

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

ADITYA WAHYU HARSONO,

Petitioner,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity as President of the United States; PAMELA BONDI, in her official capacity as United States; DANIEL HARTOG, in his official capacity as the Kandiyohi County Sheriff; MATTHEW AKERSON, in his official capacity as Kandiyohi County Jail Administrator; PETER BERG, in his official capacity as the St. Paul Field Office Director for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; JAMIE HOLT, in her official capacity as Homeland Security Investigations St. Paul Special Agent in Charge, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; TODD LYONS, in his official capacity as Acting Director, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; KRISTI NOEM, in her official capacity as Secretary of the United States Department of Homeland Security; and MARCO RUBIO, in his official capacity as Secretary of State,

Respondents.

Case No. _____

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS**

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner Aditya Wahyu Harsono is a 34-year-old Muslim international student from Indonesia, an environmental advocate, artist-entrepreneur, and the young father to an eight-month-old daughter with special medical needs. Over the past decade, he has earned both his Bachelor of Science and Master of Business Administration degrees with a concentration in Environmental Science from Southwest Minnesota State University (“SMSU”). Following graduation, Mr. Harsono was lawfully employed as a supply chain manager at Avera Marshall

Regional Medical Center under the Optional Practical Training (“OPT”) program. At all relevant times, Mr. Harsono maintained valid F-1 status. He is also lawfully present pursuant to a pending application for permanent resident status, based on his marriage to Peyton Harsono, a U.S. citizen. Mr. and Mrs. Harsono are new parents to an eight-month-old U.S. citizen daughter with special medical needs. This young family has now been separated because of Respondents’ unlawful, arbitrary, and retaliatory detention of Mr. Harsono—a plight that has attracted significant public attention and requires immediate redress.¹

2. On March 27, 2025, Mr. Harsono was unlawfully arrested by plainclothes agents from the Department of Homeland Security’s Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“DHS” or “ICE”) while at work at the local hospital. Agents coerced Mr. Harsono’s coworkers into staging a meeting with him in the basement of the hospital, then ambushed and handcuffed him without showing a warrant, stating a reason, or providing any documentation. ICE transported Mr. Harsono in an unmarked vehicle to Kandiyohi County Jail without judicial authorization, probable cause, or a lawful basis for arrest. He has remained in ICE custody ever since, despite posing no flight risk, having no history of violence, and being in valid immigration status. He has been charged with no crime.

3. The day after his arrest, on March 28, 2025, ICE served Mr. Harsono with a Notice to Appear (“NTA”) alleging that he was removable under INA § 237(a)(1)(B), 8 U.S.C. § 1227(a)(1)(B), for remaining in the United States beyond the purported “revocation date” of his

¹ See, e.g. Aleks Phillips, *Indonesian Student Detained by ICE at Hospital After U.S. Visa Revoked*, *Newsweek* (Apr. 11, 2025, 10:50 AM), <https://www.newsweek.com/aditya-harsono-detained-ice-hospital-student-visa-2059471>; Matt McKinney, *Indonesian Man Details Surprise ICE Arrest in Minnesota Hospital; Judge Denies Release*, *Star Trib.* (Apr. 12, 2025, 3:44 PM), <https://www.startribune.com/indonesian-man-details-surprise-ice-arrest-in-minnesota-hospital-judge-denies-release/601332002>; Ernesto Londoño, *Minnesota Man Whose Student Visa Was Revoked Says It ‘Shattered’ His Life*, *N.Y. Times* (Apr. 23, 2025), <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/04/23/us/minnesota-student-aditya-harsono-visa.html>.

F-1 visa.

4. However, ICE presented no contemporaneous evidence that the Department of State (“DOS”) ever revoked Mr. Harsono’s student visa pursuant to the relevant statute, INA § 221(i), 8 U.S.C. § 1201(i). The only evidence ICE has ever produced is a now-discredited DOS form-memo purporting to document a “silent revocation” of Mr. Harsono’s visa by unidentified DOS personnel.² On its face, this silent revocation memo only confirms that ICE drove the process rather than DOS officials with visa revocation authority. Moreover, no government official of any agency who cooperated in the fabrication of the silent memo ever came within a mile of exercising lawful discretion to revoke Mr. Harsono’s visa under INA § 221(i). The silent memo reflects that ICE provided DOS misleading, incomplete information about Mr. Harsono’s criminal history. The silent memo highlights a criminal charge against Mr. Harsono that ICE knew had been dismissed, while his actual conviction was for misdemeanor damage to property resulting from his graffiti art. Mr. Harsono has taken full responsibility for this incident, but it provides no basis under the INA for deporting him or refusing him admission to this country. Indeed, months before DHS arrested and detained him, it had already readmitted Mr. Harsono to the United States with knowledge of his minor criminal history. In short, even if somebody inside DOS *had* been attempting to exercise discretion pursuant to INA § 221(i), the silent memo—and the information and process embodied within it—could not possibly have informed a valid discretionary revocation.

5. Worse, the actual considered reasons that Respondents *did* have for arresting and detaining Mr. Harsono are unconstitutional, unlawful, and bear no relation to any legitimate

² Kyle Cheney & Josh Gerstein, *Feds reveal how immigration squad targeted thousands of foreign students*, *Politico* (Apr. 29, 2025), <https://www.politico.com/news/2025/04/29/immigration-foreign-students-00317437>

statutory purpose for immigration detention. On information and belief, Respondents arrested and continue to detain Mr. Harsono in retaliation for his protected speech and political associations, pursuant to their unlawful policies of targeting both international students who support Palestinian human rights as well as those who support racial justice. Mr. Harsono is a practicing Muslim who has supported Palestinian rights openly on social media, his Instagram biography prominently displays “Free Palestine” in Arabic, and he has given charitable support in sponsoring a child impacted by the war in Gaza. Mr. Harsono has also advocated for racial justice and both spoken out for and peacefully protested police violence. He peacefully participated in protests for racial justice following the killings of George Floyd and Daunte Wright. ICE boasted that it is systematically monitoring the social media of international students in order to find and stop their protected speech on these topics—and it has repeatedly used their protected speech to justify unconstitutional, retaliatory arrests and detention. *See Bridges v. Wixon*, 326 U.S. 135, 148 (1945); *Mt. Healthy City Bd. of Educ. v. Doyle*, 429 U.S. 274 (1977); *Bello-Reyes v. Gaynor*, 985 F.3d 696, 698 (9th Cir. 2021); *Lamar v. Payne*, 111 F.4th 902, 907 (8th Cir. 2024). Here, after DHS procured a silent memo from DOS purporting to revoke Mr. Harsono’s student visa, DHS then terminated Mr. Harsono’s records in the federal database universities rely upon to track international student visas, again without any notice to him. DHS justified this termination in the student visa database by stating that Mr. Harsono had been deemed deportable on “foreign policy” grounds under INA § 237(a)(4)(C).

6. Respondents are also detaining Mr. Harsono for another unlawful purpose: to terrify and coerce other international students, whose student visa records DHS has also terminated, into abandoning their lawful studies and self-deporting. Respondents have purported to revoke student visas and have arbitrarily terminated without notice the visa records of thousands

of lawfully present international students under similarly opaque and baseless circumstances. After dozens of court orders assailed DHS's sudden mass termination of student visa records as arbitrary and lawless, DHS has reactivated many student's visa records over the past week in an effort to forestall further judicial scrutiny, while also promising courts it is creating a new but as yet unelaborated policy for future student visa record terminations. Throughout all of this, Mr. Harsono has remained in DHS detention at the Kandiyohi County Jail. Respondents' unmistakable purpose in arresting and continuing to detain Mr. Harsono is to send a chilling message to other international students: speak out, and you will be next. *See Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 532–33 (2003) (Kennedy, J., concurring); *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).

7. Mr. Harsono's continued detention is not only unsupported by statute, but unconstitutional. He was arrested without a warrant, without probable cause, and without a valid charging document. Mr. Harsono is neither deportable under the Immigration and Nationality Act nor subject to mandatory detention under any statutory provision. He remains detained on the basis of a purported visa revocation, in violation of the U.S. Constitution, statute, and State Department policy.³ When an immigration judge found that Mr. Harsono's misdemeanor for graffiti did not make him a danger to public safety or a flight risk, DHS unilaterally invoked a rarely used provision of the immigration regulations to keep him detained—additional evidence that the actual purposes of Mr. Harsono's detention are to punish him and intimidate others. The unlawful purposes of Mr. Harsono's detention are further evident in light of the undisputed fact that his presence in the United States is independently lawful pursuant to a pending application for permanent resident status, through his marriage to Mrs. Harsono, and there has been no dispute

³ Coral Murphy Marcos, *Indonesian Student Detained by ICE After US Secretly Revokes His Visa*, **The Guardian** (Apr. 19, 2025), <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/apr/19/aditya-wahyu-harsono-immigration-indonesia>.

that he is prima facie eligible for this permanent status. The couple's application, once approved, would keep Mr. Harsono and their family intact here in Minnesota. DHS' unlawful detention threatens his application; indeed, Mr. Harsono has a biometrics appointment on May 5, 2025, with U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Services ("USCIS") in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, that he cannot attend because of his detention, and that he has requested to reschedule for May 23, 2025 in St. Paul, Minnesota—in the hope that he can then attend. In addition to upending Mr. Harsono's life, and future in this country, his ongoing confinement—executed without legal justification or a legitimate immigration purpose—violates both the procedural and substantive guarantees of the Fifth Amendment, as well as his First Amendment rights to free expression and association.

