## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

ALI NEZAMABADI,	)
Petitioner,	
v.	No. 25 C 1568
CALEB VITELLO, in his official capacity as Acting Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, et al.,	Judge Chang
Respondents. )	

## RESPONDENTS' SUPPLEMENTARY RESPONSE

Pursuant to this court's order of February 14, 2025, Dkt. 9, respondents hereby provide the following supplement responding to three requests for further information posed by the court.

(1) The basis for the detention of the Petitioner, explaining the factual basis and also citing governing statutes, regulations, or immigration-court orders.

The Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA") gives the United States Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") discretion to arrest and detain foreign nationals with pending removal proceedings. See 8 U.S.C. §§ 1226(a)–(b). This background law is relevant here because the petition admits that the petitioner is still in removal proceedings. See Dkt. 1 at ¶ 11 (discussing how "Petitioner along with his family are in removal proceedings").

In some cases, DHS has no discretion and must detain the relevant foreign national. See 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c) (discussing how "[t]he Attorney General<sup>[2]</sup> shall take into custody any alien"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This supplement uses the term "foreign national" as equivalent to the statutory term of "alien" within the INA.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Cf. Young Dong Kim v. Holder, 737 F.3d 1181, 1185 (7th Cir. 2013) (treating "Attorney General" and "DHS" within the INA synonymously after the enactment of the Homeland Security Act of 2002).

with certain criminal charges or convictions (emphasis added)); see also Demore v. Kim, 538 U.S. 510, 531 (2003) (held that § 1226(c) "is a constitutionally permissible part of the process" for arresting, detaining, and deporting inadmissible foreign nationals); see also Gonzalez v. O'Connell, 355 F.3d 1010, 1019–21 (7th Cir. 2004) (similar).

In a similar vein, the recently enacted Laken Riley Act "require[s] the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft" — including any foreign national "charged with, is arrested for, is convicted of, admits having committed, or admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of any burglary, theft, larceny, shoplifting, or assault of a law enforcement officer offense, or any crime that results in death or serious bodily injury to another person." Pub. Law No. 119-1 (emphasis added regarding Congress's explicit use of the past tense so as to rebut the presumption against retroactivity in civil statutes); see also § 1226(c)(1)(E)(ii) (which is a portion of the INA amended by the Laken Riley Act). That new law is relevant here because the petitioner has been arrested in the recent past for crimes involving both "bodily injury to another person" and "larceny." See Respondents' Exhibit 1.

## (2) Citations to the Illinois TRUST Act that prompted the transfer of the Petitioner from Illinois to the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

The Illinois TRUST Act was enacted in 2017 to prohibit Illinois law enforcement officials from participating in federal civil immigration enforcement. See TRUST Act, 5 Ill. Comp. Stat. 805/1 et seq. (2017). The TRUST Act was amended in 2021 by the Way Forward Act, to, among other things, prevent state and local law enforcement officials from entering into agreements to detain individuals for federal civil immigration violations. See id. at 805/15(g). In combination, the Way Forward Act and the TRUST Act limit cooperation with federal enforcement in numerous ways. For example, and as is most relevant to the court's inquiry, Section 15 of the TRUST Act

prohibits "[a] law enforcement agency or law enforcement official" from "detain[ing] or continu[ing] to detain any individual solely on the basis of any immigration detainer or civil immigration warrant or otherwise comply with an immigration detainer or civil immigration warrant." *Id.* at 805/15(a). Under this section, unless presented with a federal criminal warrant, or otherwise required by federal law, Illinois state law enforcement officials may not "assist in any capacity with an immigration agent's enforcement operations." *Id.* at 805/15(h).

## (3) The basis for the government's position that the Petitioner can be transferred again without permission of a court.

8 U.S.C. § 1231(g) provides that the DHS Secretary "shall arrange for appropriate places of detention for aliens detained pending removal or a decision on removal." As another court has observed, "Congress has squarely placed the responsibility of determining where aliens are to be detained within the sound discretion of DHS. *Avramenkov v. INS*, 99 F. Supp. 2d 210, 213 (D. Conn. 2000) (discussing § 1231(g)(1)). In other words, the agency's "discretionary power to transfer aliens from one locale to another, as [the DHS Secretary] deems appropriate, arises from [§ 1231(g)'s] statutory language." *Id*.

Moreover, multiple decisions interpreting this provision have concluded that "court[s] ha[ve] no jurisdiction to review the [Secretary's] decision to transfer an alien from one locale to another to commence removal proceedings. *Id.* at 214 (citing *Chavez v. INS*, 55 F. Supp. 2d 555, 557 (W.D. La. 1999)); see also Van Dinh v. Reno, 197 F.3d 427, 434 (10th Cir. 1999) (concluding that 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii), in combination with § 1231(g), bars judicial review of the discretionary decision to transfer a foreign national from one correctional facility to another); *Salazar v. Dubois*, No. 17 Civ. 2186, 2017 WL 4045304, at \*1 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 11, 2017) ("[W]ithout a showing that a transfer would infringe on Salazar's constitutional rights, this Court does not have authority to issue an order to change or keep Salazar at any particular location.");

Guangzu Zheng v. Decker, No. 14 Civ. 4663, 2014 WL 7190993, at \*15–16 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 12, 2014) (denying petitioner's request that the court order U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") not to transfer him to another jurisdiction).<sup>3</sup>

Respectfully submitted,

MORRIS PASQUAL Acting United States Attorney

By: s/ Joshua S. Press

JOSHUA S. PRESS Assistant United States Attorney 219 South Dearborn Street Chicago, Illinois 60604 (312) 886-7625 joshua.press@usdoj.gov

CRAIG A. OSWALD Assistant United States Attorney

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> According to ICE, petitioner was transferred today (that is, February 14, 2025) from the Waukesha County Jail to the Dodge Correctional Institution in Waupun, Wisconsin. Further, the DHS decision to detain petitioner in Wisconsin was made before this action was even filed. *See* Dkt. 8-1, Declaration of Joseph Chavez, at ¶ 10–11.