY

1. Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE"). Petitioner is detained at Stewart Detention Center in Lumpkin, Georgia where DHS/ICE has contracted the institution to house Immigration detainees such as Petitioner. Petitioner is

in the direct control of Respondents and their agents.

JURISDICTION

2. This action arises under the Constitution of the United States, 28 U.S.C. §2241 (c)(1), and to the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA"), 8 U.S.C. §1101 et seq. This Court has subject matter Jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §2241, Art IS9, cl. 2 of the United States Constitution (" Suspension Clause"); and 28 U.S.C. §1331, as Petitioner is Presently in custody under color of the authority of the United States, and such custody is in violation of the Constitution, Laws, or treaties of the United States. *See* **Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678, 688 (2001)** (We conclude that §2241 Habeas Corpus proceedings remain available as a form for statutory and constitutional challenges to post-removal-period detention.") INS v. St. Cyr, 533 U.S. 289, 301 (2001) **("at it's historical core, the writ of Habeas Corpus has served as a means of reviewing the legality of executive detention, and it is in that context that it's protections have been strongest.") Clark v. Martinez, 543 U.S. 371 (2005)** (holding that **Zadvydas** applies to aliens found inadmissible as well as removable.)

VENUE

3. Venue lies in the Middle District of Georgia as the Petitioner is currently detained in the territorial jurisdiction of this Court, at the Stewart Detention Center in Lumpkin, Georgia. 28 U.S.C. §1391.

EXHAUSTION OF REMEDIES

4. Petitioner has exhausted his administrative remedies to the extent required by law, and his only remedy is by way of this judicial action. After the Supreme Court decision in **Zadvydas**, the Department of justice issued regulations governing the custody of aliens removed. *See* 8 C.F.R. §241.4. Petitioner received a final order of removal on **7-21-2005**. Petitioner was apprehended again by DHS/ICE on **1-16-2026**, and was supposed to have a 90-day custody review after being detained this time on **4-15-2026** where DHS/ICE decided to continue his detention w/o notice to him. Subsequently **"NO DECISION WAS EVER MADE"**. DHS/ICE has never informed the petitioner **if /or** why it decided to continue his detention. Like **Zavvar v. Scott,** 2025 U.S. Dist LEXIS 175897 Respondents have not been able to obtain any travel documents or find a country to accept him, not to mention that he has never been given notice of which Country they have tried to get to accept him. He is entitled to **"Seek Fear based relief from that Country"**, which would require additional proceedings as well. **CF. Guzman Chavez**, 594 U.S. At 537. ICE's Headquarters Post-order Detention Unit ("HQPDU") **has not** informed Petitioner that it would release or continue to keep him in custody despite having been detained for over 6-months after a final order of removal. The custody review regulations do not

provide for appeal from a HQPDU custody review decision. See8 C.F.R. §241.4(d).

Especially when it has never been made or given to the Petitioner.

5. No statutory exhaustion requirements apply to Petitioner claim of unlawful detention. Petitioner remains detained without any indication from the United States Government or the Government of Vietnam that the Petitioner's repatriation is reasonably foreseeable. A Habeas Corpus petition is proper in light of these facts

PARTIES

6. Petitioner is a Citizen of Vietnam, detained and in the custody of DHS/ICE in the United States, But has been ordered removed to Vietnam on **7-21-2005** by an Immigration Judge. It is known that Vietnam will not accept the Petitioner nor will it agree to repatriation.

7. Respondent Todd Blanch is the Attorney General of the United States and is responsible for the administration of ICE and the implementation and enforcement of the Immigration and Naturalization Act(INA). As such, Mr. Blanch has ultimate custodial authority over the petitioner.

8. Respondent Mark Mullen is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. She is responsible for the administration of ICE and the implementation and enforcement of the (INA), as such Mr. Mullen is the legal custodian of the Petitioner.

9. Respondent La Deon Francis is the ICE field office director for the Middle District of Georgia for the Stewart Detention center in Lumpkin, Georgia field office of ICE and is Petitioner's immediate custodian, *See* **Vasquez v. Reno**, 233F.3d 688, 690 (1st Cir. 2000), cert. Denied, 122 S. Ct. 43 (2001).