8. The arrest and continued detention of Mr. Harsono—without a warrant, without probable cause, without due process, and in apparent retaliation for constitutionally protected political speech—is a direct assault on the Constitution. DHS has acted in blatant defiance of constitutional guarantees, statutes, regulations, and its own internal policies. Such unchecked executive overreach cannot stand. The rule of law demands not only relief for Mr. Harsono, but a resounding reaffirmation that the Constitution is not a suggestion—and that no agency, no matter how powerful, is above its commands.

9. This federal habeas petition is Mr. Harsono's only avenue for relief from detention that has been unlawful from the moment of his arrest over a month ago. He respectfully asks this Court to: (1) declare that his detention is unlawful; (2) prohibit Respondents from detaining him by ordering his immediate release; and (3) prohibiting Respondents from transferring Mr. Harsono out of the District of Minnesota while it resolves his habeas petition. The relief requested is not only legally warranted but urgently needed to halt the ongoing constitutional harm.⁴

⁴ Petitioner is also filing a separate Emergency Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary

JURISDICTION

10. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, as Petitioner is currently in federal immigration custody and seeks habeas corpus relief for ongoing violations of the U.S. Constitution, federal statutes, and applicable regulations. Jurisdiction is also proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, as this action arises under the laws and Constitution of the United States. Additional jurisdiction exists under the Suspension Clause, U.S. Const. art. I, § 9, cl. 2, which guarantees the right to petition for habeas corpus to challenge unlawful executive detention. This Court also has jurisdiction under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 701 et seq., because Petitioner challenges final agency actions that are arbitrary, capricious, and contrary to law. Declaratory and injunctive relief are authorized by 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, and the Court has supplemental remedial authority under the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651, to issue such writs as may be necessary to preserve its jurisdiction and protect Petitioner's rights.

11. An actual, justiciable controversy exists between the parties regarding the legality of Mr. Harsono's ongoing detention. This Court is empowered to issue declaratory relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2201 and injunctive relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2202. In light of the ongoing constitutional violations and risk of irreparable harm, the Court may also invoke its authority under the All Writs Act to issue temporary or emergency relief to preserve the status quo and prevent mootness.

12. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241(a), because Petitioner is detained within the District of Minnesota at Kandiyohi County Jail in Willmar, Minnesota. Venue is also proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2), because a substantial part of the events and omissions giving rise to this action occurred in this District. Venue further lies under 28 U.S.C. §

Injunction to preserve the status quo and prevent irreparable harm while this action is pending. That motion is incorporated herein by reference.

1391(e)(1), because Respondents are officers or employees of the United States acting in their official capacities and reside or may be found in this District. The St. Paul Field Office of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), located at Fort Snelling, Minnesota, is the agency responsible for initiating and directing the enforcement actions at issue. Additionally, the Kandiyohi County Sheriff and Jail Administrator, who maintain day-to-day custody over Mr. Harsono, are located within this District and are considered his immediate custodians for habeas purposes. Petitioner also resides in this District.

PARTIES

13. Petitioner Aditya Wahyu Harsono (pronounced Uh-Ditt-Yuh Hair-Sow-No) is a resident of Marshall, Minnesota, currently detained by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) at Kandiyohi County Jail in Willmar, Minnesota. He is a citizen of Indonesia who was lawfully admitted to the United States on an F-1 student visa in January 2021. After completing his studies at Southwest Minnesota State University, he was authorized to work under the Optional Practical Training (“OPT”) program. Mr. Harsono is a practicing Muslim and is married to a United States citizen, with whom he shares an eight-month-old U.S. citizen daughter with special medical needs. He has a pending I-485 application for adjustment of status based on this bona fide marriage and is lawfully present in a period of authorized stay.

14. Respondent Donald J. Trump is named in his official capacity as President of the United States. In this role, he is ultimately responsible for the policies and actions of the executive branch, including those of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), ICE, and the U.S. Department of State, and for setting the immigration enforcement policies and posture that led to Mr. Harsono’s detention.

15. Respondent Peter Berg is named in his official capacity as the Field Office Director

for ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) in the St. Paul Field Office. He has direct and immediate custody over Mr. Harsono and is responsible for decisions concerning his arrest, detention, and removal.

16. Respondent Pamela Bondi is named in her official capacity as Attorney General of the United States. As the head of the U.S. Department of Justice, she exercises oversight over immigration adjudications and prosecutions through delegated authority.

17. Respondent Jamie Holt is named in her official capacity as Special Agent in Charge of Homeland Security Investigations (HSI) in St. Paul, Minnesota. She is responsible for initiating, supervising, and directing the investigations that led to Mr. Harsono's arrest.

18. Respondent Todd Lyons is named in his official capacity as Acting Director of ICE. He exercises nationwide authority over the administration and enforcement of U.S. immigration laws and is responsible for all ICE custody decisions.

19. Respondent Kristi Noem is named in her official capacity as Secretary of Homeland Security. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a), she is charged with the overall administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, including implementation of immigration enforcement policies and detention protocols. Upon information and belief, DHS under her direction initiated the unlawful arrest of Mr. Harsono and the unlawful termination of Mr. Harsono's SEVIS record.

20. Respondent Marco Rubio is named in his official capacity as Secretary of State. He holds ultimate authority over the U.S. Department of State and visa adjudications, including discretionary power to revoke visas under 8 U.S.C. § 1201(i) and to make determinations regarding foreign policy consequences under 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182(a)(3)(C)(iii)-(iv) and 1227(a)(4)(C). Respondent Rubio, through his agency, played a role in the silent and retroactive purported revocation of Mr. Harsono's F-1 visa.

21. Respondents Daniel Hartog, Sheriff of Kandiyohi County, and Matthew Akerson, Kandiyohi County Jail Administrator, are named in their official capacities as Mr. Harsono's immediate custodians. They are responsible for his physical detention at Kandiyohi County Jail pursuant to an intergovernmental service agreement with ICE.

REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST

22. While Respondents Peter Berg, Jamie Holt, and Todd Lyons are named as Petitioner's immediate custodians and exercise direct control over his detention and removal, the real parties in interest include high-ranking executive officials who created and implemented the policies resulting in Mr. Harsono's unlawful arrest and continued confinement.

23. Specifically, Respondents Donald J. Trump, Kristi Noem, and Marco Rubio—in their capacities as President, Secretary of Homeland Security, and Secretary of State, respectively—bear ultimate responsibility for the retaliatory immigration enforcement posture, silent visa revocation practices, and policy directives that gave rise to this action. Their discretionary actions and omissions directly contributed to the violations of law and constitutional rights alleged herein.

24. Each of these Respondents exercises statutory authority under the Immigration and Nationality Act and related federal laws. They are properly named in this action to ensure that the Court may grant complete and effective relief, including declaratory and injunctive remedies necessary to halt the ongoing constitutional and statutory violations impacting not only Mr. Harsono, but similarly situated individuals across the country.

EXHAUSTION OF REMEDIES

25. Exhaustion is not required in this case because no alternative forum exists in which Petitioner can obtain relief on the claims presented here. Immigration courts and the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) lack jurisdiction to decide constitutional questions. *See Matter of C-*,

20 *I. & N.* Dec. 529, 532 (BIA 1992). Nor is there any statutory requirement that Petitioner exhaust administrative remedies before seeking habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Courts have consistently recognized that constitutional claims are exempt from exhaustion requirements in the immigration context. *See Pedro O. v. Garland*, 543 F. Supp. 3d 733, 740–41 (D. Minn. 2021); *see also Ace Property & Cas. Ins. Co. v. Fed. Crop Ins. Co.*, 440 F.3d 992, 1000 (8th Cir. 2006).

26. Moreover, even if some exhaustion doctrine were arguably applicable, it would be excused here because requiring further exhaustion would be futile, unavailable, and unreasonable. *See Raymond v. Bd. of Regents of Univ. of Minn.*, 847 F.3d 585, 591 (8th Cir. 2017). Petitioner challenges the legality of his arrest and detention, including his seizure without a warrant, the silent revocation of his visa in violation of binding federal policy, and ongoing violations of his First and Fifth Amendment rights. None of these claims can be meaningfully addressed or remedied through administrative processes.

27. Finally, exhaustion is not required where, as here, a petitioner would suffer irreparable harm if immediate judicial relief is denied. *See McCarthy v. Madigan*, 503 U.S. 140, 147 (1992). Petitioner is currently detained under constitutionally infirm circumstances, separated from his family, and at risk of removal without any meaningful opportunity to be heard. The urgency of these constitutional injuries requires this Court’s immediate intervention.

28. For the same reasons that justify this Court’s issuance of a Temporary Restraining Order—namely, the ongoing and irreparable constitutional harm suffered by Mr. Harsono—further administrative exhaustion is neither required nor appropriate in this case.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

I. RESPONDENTS ARE ARRESTING AND DETAINING INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS PURSUANT TO A RETALIATORY POLICY AND FOR PUNITIVE PURPOSES.

A. Respondents Developed and Implemented a Policy Using the Immigration System to Retaliate Against International Students' Protected Speech and Association.

29. Following the January 2025 inauguration, President Trump issued two Executive Orders explicitly designed to weaponize the immigration system against lawfully present noncitizens who engage in constitutionally protected political speech and association.

30. Executive Order 14161 directs federal agency heads to create internal policies to identify noncitizens deemed to “bear hostile attitudes” toward the “culture, government, institutions, or founding principles” of the United States. This sweeping and undefined standard encompasses virtually any form of dissent—such as criticism of police brutality or advocacy for Palestinian rights—and invites discriminatory application, particularly against international students, immigrants, and religious minorities.⁵

31. Executive Order 14188 further instructs the Secretaries of State, Education, and Homeland Security to coordinate with institutions of higher education to identify and report “activities by [noncitizen] students” that may trigger removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(3), which addresses “[s]ecurity and related grounds” of inadmissibility. The White House described this initiative as “forceful and unprecedented,” specifically targeting what it called “leftist, anti-American colleges and universities.” The Order blurs the line between education and surveillance, chilling political expression on campuses nationwide.⁶ The White House fact sheet accompanying Executive Order 14188 promises to “punish anti-Jewish racism in leftist, anti-American colleges and universities.”⁷ The fact sheet also promises to target the student visas of “all Hamas

⁵ Exec. Order No. 14161, 90 Fed. Reg. 8451 (Jan. 30, 2025)

⁶ Exec. Order No. 14188, 90 Fed. Reg. 8847 (Jan. 29, 2025).

⁷ Fact Sheet: President Donald J. Trump Takes Forceful and Unprecedented Steps to Combat Anti-Semitism, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/fact-sheets/2025/01/fact-sheet-president-donald-j-trump-takes-forceful-and-unprecedented-steps-to-combat-anti-semitism>. [<https://perma.cc/6QTD-M3FD>]

sympathizers on college campuses, which have been infested with radicalism like never before.” *Id.* It threatens: “To all the resident aliens who joined the pro-jihadist protests, we put you on notice: come 2025, we will find you, and we will deport you.” *Id.*

32. On or around March 5, 2025, Respondents began implementing the broad and vague “Foreign Policy Ground” for deportability, codified at 8 U.S.C. § 1227(a)(4)(C)(i). This provision permits the Secretary of State to revoke the visas of certain noncitizens and in certain circumstances where an individual’s “presence or activities” in the United States are deemed to have “potentially serious adverse foreign policy consequences.”

33. Under this policy, multiple federal agencies have coordinated to target and detain international students based on their real or perceived political views—particularly support for Palestinian human rights.

34. Although 8 U.S.C. § 1227(a)(4)(C)(i) grants the Secretary of State authority to revoke visas in certain circumstances, that authority is significantly constrained. Federal law and the Constitution prohibit its use to retaliate against or punish constitutionally protected expression. *See* U.S. Const. amend. I; 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(3)(C)(ii)–(iii). The sole exception requires a personal determination by the Secretary of State that a noncitizen’s admission would compromise a compelling foreign policy interest, along with formal notification to relevant congressional committees. *See* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182(a)(3)(C)(iii)–(iv), 1227(a)(4)(C)(ii).

35. Congress made clear that the Foreign Policy Ground should be “used sparingly,” for situations such as when an individual’s presence could cause “imminent harm to the lives or property of United States persons abroad”—not as a catch-all for political dissent. *See* H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 101-955, at 6794–95 (1990).

36. DHS’s internal guidance has long warned against using immigration enforcement

to suppress lawful political activity. One such memorandum from the first Trump administration states unequivocally: “DHS does not profile, target, or discriminate against any individual for exercising his or her First Amendment rights.”⁸

37. That same memo prohibits DHS from collecting or using information about political speech or protest participation—except in narrowly defined circumstances. Upon information and belief, this guidance remains in effect.⁹

38. Despite these legal and policy restrictions, Respondents have applied the Foreign Policy Ground to punish the constitutionally protected speech of international students such as Mahmoud Khalil and Rumeysa Ozturk. When asked whether political protest is grounds for deportation, Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security Troy Edgar, speaking of Mr. Khalil, told NPR’s Morning Edition:

“[L]et me put it this way, . . . imagine if he came in and filled out the form and said, ‘I want a student visa.’ They ask him, ‘What are you going to do here?’ [A]nd he sa[ys], ‘I’m going . . . [t]o go and protest.’ . . . We would never have let him in the country.”¹⁰

39. In flagrant violation of the First and Fifth Amendments, and DHS’s own internal policies, Respondents—including Secretary of State Marco Rubio—have revoked the visas of international students engaged in political expression, particularly those advocating for Palestinian rights or supporting racial justice.¹¹

⁸ 7 HOMELAND SECURITY, *Information Regarding First Amendment Protected Activities* (May 17, 2019), https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/info_regarding_first_amendment_protected_activities_as1_signed_05.17.2019.pdf.

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ Michel Martin (Host), *DHS Official Defends Mahmoud Khalil Arrest, but Offers Few Details on Why It Happened*, **NPR Morning Edition** (Mar. 13, 2025, 4:18 AM), <https://bit.ly/3Ych75C> (Transcript)

¹¹ The Policy was in effect as early as March 6, 2025. Secretary Marco Rubio (@secrubio), X (Mar. 6, 2025, 4:30 PM), <https://bit.ly/3EjdFzn>. By March 27, 2025, when asked how many revocations have been executed, Respondent Rubio responded: “It might be more than 300 at this point. We do it every day. Every time I find one of these lunatics, I take away their visas.” Humeysra Pamuk, *Rubio Says US May Have Revoked More Than 300 Visas*, **Reuters** (Mar. 27, 2025, 10:15 PM), <https://bit.ly/3EgLTg>.

40. Since the policy's implementation, multiple international students and faculty have been arrested and detained, including a post-doctoral fellow at Georgetown University and an assistant professor at Brown University's medical school.¹²

41. Those detained under the policy are often confined in remote local jails or federal detention centers, far from their families, schools, and attorneys. These sudden transfers—executed without notice or individualized assessment—undermine detainees' ability to secure legal representation and violate their Fifth and Sixth Amendment rights.¹³

42. Upon information and belief, DHS—through ICE—has also used social media surveillance to target international students for deportation. DHS has established overlapping dragnets of social media surveillance that use artificial intelligence¹⁴ and data analytics to target international students *both* for protected pro-Palestinian speech *and* for any kind of contact with the criminal justice system.¹⁵ On information and belief, Respondents identified and unlawfully targeted Mr. Harsono for arrest and detention in *both* respects. A March 2025 *New York Times* investigation reported that ICE investigators “scoured the internet for social media posts and videos that the administration could argue showed sympathy toward Hamas,” and “handed over reports on multiple protesters to the State Department” during the period just prior to Mr.

¹² Karina Tsui, *What We Know About the Federal Detention of Activists, Students and Scholars Connected to Universities*, CNN (Apr. 2, 2025, updated 8:48 PM), <https://www.cnn.com/2025/03/31/us/what-we-know-college-activists-immigrationhnk/index.html>.

¹³ See, e.g., Jaelyn Diaz & Adrian Florido, *Why Is Trump Sending Immigrant University Scholars to Louisiana and Texas?*, NPR (Apr. 8, 2025, 5:00 AM), <https://www.npr.org/2025/04/08/nx-s1-5351645/ice-detention-louisiana-university-scholars>.

¹⁴ Marc Caputo, *State Dept. to use AI to revoke visas of foreign students who appear 'pro-Hamas'*, *Axios* (Mar. 6, 2025), <https://www.axios.com/2025/03/06/state-department-ai-revoke-foreign-student-visas-hamas>

¹⁵ Andrew Harrer, *Inside the DHS task force scouring foreign students' social media*, *NBC News* (Apr. 9, 2025), <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/national-security/dhs-task-force-scouring-foreign-students-social-media-rcna198532>.