10. Respondent Jason Streeval Warden at the Stewart Detention Center in Lumpkin, Ga where the Petitioner is currently detained under the authority of ICE, alternatively may be considered to be petitioner's immediate custodian.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

11. Petitioner was born in Vietnam on [redacted] to a soldier of the United States Army and fled the country to the United States and arrived in 1991 as a Political refugee. **(See Exhibits attached)**

12. Petitioner was a Permanent Resident until he was ordered removed on **7-21-2005**.

13. Petitioner was convicted of Assault, which issued an order of removal against him.

14. Petitioner was released on supervision after a final order of removal which gave him a credit to use in a Habeas Corpus petition and is recognized by various Court's decision's and the instant case dated October 2, 2025 under **Perez v. Noem**, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 195132. **An Imaginary Detention clock "does not start every time DHS feels like detaining an alien just for the sake of**

detention", which becomes cruel and unusual punishment. See **Mong Tuyen Thi Tran v. Scott**, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 201561 and **Quoc Anh Nguyen v. Noem**, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 219216

15. Petitioner was detained by DIIS/ICE this time on **1-16-2026** and brought to Stewart Detention Center where he has remained detained.

16. To date however, ICE has not released the petitioner, and this is going on over **180 + Days**.

17. As of today ICE has been unable to to remove the petitioner to Vietnam or any other Country. Petitioner knows for sure that Vietnam will deny and has denied any and all request for travel documents and this has been proven time and time again since 2005.

18. Petitioner has cooperated fully with all efforts of ICE to remove Petitioner from the United States, even though all parties acknowledge that Vietnam will not accept him back to Vietnam.

19. Petitioner's most recent 90 day custody review plan under 8 C.F.R. §212.12 took place on **4-15-2026** with-out his presence or knowledge at which point the Petitioner still remains detained. **(Awaiting to be released on supervision since Vietnam has not accepted him.)**

LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR RELIEF SOUGHT

20 . In **Zadvydas v. Davis**, 533 U.S. 678(2001), the U.S. Supreme Court held that 8.U.S.C.§1231(a)(6), when **"read in light of the Constitution's demands, limits an alien's post-order removal period detention to a period reasonably necessary to bring about the alien's removal from the United States."** 533 U.S. At 689. a **"Habeas Court must[first] ask whether the detention in question exceeds a period reasonably necessary to secure removal."** Id. at 699 if the individual's removal **"is not reasonably foreseeable, the Court should hold continued detention unreasonable and no longer authorized by the statute."** Id. at 699-700. In **Clark v. Martinez**, 543 U.S. 371(2005), the U.S. Supreme Court held that **Zadvydas** applies to aliens found inadmissible as well as removable.

21. In determining the length of a reasonable removal period, the Court adopted a "preemptively reasonable period of detention." **After 90 days**, DHS has the discretion to release the detainee under reasonable conditions of supervision. The Government bears the Burden of disproving an alien's **"good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future."** *See* **Zhou v. Farquharson**, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18239, 2-3 (D. Mass. Oct. 19, 2001) (quoting and summarizing **Zadvydas**). Moreover, "for detention to remain reasonable, as the period of prior post-order removal grows, what counts as the reasonably foreseeable future' conversely have to shrink." **Zadvydas**, 533 U.S. At 701. ICE's administration regulations also

recognize that the HQPDU has a maximum six-month period for determining whether there is a significant likelihood of a alien's removal in the reasonable foreseeable future. *See* 8 C.F.R. §241.4(k)(2)(ii).