Harsono's arrest.¹⁶ DHS confirmed in April 2025 that it actively screens social media posts for pro-Palestinian speech as part of immigration benefit adjudications under the President's Executive Orders.¹⁷ And the *New York Times* reported yesterday that the Department of Justice sought to investigate a Columbia University student group with the goal of deporting the students—a request that was halted by a federal magistrate judge repeatedly instructing them that the investigation was unlawful.¹⁸

43. In some cases—including Mr. Harsono's—Respondents have later pretextually claimed to revoke visas not under the Foreign Policy Ground, but under INA § 221(i), 8 U.S.C. § 1201(i), which permits discretionary visa revocation. But visa revocations do not automatically lead to termination of status or removal proceedings. *See Knoetze v. U.S. Dep't of State*, 634 F.2d 207, 212 (5th Cir. 1981) (“Revocation of an entry visa does not automatically lead to deportation of the [noncitizen.]”); *Jane Doe #1 v. Bondi*, No. 25-cv-1998, 2025 WL 1188469, at *2 (N.D. Ga. Apr. 18, 2025) (“[T]he revocation of an F-1 visa does not constitute failure to maintain status pursuant to the relevant regulations and does not provide a basis to terminate F-1 student status under the SEVIS registration system.”). Indeed, in litigation about student status terminations, DHS has attempted to assure courts that visa revocations do not pose grounds for immediate deportation. *See* Decl. of Andre Watson ¶ 21, *Deore v. Noem*, No. 2:25-cv-11038 (E.D. Mich. filed Apr. 14, 2025), ECF No. 14-3 (“Prudential visa revocation, absent other factors, does not make an individual amendable [sic] to removal.”); Gov. Opp. at 3, *Deore*, ECF No. 14 (“[A] prudential

¹⁶ See Jack Healy, Zolan Kanno-Youngs, and Mike Baker, *A Video From Tufts Captures the Fear and Aggression in Trump's Crackdown*, **N.Y. Times** (Mar. 27, 2025), <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/03/27/us/politics/tufts-ice-crackdown.html>.

¹⁷ U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGR. SERVS., *DHS to Begin Screening Aliens' Social Media Activity for Antisemitism* (Apr. 9, 2025), <https://www.uscis.gov/newsroom/news-releases/dhs-to-begin-screening-aliens-social-media-activity-for-antisemitism>.

¹⁸ Devlin Barrett, *Orders to Investigate Columbia Protesters Raised Alarms in Justice Dept.*, **N.Y. Times** (May 1, 2025), <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/05/01/us/politics/columbia-protests-justice-department.html>.

revocation, or revocation upon departure, does not have a corresponding ground of removability.”); *id.* at 10 (claiming that because the visa revocation was not immediate, it was prudential). The differential treatment of Mr. Harsono and students like him offers insight into Respondents’ retaliatory purpose in targeting them. And the cited offenses—like Mr. Harsono’s 2023 misdemeanor for nonviolent graffiti—do not satisfy the regulatory requirements to terminate student status. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 214.1(g) (defining relevant offenses as “crimes of violence” punishable by more than one year imprisonment). This aspect of the Respondents’ dragnet has been especially wide-ranging and overbroad.¹⁹

44. When students are granted bond by immigration judges—based on findings that they are neither dangerous nor flight risks—DHS has invoked a very rarely used automatic stay regulation, 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(i)(2), to block their release. This regulation gives DHS a tool that can unilaterally block a noncitizen’s release from detention pending its bond appeal to the Board of Immigration Appeals, for a period of up to 90 days that is subject to further extensions. *See Review of Custody Determinations*, 71 Fed. Reg. 57873-01 (Oct. 2, 2006).

45. As applied to Mr. Harsono, the automatic stay regulation is untethered from any lawful purpose under the immigration statute, 8 U.S.C. § 1226. Instead, it has been used as a tool calculated to punish dissent, chill protected speech, and circumvent core constitutional protections. This aspect of Respondents’ campaign of politically motivated immigration detention represents a deliberate abuse of executive power—one that courts must not allow to stand.

B. Respondents Are Arresting and Detaining Some International Students to Coerce Hundreds—if Not Thousands—of Others to Self-Deport, Even Though They Remain in Lawful Status.

¹⁹ Kyle Cheney and Josh Gerstein, *Feds reveal how immigration squad targeted thousands of foreign students*, *Politico* (Apr. 29, 2025), <https://www.politico.com/news/2025/04/29/immigration-foreign-students-00317437>.

46. Under the Fifth Amendment, immigration detention is only permissible for narrow, statutorily defined purposes: namely, to ensure appearance at future proceedings or to protect the public from danger. It may not be used to punish or retaliate against individuals based on their speech, beliefs, or status. *See Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 532–33 (2003) (Kennedy, J., concurring) (“The permissibility of continued detention... turns solely upon . . . risk of flight or a danger to the community”); *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001) (Fifth Amendment prohibits immigration detention that is punitive in either purpose or effect); *Wong Wing v. United States*, 163 U.S. 228, 237–38 (1896) (prohibiting the use of immigration detention as punishment under the Fourteenth Amendment).

47. In recent weeks, however, DHS has used immigration detention to serve an entirely different and constitutionally impermissible purpose: to instill fear across international student communities, particularly among students from majority-Muslim countries and those perceived as political dissidents. By detaining Mr. Harsono without legal basis and falsely portraying him as a public safety threat, Respondents are sending an unmistakable message: dissent will be punished, and no legal status is safe.

48. In recent weeks, DHS has notified hundreds, if not thousands, of international students that they have “lost status” due to visa revocations or SEVIS record terminations.²⁰ This has happened even though neither action, under federal law, extinguishes a student’s lawful presence in the United States. As of April 25, 2025, over 240 colleges and universities have reported more than 1,800 international students and recent graduates who have been similarly

²⁰ The Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) is a web-based platform managed by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to monitor and track nonimmigrant students, exchange visitors, and their dependents in the F, M, and J visa categories. *See* U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, *SEVIS Overview*, <https://www.ice.gov/sevis/overview>.

affected.²¹

49. This is a gross distortion of immigration law. Under the law, a student's F-1 visa governs admission to the United States, but their continued stay is governed by compliance with regulatory requirements for F-1 classification. Once admitted, a student may remain in the United States lawfully so long as those requirements are met. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(f). Revocation of the visa after admission does not extinguish student status, nor does it authorize removal; it merely affects a student's ability to reenter the United States. *Id.*

50. Nor does visa revocation provide legal grounds for terminating a student's SEVIS record.²² If an F-1 visa is revoked, DHS is not authorized to terminate the student's SEVIS record. DHS's own guidance confirms this: "Visa revocation is not, in itself, a cause for termination of the student's SEVIS record."²³ Yet Respondents continue to terminate records on that precise basis—falsely declaring students out of status to justify enforcement actions and to pressure voluntary departure.²⁴

51. DHS has used these fabricated grounds to mislead students into believing they are unlawfully present and subject to immediate deportation. In reality, many remain lawfully present under the regulations. This misinformation campaign has created widespread confusion and fear

²¹ Ashley Mowreader, *International Student Visas Revoked, Inside Higher Ed*, <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/global/international-studentsus/2025/04/07/where-students-have-had-their-visas-revoked> (last visited Apr. 25, 2025).

²² DHS may only terminate a SEVIS record without student misconduct in three narrow circumstances: (1) revocation of a waiver under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(3) or (4); (2) introduction of a private bill to grant permanent residency; or (3) publication of a Federal Register notice citing national security, diplomatic, or public safety concerns. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 214.1(d); *Jie Fang v. Dir. U.S. Immigr. & Customs Enf't*, 935 F.3d 172, 185 n.100 (3d Cir. 2019).

²³ IMMIGR. & CUSTOMS ENF., *Policy Guidance 1004-04 – Visa Revocations* (June 7, 2010), https://www.ice.gov/doclib/sevis/pdf/visa_revocations_1004_04.pdf.

²⁴ Luis Ferré-Sadurní & Hamed Aleaziz, *How a Columbia Student Fled to Canada After ICE Came Looking for Her*, *N.Y. Times* (Mar. 15, 2025), <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/03/15/nyregion/columbia-student-kristi-noem-video.html>. ²⁴ Kristi Noem (@KristiNoem), X (Mar. 14, 2025, 11:01 AM), https://x.com/Sec_Noem/status/1900562928849326488.

across campuses, disrupting lives and sowing distrust in the rule of law.

52. The arrest and detention of Mr. Harsono—based on the unlawful revocation of his visa and the corresponding SEVIS record termination—is not only unauthorized by statute, but fundamentally punitive. Its purpose is to instill fear among international students and intimidate those who might otherwise challenge these actions. The intent and effect are to pressure students to abandon their lawful status and voluntarily depart the country under the threat of detention.

53. Several federal courts have already enjoined this practice. *In Isserdasani v. Noem*, No. 25-CV-283-wmc (W.D. Wis. Apr. 15, 2025), the court granted a temporary injunction halting SEVIS terminations and any associated legal consequences, including arrest or detention. Similarly, three judges in this District have enjoined the same practice. *See Ratsantiboon v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-01315 (JMB-JFD), 2025 WL 1118645 (D. Minn. Apr. 15, 2025); *Ziliang J. v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-01391 (PJS-DLM), 2025 WL 1235427 (D. Minn. Apr. 17, 2025); *Shaik v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-1584 (JRT/DJF), 2025 WL 1170447 (D. Minn. Apr. 22, 2025).

54. The message behind Mr. Harsono's arrest and detention could not be more chilling: even international students who comply with every legal requirement and maintain valid status are not safe if they express disfavored political views. That message—and the constitutional violations it embodies—have already driven countless students to quietly self-deport, not because they were legally required to, but because they were intimidated into silence, fear, and self-exile. That is not legitimate detention. It is state-sanctioned retaliation.

55. Allowing this kind of unchecked executive power to persist—where individuals are detained without legal authority, without process, and for impermissible, retaliatory reasons—renders the guarantees of the Constitution and federal law little more than hollow rhetoric. If the government can quietly strip away lawful status, arrest individuals without notice or cause, and

cloak these acts in bureaucratic discretion, then the rule of law itself is at risk. Federal courts must act. To leave such conduct unreviewed is to reduce the Constitution to a symbol and the legal protections it enshrines to a façade. Without meaningful judicial intervention, our founding documents cease to be enforceable guarantees and instead become ceremonial relics—invoked in theory but abandoned in practice.

II. RESPONDENTS WAS ARRESTED AND DETAINED PURSUANT TO RESPONDENTS' RETALIATORY POLICY FOR PUNITIVE PURPOSES.

A. Mr. Harsono Was Lawfully Present in the United States and Exercising Core First Amendment Rights When He Was Arrested Without Cause

56. Aditya Wahyu Harsono is a 34-year-old Indonesian national, a practicing Muslim, and a young father who was living peacefully in Marshall, Minnesota, with his U.S. citizen wife and medically vulnerable infant daughter when federal immigration agents abruptly and unlawfully arrested him at his workplace on March 27, 2025. He was given no explanation, no notice, and no opportunity to respond. He was simply taken.

57. Mr. Harsono's life in the United States reflected the very ideals that the Constitution promises to protect. After arriving in 2021 on a valid F-1 student visa, he lawfully earned both a Bachelor of Science degree and an MBA with a concentration in Environmental Science from Southwest Minnesota State University. Upon graduation, he was approved for Optional Practical Training (OPT) and began working as a supply chain manager at a hospital in Marshall, Minnesota—where he contributed meaningfully to his community and upheld every legal obligation of his status. In October 2023, he married a United States citizen, and the two are parents of an eight-month-old daughter.

58. At the time of his arrest on March 27, 2025, Mr. Harsono was lawfully present in the United States—both under a valid F-1 visa and in a period of authorized stay pursuant to a

pending I-485 application for adjustment of status, based on his bona fide marriage to a U.S. citizen. He had never missed an immigration appointment, violated a court order, or failed to meet any visa-related obligation. By every measure, Mr. Harsono was doing exactly what the law asks of him: following the rules, contributing to his community, and seeking permanent legal status through proper, lawful channels.

59. Mr. Harsono has no criminal history that justifies either the purported revocation of his visa or his ongoing detention. Apart from a small number of driving-related citations, his sole conviction—a non-violent misdemeanor property damage offense from 2022 related to graffiti art—stemmed from a youthful mistake for which Mr. Harsono has accepted responsibility, but does not remotely present a threat to public safety. He received a stayed sentence, completed a year of probation without incident, paid \$100 restitution plus \$485 in fees and fines, and he has had no subsequent contact with the criminal justice system since. This offense was not a crime of violence and does not render him removable or inadmissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 214.1(g) (explaining that only a conviction for a “crime of violence for which a sentence of more than one year imprisonment may be imposed” triggers a failure to maintain status). Mr. Harsono was convicted under Minn. Stat. § 609.595, subd. 3—a fourth-degree misdemeanor punishable by no more than 90 days in jail or a \$1,000 fine. *See* Minn. Stat. § 609.02, subd. 3.

60. After completing probation without incident, Mr. Harsono traveled to Indonesia in the spring of 2024 to visit family. Upon returning to the United States on April 27, 2024, he passed through both primary and secondary inspection at Los Angeles International Airport and was lawfully readmitted. DHS’s decision to admit him—after full inspection and post-conviction—affirmatively demonstrates that his misdemeanor conviction was neither disqualifying nor grounds

for exclusion.

61. In 2021, Mr. Harsono was arrested while peacefully participating in a protest in Minnesota following the police killings of George Floyd and Daunte Wright. That arrest resulted in no charges and was formally dismissed “in the interests of justice.” Nonetheless, DHS appears to have quietly catalogued the incident and is now using it as part of its detention rationale.²⁵

62. Mr. Harsono has never endorsed or participated in political or racial violence. His involvement in these protests was peaceful and fell squarely within the protections of the First Amendment—particularly as speech on matters of public concern. His actions were lawful, expressive, and constitutionally protected.

63. Following Mr. Harsono’s protest-related arrest in 2021, he returned to Indonesia after completing his undergraduate degree. He later reapplied for an F-1 student visa to pursue a Master’s Degree in Business Administration at Southwest Minnesota State University. The visa was granted without issue—affirmative evidence that DHS and the Department of State did not view Mr. Harsono as a public safety risk at that time, despite the prior protest arrest. This further undercuts any post hoc claim that Mr. Harsono poses a danger warranting visa revocation or detention.

64. Mr. Harsono, while attending fewer protests in recent years, used his voice and platform online to speak out against the ongoing violence in Gaza and in support of Palestinian rights. A social media account he has operated for a personal project of his—a small clothing line called “Butter Soup and Frozen Custard”—has a note on the biography page, in Arabic, saying “Free Palestine.” He donated his personal income to humanitarian aid organizations in Indonesia

²⁵ In DHS’s Evidence Packet Supporting Removal, the dismissal order for Mr. Harsono’s protest-related arrest was inexplicably prioritized as an exhibit over the sole conviction—misdemeanor damage to property—that purportedly formed the basis for his visa revocation. This ordering strongly suggests that DHS’s true focus was not on the conviction, but on penalizing Mr. Harsono for engaging in protected protest activity.

and Gaza and promoted messages of peace, solidarity, and human dignity. These expressions, rooted in his deeply held religious and moral beliefs, were entirely lawful, nonviolent, and emblematic of the freedoms the First Amendment is designed to protect. They are also directly related to his art as has explained on his social media account:

To me, making art or music are very enjoyable and liberating. It enables me to express and convey my feelings, experiences, messages and awareness about our world in subliminal, and metaphor manner. . . . I get ideas from places I go and what I look at. One way I get ideas is when I'm traveling. I get to see and experience new things and places. Another way that I get inspired is when I see the world or my life is in turmoil. For instance, in 2020, there were many momentous events that occurred and impacted our lives such as Covid-19 outbreaks, climate change, the killing of George Floyd, and many social injustice issues that are still happening around the world. Some of these events are the main factors that inspire and motivate me to make more arts and music.

65. Again, Respondents now openly boast that they used data analytics to scour social media for any mention of Palestine. Respondents targeted Mr. Harsono for detention because of the protected expression they monitored on his social media account, then pretextually justified that unlawful detention with his minor criminal history, despite having previously inspected and admitted him back into the United States *after* his misdemeanor conviction for graffiti damage had been fully resolved.

66. Mr. Harsono's detention shocks the conscience. It violates settled law, defies the Constitution, and offends the most basic principles of due process. His case reflects a deeply disturbing practice: punishing speech, silencing dissent, and weaponizing immigration enforcement as an instrument of political repression. That this was done to a peaceful, law-abiding father of a medically vulnerable eight-month-old U.S. citizen child—who believed so deeply in the promises of the First Amendment that he came to this country to live them—is not merely unlawful. It is chilling. And it must not be allowed to stand.

B. DHS Officers Arrested and Detained Mr. Harsono on March 27, 2025,

Without a Warrant, Charges, or Lawful Justification.

67. On the morning of March 27, 2025, two plainclothes Homeland Security Investigations (HSI) officers entered the hospital in Marshall, Minnesota, where Mr. Harsono worked lawfully as a supply chain manager. Without a warrant or court order, the agents instructed his coworkers to stage a fake meeting in the hospital basement to lure him into custody. They threatened legal consequences if hospital staff refused to cooperate. Through tears, and under duress, Mr. Harsono's employers, who viewed him as a model employee, complied and summoned him to the basement under false pretenses.²⁶

68. There, in the basement hallway, two ICE officers handcuffed and shackled Mr. Harsono without warning. They forcibly frisked him, confiscated his belongings, and placed him in an unmarked vehicle—refusing to tell him where he was being taken or why he was being detained. When Mr. Harsono repeatedly asked for an explanation, one officer told him only, “They will explain all that to you tomorrow,” but refused to clarify who “they” were. By the time they arrived at Kandiyohi County Jail, Mr. Harsono reasonably believed he had been formally charged with a crime, despite having received no warrant or *Miranda* warning.

69. Mr. Harsono was booked into Kandiyohi County Jail without charges, without access to an attorney, and without being informed of the basis for his detention. He was placed in general population and held for more than 24 hours, during which time he was denied phone access, legal representation, or any formal notice of proceedings. Even jail staff expressed confusion about the reason for his confinement. This extraordinary deprivation of liberty occurred without probable cause, judicial oversight, or any of the procedural safeguards required under the

²⁶ See Theo Keith, *ICE arrest of Marshall hospital employee condemned by Minnesota Nurses Association*, FOX 9 (Apr. 10, 2025), <https://www.fox9.com/news/ice-arrest-marshall-hospital-employee-condemned-mn-nurse-association> (reporting that ICE agents told hospital staff to “lure the worker into a fake meeting in the basement” and “threatened legal consequences if the staff didn’t comply”).