22. An alien who has been detained beyond the presumptive period should be released where the government is unable to present documented confirmation that the foreign government at issue will agree to accept the particular individual in question. *See* **Agbada v. Hohn Ashcroft**, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15797(D. Mass. August 22, 2002) (court **"will likely grant"** after ICE is **"unable to present document confirmation that the government has agreed to [petitioner's] repatriation."** ; **Zhou**, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19050 at *7(W.D. Wash February 28, 2002) (government's failure to offer specific information regarding how or when it expected to obtain the necessary documentation or cooperation from the foreign government indicated that there is no significant likelihood of petitioner's removal in the reasonably foreseeable future).The United States and Vietnam entered into a Memorandum of Understanding where Vietnam agreed to accept deportees **"only if they entered the United States after July 12, 1995"**, but individuals that entered before that date such as Petitioner who entered in 1991, **"DHS cannot secure travel documents and cannot effectuate removal within a reasonably foreseeable period"**. See **Tai Tan Huynh v. Warden, Baker. Inst**, 2026 .

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT ONE

STATUTORY VIOLATION

23. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 22 above.

24. Petitioner's continued detention by respondents is unlawful and contravenes 8 U.S.C.§1231(a)(6) as interpreted by the Supreme Court in **Zadvydas**. Petitioner's 90-day statutory period of detention have passed exceeding a 90-day removal proceeding and the 180-day detention period detained by DHS/ICE since being ordered removed on **7-21-2005 and being on Supervision since 2005 for over 20- YEARS**. Petitioner has raised a family in the USA and has U.S. citizen children. (**See Exhibits attached**) Respondent's are unable to remove the Petitioner to Vietnam, because there is no repatriation agreement between the United States and Vietnam for Political Refugees such as the Petitioner, and Vietnam will not accept Political Refugee Vietnamese from the era that the Petitioner arrived to the United States who have been ordered removed. In the instance of **Clark v. Martinez**, the Supreme Court held that the continued indefinite detention of someone like the petitioner under such circumstances is unreasonable and not authorized by U.S.C. §1231(a)(6).

COUNT TWO

SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS VIOLATION

25. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 24 above.

26 Petitioner's continued detention violates his right to substantive due process through a deprivation of the core liberty interest in freedom from bodily restraint. *See* e.g., **Tam v. INS**, 14 F. Supp. 2d. 1184(E.D. Cal 1998)**(Alien's retain substantive due process rights).**

27. The due process clause of the Fifth Amendment require that the deprivation of Petitioner's liberty be narrowly tailored to serve a compelling government interest. While Respondents would have an interest in detaining Petitioner's in order to effectuate removal, that interest does not justify the indefinite detention of petitioner, who is not significantly likely to be removed in the reasonably foreseeable future. The United States Supreme Court in **Zadvydas** thus interpreted 8 U.S.C. §1231(a) to allow continued detention only for a period reasonably necessary to secure the alien's removal, because any other reading would go beyond the government's articulated interests to effect the alien's removal. *See* **Kay v. Reno**, 94 F. Supp. 2d. 546, 551 (M.D. Pa. 2000) (granting writ of Habeas Corpus, because petitioner's due process rights were violated, and noting that **"If deportation can never occur, the government's primary legitimate purpose in detention-executing removal-is nonsensical.").** Because Petitioner is unlikely to be removed to Vietnam, his continued indefinite detention violates substantive due process. **Mong Tuyen Thi Tran v. Scott**, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 201561

28. **"Detention is now not driven by legitimate interest of removal at all, but rather detention for the sake of detention, motivated by animus towards, or ill will against the individual, or even a desire to inflict suffering." C.F. Riverside, 500 U.S. At 56**

29. If the non-citizen satisfies the initial burden then the Government **"must respond with evidence sufficient to rebut that showing."** Id. If the Government fails to meet its burden, then the non-citizen must be released from detention. *See* **Jennings v. Rodriguez**, 583 U.S. 281, 299 (2018)

COUNT THREE

PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS VIOLATION

30. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 29.