Fourth and Fifth Amendments.

70. The following morning, March 28, Mr. Harsono was transported to ICE's Field Office at Fort Snelling, where he was interrogated by agents for over five hours. They continued to refuse to disclose the legal basis for his arrest or detention. When Mr. Harsono explained that he maintained valid F-1 status, agents vaguely responded that he had "no lawful status," citing an inability to verify anything because the SEVIS system was "down." These explanations were not only inadequate—they were demonstrably false.

71. In truth, as of March 28, 2025, SEVIS records confirmed that Mr. Harsono's F-1 status remained active and in good standing. SEVIS—the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System—tracks compliance with F-1 visa requirements, including enrollment and status maintenance. There had been no SEVIS termination, no revocation of status under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(f), and no lawful basis to conclude that Mr. Harsono was unlawfully present.

72. On March 28, 2025—the day after his arrest—DHS issued Mr. Harsono a Notice to Appear ("NTA"), charging him as removable under INA § 237(a)(1)(B), 8 U.S.C. § 1227(a)(1)(B), for allegedly remaining in the United States beyond the expiration of his authorized stay or following revocation of his visa. However, Mr. Harsono was arrested *before* any such revocation was supposedly effectuated, and while his SEVIS record confirmed that he remained in active, lawful F-1 status. The charge in the NTA did not reflect the legal reality at the time of his arrest; it was a retroactive rationalization—an apparent attempt to fabricate a lawful basis for a detention that had already occurred without one.

73. The language of the NTA itself is incoherent. It alleges: "You remained in the United States beyond your Visa [sic] revocation date of March 23, 2025, by the Department of State for convictions of prior crimes without authorization from Immigration and Naturalization

Service or its' successor the Department of Homeland Security.”

74. First, there is no statutory or regulatory authority providing that retroactive visa revocation extinguishes lawful presence or justifies arrest. Second, the NTA references “convictions” when Mr. Harsono has only a single misdemeanor that DHS has identified in justifying his detention, and it is not a removable offense. Third, it falsely suggests he required affirmative authorization to remain in the U.S. when, in fact, he was in a period of authorized stay based on his pending I-485 application. Fourth, it misidentifies the “Immigration and Naturalization Service”—an agency that ceased to exist in 2003—and includes a grammatically incorrect reference to “its' successor.” This charging document not only fails to meet legal standards; it fails to meet basic standards of coherence.

75. The NTA also falsely asserts that Mr. Harsono entered the U.S. at an “unknown port of entry.” In reality, he lawfully entered through Los Angeles International Airport on April 27, 2024, as documented in his I-94 and CBP admission records. He passed through both primary and secondary inspection and was admitted under his valid F-1 visa. The government’s claim that it cannot identify the port of entry for a noncitizen who entered at LAX—a major international airport, with biometric and digital records—is emblematic of the broader procedural sloppiness and disregard for fact that has infected this case from the start.

76. The only document DHS appears to rely on to justify its retroactive enforcement is a memo, purportedly dated March 23, 2025, from a Department of State official to DHS. This memo—never served on Mr. Harsono—claims that his F-1 visa was revoked due to a minor misdemeanor and states that the revocation would be “silent,” meaning that Mr. Harsono would receive no notice:

On March 23, 2025, in response to a request from DHS/ICE and the information from DHS/ICE that Aditya HARSONO has been

convicted... and now poses a threat to U.S. public safety, the Bureau of Consular Affairs approved revocation, effective immediately, of the F-1 visa... We understand that DHS/ICE intends to immediately pursue removal... this revocation will therefore be silent; the Department of State will not notify the subject of the revocation.

77. As of March 27, 2025—the date of Mr. Harsono’s arrest—there was no evidence that the purported revocation had been effectuated, served, or lawfully executed. His SEVIS record remained active, there was no pending violation, and he was in lawful F-1 status, further supported by a pending adjustment of status application placing him in a period of authorized stay. DHS arrested Mr. Harsono based on a retroactive justification that did not exist at the time. This was not an administrative misstep—it was a constitutional ambush. DHS detained him without a warrant, without probable cause, and without any legal authority, and then attempted to retroactively fabricate a legal basis by anchoring a removal charge to a facially invalid visa revocation.

78. The Foreign Affairs Manual (FAM) leaves no ambiguity: “Under no circumstances should you revoke a visa when the individual is in the United States... other than a revocation based on driving under the influence (DUI).” 9 FAM § 403.11-3(B). That exception is wholly inapplicable. Mr. Harsono’s sole conviction was for misdemeanor property damage—a nonviolent offense punishable by no more than 90 days in jail. It is not a crime of violence, does not implicate public safety, and does not render him inadmissible or removable under the INA. It is categorically insufficient to justify a covert revocation, much less one in open defiance of binding State Department policy.

79. DHS detention relies on the purported revocation—which is otherwise ultra vires and expressly barred by the FAM. The agency failed to follow its own rules, circumvented fundamental constitutional safeguards, and deprived Mr. Harsono of his liberty based on a charge

that was legally nonexistent at the time of arrest, and apparently still does not exist. This is not lawful immigration detention; it is a constitutional violation of due process and free speech.

C. DHS's Justifications for Mr. Harsono's Detention Are Post Hoc, Legally Baseless, and Constitutionally Deficient.

80. On April 7, 2025—eleven days after Mr. Harsono's arrest—DHS produced three exhibits it claimed supported its removal action:

- 1) A memorandum from DOS official John Armstrong referencing the purported "silent" revocation of Mr. Harsono's visa, citing his misdemeanor conviction.
- 2) A dismissal order from Mr. Harsono's 2021 protest arrest, which states the charges were dropped "in the interests of justice."
- 3) A copy of his plea petition in the 2022 misdemeanor damage to property case.

81. None of these documents provides a lawful basis for arrest or detention. Mr. Harsono's sole conviction is more than two years old, non-violent, and does not make him either deportable or inadmissible. His protest arrest resulted in no conviction. And DHS had full knowledge of this history when it lawfully admitted Mr. Harsono through inspection at LAX in April 2024.

82. Moreover, at the time of his arrest, Mr. Harsono was in valid F-1 status, with an active SEVIS record and a pending I-485 application that placed him in a period of authorized stay. The removal charge DHS later presented did not yet exist when he was taken into custody. Instead of obtaining a warrant or articulating lawful grounds, DHS arrested Mr. Harsono first, then tried to fabricate a justification after the fact—relying on a retroactive visa revocation that violated both agency rules and constitutional norms, and then seeking to penalize Mr. Harsono for

remaining in the United States after his visa was “revoked” without any notice. This is not enforcement. It is an abuse of power, in direct contravention of the Fifth Amendment.

83. DHS is using Mr. Harsono’s detention not to ensure public safety or lawful proceedings, but to make an example of him. Upon information and belief, he is being held punitively—to deter international students from engaging in constitutionally protected political speech. Indeed, even while DHS assures courts in other contexts that it is rolling back student status terminations and that visa revocations do not pose grounds for immediate deportation, it continues to target Mr. Harsono precisely because of a visa revocation and status termination—for no clear differentiating reason from similarly situated students other than Mr. Harsono’s speech. The government’s campaign of retaliatory enforcement chills First Amendment activity and coerces “voluntary” self-deportation by manufacturing fear and uncertainty.

84. This Court should find that Mr. Harsono’s arrest and continued detention are unlawful and immediately order his release. Any further delay only deepens the constitutional harm.

D. Despite No Lawful Basis for Detention, DHS Continues to Hold Mr. Harsono.

85. On April 10, 2025—nearly two weeks after his arrest—Mr. Harsono appeared for a bond hearing. He submitted over 70 pages of evidence demonstrating no danger to the community and no risk of flight, including proof of full compliance with probation, evidence of stable housing and employment, and letters of support from professors, coworkers, and peers.

86. The immigration judge found that Mr. Harsono was neither a danger nor a flight risk, citing his “prima facie eligibility” for adjustment of status through his marriage and his deep family and community ties. The judge set a \$5,000 bond. But DHS refused to allow it, by filing a notice of appeal to the Board of Immigration Appeals and invoking a rarely used automatic stay

regulation to unilaterally block his release and prolong his detention by up to ninety additional days, and potentially longer.

87. On April 14, 2025, undersigned counsel contacted ICE Chief Counsel for clarification on DHS's removability position in light of Mr. Harsono's valid status and adjustment eligibility. That inquiry was ignored. No response was ever received.

88. Ahead of the master calendar hearing set for April 17, 2025, Mr. Harsono filed a motion to terminate removal proceedings, arguing that his pending I-485 based on a bona fide marriage to a U.S. citizen placed him in a period of authorized stay, even absent an active student visa. The motion included:

- 1) Proof of lawful admission on April 27, 2024;
- 2) Proof of F1 visa valid until June 2026;
- 3) Evidence of properly filed and pending I-130 and I-485 applications;
- 4) A copy of his unexpired F-1 visa (valid through June 2026); and
- 5) Numerous character letters.

89. In response, DHS presented only one removal charge: INA § 237(a)(1)(B), alleging unlawful presence after visa expiration or revocation. Yet DHS offered no evidence that Mr. Harsono was out of status or unlawfully present at the time of his arrest.

90. Despite the judge's prior risk findings and Mr. Harsono's clear eligibility for immigration relief, DHS opposed discretionary termination and insisted on proceeding with removal. The immigration judge, while acknowledging the favorable equities and DHS's lack of evidence, stated that she lacked authority to terminate the proceedings while Mr. Harsono remained detained or to release Mr. Harsono to his family absent DHS consent.

91. On April 30, 2025, USCIS sent Mr. Harsono an I-797 Notice of Action scheduling

him for a biometrics appointment on May 5, 2025, at 1:30 PM, in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, in connection with his pending adjustment of status application.

92. Mr. Harsono has twice sought termination, or alternatively, continuances in order to pursue his I-485 application for adjustment of status through his U.S. citizen spouse, Peyton. Mr. Harsono made his most recent motion for this basic fairness on May 1, 2025, in advance of his continued removal hearing before the immigration court, noting that Mr. Harsono's student status was not terminated until two days after his arrest, that Mr. Harsono's visa revocation was procedurally defective, and that he remains eligible for adjustment of status. The immigration judge denied the motion to terminate, claiming—incorrectly—that she lacked the authority to evaluate the lawfulness of the visa revocation. All parties agreed that Mr. Harsono was *prima facie* eligible for adjustment of status and that his detention placed him on a fast track that may inhibit his ability to pursue his petition fully. The government counsel claimed that Mr. Harsono's biometrics appointment might be accommodated at the Kandiyohi County Jail, but there has been no guarantee that this will happen when the appointment requires Mr. Harsono's appearance in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. On May 2, 2025, Mr. Harsono requested on USCIS's website that the appointment be rescheduled for May 23, 2025, in St. Paul, Minnesota; the website did not provide an option to schedule the appointment at Kandiyohi County Jail, and Mr. Harsono hopes that he is able to attend the appointment in person.

93. In short, Mr. Harsono remains detained—without a valid removal charge, without judicial finding of risk, and without legal justification. Meanwhile, he is separated from his wife and their medically fragile eight-month-old daughter. He cannot care for his family, cannot support them financially, and cannot pursue the legal relief to which he is entitled—all because DHS refuses to relinquish its unconstitutional grip on his liberty.

E. This Court Has Jurisdiction Over Mr. Harsono's Claims.

94. Mr. Harsono's petition is properly before this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, which authorizes federal courts to review the legality of detention. As Judge Michael E. Farbiarz recently observed, "[n]o one doubts that federal district courts have jurisdiction over the subject matter, habeas cases under 28 U.S.C. § 2241." *Khalil v. Joyce*, No. 25-cv-1963, 2025 WL 972959, at *6 n.12 (D.N.J. Apr. 1, 2025).

95. Federal courts in other recent cases involving similarly situated international students have confirmed jurisdiction over § 2241 habeas claims challenging immigration detention based on visa revocation or SEVIS termination. *See Khalil v. Joyce*, No. 25-cv-1935, 2025 WL 849803, at *11–13 & n.7 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 19, 2025); *Khalil v. Joyce*, No. 25-cv-1963, 2025 WL 972959, at *14–24 (D.N.J. Apr. 1, 2025); *Öztürk v. Trump*, No. 2:25-cv-374, 2025 WL 1145250, at *10–15 (D. Vt. Apr. 18, 2025); *Öztürk v. Joyce*, No. 25-cv-10695, 2025 WL 1009445, at *10–11 (D. Mass. Apr. 4, 2025); *Mahdawi v. Trump*, No. 2:25-cv-389, 2025 WL 1243135, at *4–8 (D. Vt. Apr. 30, 2025). Indeed, multiple courts have reaffirmed jurisdiction in two of the cases. This Court should follow suit and hold that it has jurisdiction over Mr. Harsono's claims.

96. The Supreme Court has repeatedly confirmed that federal district courts have habeas jurisdiction over claims challenging the legality of civil immigration detention. *See Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 293 (2018) (finding jurisdiction over habeas challenge to prolonged detention under § 1226); *Nielsen v. Preap*, 586 U.S. 392, 401–02 (2019) (same).

97. None of the INA's jurisdiction-channeling provisions—8 U.S.C. §§ 1252(g), 1226(e), and 1201(i)—bar judicial review of Mr. Harsono's habeas claims. Courts interpreting these statutes have consistently found that they do not apply to claims challenging the legality or constitutionality of detention, as Mr. Harsono does here.

98. Section 1252(g) is narrow and applies only to DHS’s decision to “commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders.” *See Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 482 (1999). Mr. Harsono challenges the legality of his detention, not the decision to initiate removal. Numerous courts agree that § 1252(g) does not bar review of detention claims. *See Bello-Reyes v. Gaynor*, 985 F.3d 696, 700 n.4 (9th Cir. 2021); *Kong v. Brown*, 62 F.4th 597, 609 (2d Cir. 2023); *Michalski v. Decker*, 279 F. Supp. 3d 487, 495 (S.D.N.Y. 2018).

99. Nor is Mr. Harsono challenging discretionary decision-making. He argues that DHS lacked any legal authority to detain him. His claim is jurisdictional, not discretionary—it is a claim that DHS acted in excess of its powers and in violation of constitutional guarantees.

100. Section 1226(e) bars judicial review only of “discretionary judgments” in custody determinations—not whether DHS had authority to detain someone at all. Constitutional claims and questions of legal authority remain fully reviewable. *See Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 516–17 (2003) (“Section 1226(e)... does not bar constitutional challenges”); *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 296 (same); *Nielsen*, 586 U.S. at 401.

101. As *Öztürk* makes clear, “Section 1226(e) does not preclude review of a claim that the government lacked authority to detain a person in the first place.” 2025 WL 1009445, at *4 & n.1. Here, DHS arrested and detained Mr. Harsono while he remained in lawful F-1 status and was in a period of authorized stay. That is a legal and constitutional question—squarely within the Court’s jurisdiction.

102. DHS may argue that Mr. Harsono had an alternative remedy through immigration bond proceedings. But that argument fails for two reasons. First, the immigration judge has disclaimed the authority to decide constitutional questions. Second, even where administrative

relief might be theoretically available, habeas is appropriate where legal authority is lacking or where irreparable harm is at stake. *See McCarthy v. Madigan*, 503 U.S. 140, 147–48 (1992) (prudential exhaustion not required where agency relief is unavailable or futile, or where irreparable harm is at stake).

103. Section 1201(i), which governs visa revocation, also does not bar review. Mr. Harsono is *not* challenging any purported or actual discretionary revocation. He challenges the use of any purported revocation or actual revocation as pretext to justify his warrantless arrest and retaliatory unconstitutional detention. Courts have consistently held that § 1201(i) does not preclude review of collateral legal claims. *See Fang v. Garland*, 935 F.3d 172, 176 (2d Cir. 2019); *Maramjaya v. USCIS*, Civ. No. 06-2158 (RCL), 2008 WL 9398947, at *4 (D.D.C. Mar. 26, 2008).

104. The Supreme Court has repeatedly confirmed that claims of unlawful immigration detention fall within the core of habeas review. Arbitrary visa revocation extinguishes lawful presence without due process implicates those same protections. It is unreviewable in removal proceedings, is independent of removability, and causes harm that cannot be addressed later.

105. For these reasons, and consistent with recent rulings in *Khalil, Öztürk*, and *Mahdawi*, this Court has jurisdiction over Mr. Harsono's habeas petition and related claims. It should assert that jurisdiction and proceed to review the legality of Mr. Harsono's detention.

F. Mr. Harsono's Detention Is Unlawful, and This Court Should Order His Immediate Release

106. Respondents' continued detention of Mr. Harsono is both unlawful and unconstitutional. It stems from a retaliatory policy targeting international students who exercise protected political speech—specifically, Mr. Harsono's public support for human rights in Gaza and his support of racial justice. DHS is also using his incarceration as a deterrent, attempting to coerce other international students with revoked visas or terminated SEVIS records into self-

deportation, in direct violation of the Fifth Amendment.

107. This detention serves no legitimate immigration purpose and violates both the First and Fifth Amendments, along with federal statutes governing lawful civil detention. It is not rooted in public safety, flight risk, or statutory authority—it is rooted in reprisal.

108. Mr. Harsono does not challenge DHS's general authority to detain noncitizens under lawful circumstances. But that authority is limited to situations involving a genuine risk to the community or likelihood of flight. In this case, the immigration judge expressly found that neither applies, and this Court can find the same.

109. Mr. Harsono is a peaceful, law-abiding individual with deep roots in the community. He has no disqualifying criminal record and is pursuing lawful permanent residency through a pending I-485 based on his marriage to a U.S. citizen. He is the father of a medically fragile eight-month-old U.S. citizen child who needs his care and presence.

110. More than a month into his detention and separation from his family, Mr. Harsono still does not understand the basis for his incarceration. He was arrested without a warrant, detained without formal charges, and placed in removal proceedings based on a retroactive, procedurally invalid justification. This is antithetical to the rule of law.