31. Under the Due process clause of the Fifth Amendment, an alien is entitled to a timely and meaningful opportunity to demonstrate that he/she should not be detained. Petitioner in this case has been denied that opportunity. **There is no administrative mechanism in place for the petitioner to obtain a decision from a neutral arbiter or appeal a custody decision and that violates Martinez.** *See* **generally 8 C.F.R. §212.12 The custody review procedures for Vietnamese Nationals are**

Constitutionally insufficient both as written and as applied. A number of courts have identified a substantial bias within ICE towards the continued detention of aliens, raising the risk or erroneous deprivation to constitutionally high levels. *See,* e.g., **Phan v. Reno**, 56 F. Supp. 2d. 1149, 1157 (W.D. Wash. 1999) **("INS does not meaningfully and impartially review the petitioner's status.")**; **St. John v. McElroy**, 917 F. Supp. 243, 251(S.D.N.Y. 1996) ("Due to community and political pressure, INS, an executive agency, has though they have served their sentences, on the suspicion that they may continue to pose a danger to the community."); *See* also **Rivera v. Demore**, No. C99-3042 THE, 199WL521177, (N.D. Cal. Jul. 13, 1999)(procedural due process requires that aliens release determination be made by impartial adjudicator due to policy bias.)

COUNT FOUR

PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS VIOLATION

32. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 31.

Respondent's failure to provide him with notice and an opportunity to be heard to contest his removal to a nation that is not his country of origin violates the Due process Clause, the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"), 5 U.S.C. §§ 551-559, 701-706, and the INA and its implementing regulations.

Like **Zavvar v. Scott**, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 175897 the petitioner in this case seeks an order directing Respondents to provide him with notice and an opportunity to contest removal to a third country on the basis of fear or likelihood of persecution in such a third country. Petitioner fled from a Communist country given asylum and C.A.T. comparable to that sought in D.V.D. *See* D.V.D., 2025 WL 1142968, at *24 (enjoining the Government from removing non-citizens to third-party countries without providing various procedural safeguards, including a "meaningful opportunity for the alien to raise a fear of return for eligibility for [Convention Against Torture ("CAT")] protections"). If granted the Habeas relief petitioner asks that it be ordered just as the case of **Alic v. Dept of Homeland Security**, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 193793 that Respondents and all their officers, agents, employees, attorneys, and persons acting on their behalf or in concert with them be prohibited from removing Petitioner to a third country without a meaningful opportunity to be heard in reopened removal proceedings with hearing before an immigration Judge.

The question as to whether Petitioner's detention is in violation of the Laws of the United States and 4th and 5th Amendment is one for a Federal Habeas Court to hear. 28 U.S.C. §2241. Accordingly, Petitioner files the accompanying petition for appointment of Counsel and request that this Court order his immediate release from detention/confinement at Stewart Detention Center located at 146 CCA Rd. Lumpkin, GA 31815.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

1. Assume jurisdiction over the matter;
2. Grant the Petitioner a Habeas Corpus directing the respondent to immediately release petitioner from custody, under reasonable conditions of supervision;
3. Order respondent to refrain from transferring the petitioner out of the jurisdiction of ICE Director's Jurisdiction for the Middle District of Georgia while the petitioner remains in the Respondent's custody; and
4. Order Respondents and all their officers, agents, employees, attorneys, and persons acting on their behalf or in concert with them be prohibited from removing Petitioner to a third country without a meaningful opportunity to be heard in reopened removal proceedings with hearing before an immigration Judge especially once released on supervision.
5. Award Petitioner's Attorney fees and cost under the Equal Access to Justice Act("EAJA"), as amended, 5 U.S.C. §2412, and on other basis justified under law; and
6. Grant any other form of relief this court deems proper.

x _____

JULY 22-2026

THU MINH LY,

DETAINED A# [redacted]

Stewart Detention Center

146 CCA Rd.

Lumpkin, GA 31815

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I Swear, that a true and correct copy of the following Motion has been placed in the hands of an institution official to be furnished and forwarded by first class mail to the following parties listed below on JULY 22-2026

1. **U.S. DISTRICT COURT**
   For the Middle District of Georgia
   Columbus Division
   P.O. BOX 124
   Columbus, GA 31902

2. **Office Of Chief Counsel DHS/ICE**
   Stewart Detention Center
   146 CCA Rd.
   Lumpkin, GA 31815

x Thu

JULY 22-2026
THU MINH LY,
DETAINED A# [redacted]
Stewart Detention Center
146 CCA Rd.
Lumpkin, GA 31815