111. The sequence of events does not reflect lawful enforcement—it reflects retaliatory gamesmanship. Mr. Harsono's treatment violates constitutional guarantees and undermines confidence in the integrity of our immigration system. Above all, it has harmed a young father who came to the United States to learn, to contribute, and to exercise the rights this nation purports to protect. Whether the product of incompetence or intention, the effect is the same: a peaceful, contributing resident, father, and husband is being detained without legal justification.

112. DHS's actions in this case defy due process and basic human decency. Arresting

individuals without warrants, cause, or notice—based on secret political targeting—is an affront to the Constitution. To allow such conduct to go unchallenged would render our federalist principles hollow and our liberties rhetorical. The rule of law demands this Court’s intervention—not just to protect Mr. Harsono’s individual rights, but to uphold the constitutional and moral foundation of this country. History will remember who chose to defend that foundation—and who chose to look away.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

FIRST CLAIM

Violation of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution

113. The First Amendment protects past, present, and future speech, including political speech, humanitarian advocacy, and speech by noncitizens.

114. Respondents violated the First Amendment by retaliating against Mr. Harsono’s protected speech, attempting to chill or prevent future expression, and deterring others from engaging in political advocacy—particularly criticism of law enforcement and U.S. foreign policy.

115. Mr. Harsono engaged in speech on matters of profound public concern, regarding his support of Palestinian rights and racial justice in policing. He has peacefully participated in protests, shared his views on social media, and contributed proceeds from his nonprofit art project to humanitarian relief efforts in Palestine.

116. The consequences of that speech Mr. Harsono is suffering now are not incidental; they are the intended outcome of Respondents’ actions in arresting and detaining him. These actions were substantially motivated by opposition to Mr. Harsono’s views and associations, particularly his public support for Palestinian rights, his support for racial justice, and his criticism of police brutality.

117. Mr. Harsono is being detained in retaliation for his constitutionally protected

expression and affiliations, in direct violation of the First Amendment, which bars the government from retaliating against political speech. This protection extends to noncitizens and encompasses peaceful advocacy for marginalized populations. *See Bello-Reyes v. Gaynor*, 985 F.3d 696, 701 (9th Cir. 2021).

118. Mr. Harsono's detention has not only impeded his ability to engage in protected speech, but it has also sent a chilling message to other international students and noncitizens, deterring them from exercising their First Amendment rights out of fear of immigration consequences.

SECOND CLAIM

Violation of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution

119. Mr. Harsono repeats and re-alleges the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein. The Fifth Amendment guarantees due process protections to all "persons" in the United States, including noncitizens, regardless of immigration status. *See Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001).

120. Respondents violated Mr. Harsono's due process rights by enforcing a policy that is impermissibly vague, invites arbitrary enforcement, and provides no fair warning of what conduct might trigger adverse immigration action. These due process violations further chill Mr. Harsono's First Amendment rights.

121. Mr. Harsono also has a protected property interest in his SEVIS record. *See ASSE Int'l, Inc. v. Kerry*, 803 F.3d 1059, 1065 (9th Cir. 2015). DHS terminated this record without proper legal basis, notice, or an opportunity to be heard—violating fundamental procedural due process.

122. Immigration detention is lawful only if justified by narrow purposes: to ensure court appearance or protect public safety. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690. The Immigration Judge

found that neither applies in Mr. Harsono's case.

123. His continued detention bears no reasonable relationship to any legitimate government purpose and is therefore punitive. Detention in this context is not being used to protect the public or facilitate removal, but rather to punish Mr. Harsono for his protected speech and to coerce self-deportation among similarly situated individuals.

124. Due process requires a lawful basis for every deprivation of liberty. Here, none existed at the time of arrest, and none exists today.

125. For these reasons, Respondents' policy and Mr. Harsono's detention violate the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

THIRD CLAIM
Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act

126. Mr. Harsono repeats and re-alleges the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint-Petition as if fully set forth herein.

127. DHS arrested Mr. Harsono on March 27, 2025—before any lawful termination of his F-1 nonimmigrant status had occurred. At the time of arrest, Mr. Harsono's SEVIS record remained active, and he was lawfully present in the United States under both valid F-1 status and a pending adjustment of status application. The subsequent SEVIS termination and visa revocation were not only retroactive, but carried out without proper statutory authority, factual justification, or procedural compliance.

128. DHS has no statutory or regulatory authority to terminate a noncitizen's SEVIS record based solely on the revocation of a visa. Federal regulations provide that an F-1 student maintains status so long as they comply with academic requirements—not visa validity. See 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(f). DHS's termination of Mr. Harsono's SEVIS record, based solely on a revoked visa and without notice or articulated cause, was arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion,

and exceeded its lawful authority. See 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)–(D).

129. DHS also cited INA § 237(a)(1)(B) as the basis for removability, claiming that Mr. Harsono had “remained beyond the period of stay authorized” following visa revocation. But visa revocation alone does not terminate a noncitizen’s lawful presence once admitted. See 9 FAM 403.11-3(B). Moreover, DHS’s own policies make clear that a visa’s revocation does not independently nullify SEVIS status or trigger automatic removability. Applying INA § 237(a)(1)(B) to someone lawfully present in a period of authorized stay, as Mr. Harsono was, reflects an unlawful interpretation of the statute and an abuse of discretion.

130. Additionally, DHS carried out a “silent” visa revocation after Mr. Harsono was already in custody—violating binding Department of State policy that categorically prohibits visa revocation while a noncitizen is physically present in the United States, except in limited DUI-related circumstances. See 9 FAM 403.11-3(B). Mr. Harsono has no DUI or other qualifying offense. The retroactive use of an unlawful revocation to justify a warrantless arrest is both procedurally invalid and constitutionally defective.

131. The Policy underlying these actions—targeting international students for speech-related activity and circumventing formal procedures—is itself arbitrary and capricious, lacking any clear statutory authority and implemented without observance of legally required procedures. See 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(D).

132. For all these reasons, DHS’s and DOS’s actions—including the arrest, detention, visa revocation, SEVIS termination, and initiation of removal proceedings—must be set aside under the Administrative Procedure Act.

FOURTH CLAIM
Request for Release on Bail Pending Adjudication

133. Mr. Harsono repeats and re-alleges the allegations contained in the preceding

paragraphs of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.

134. Mr. Harsono is currently detained without lawful authority. His arrest occurred before any valid revocation of status or termination of his SEVIS record. He has never been found to be a danger to the community or a flight risk. His continued detention serves no legitimate government interest and violates both constitutional guarantees and federal immigration law.

135. Federal district courts possess inherent authority to release habeas petitioners on bail where extraordinary circumstances warrant it. *See Zepeda Rivas v. Jennings*, 445 F. Supp. 3d 36, 41 n.17 (N.D. Cal. 2020); *Mapp v. Reno*, 241 F.3d 221, 229 (2d Cir. 2001); *Martin v. Solem*, 801 F.2d 324, 329 n.3 (8th Cir. 1986).

136. Courts also retain broad equitable authority to restrain unlawful executive action. *See Armstrong v. Exceptional Child Ctr., Inc.*, 575 U.S. 320, 326–27 (2015).

137. Mr. Harsono's petition raises substantial constitutional and statutory challenges to the legality of his detention, including compelling evidence that it is retaliatory in nature. Continued incarceration in the face of these claims exacerbates the constitutional harm, frustrates access to counsel, and renders meaningful relief impossible. His release is essential to prevent irreparable injury and to ensure this litigation can proceed on fair and constitutional footing. *See Mahdawi v. Trump*, No. 2:25-cv-389, 2025 WL 1243135, at *14 (D. Vt. Apr. 30, 2025).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Accordingly, Mr. Harsono respectfully requests that this Court:

- 1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- 2) Enjoin Respondents from transferring Mr. Harsono outside the jurisdiction of this District while these proceedings are pending;
- 3) Grant a writ of habeas corpus directing Respondents to immediately release Mr.

Harsono from custody;

- 4) Award Mr. Harsono his costs and reasonable attorneys' fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act, 5 U.S.C. § 504 and 28 U.S.C. § 2412; and
- 5) Grant such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: May 2, 2025

s/ Kshithij Shrinath

Sarah Gad, Reg. No. 0403328
GAD & GAD LAW OFFICES LLP
8 East 25th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55404
sarah@gadlawoffice.com
(612) 512-1870

Teresa Nelson, Reg. No. 0269736
Benjamin Casper, Reg. No. 0276145
**AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF
MINNESOTA**
P.O. Box. 14720
Minneapolis, MN 55414
tnelson@aclu-mn.org
bcasper@aclu-mn.org
(651) 645-4907

Linus Chan, Reg. No. 0403311
**JAMES H. BINGER CENTER FOR NEW
AMERICANS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
LAW SCHOOL**
190 Mondale Hall
229 19th Street South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
rlchan@umn.edu
(612) 301-1156

Kshithij Shrinath, Reg. No. 0505164
GREENE ESPEL PLLP
222 S. Ninth Street, Suite 2200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
kshrinath@greeneespel.com
(612) 373-0830

Attorneys for Petitioner