

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

MELGAR HERNANDEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

BAKER, *et al.*,

Respondents

\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*

No. 1:25-cv-01663-LKG

**PETITIONER’S REPLY BRIEF**

Petitioner opposes Respondents’ motion to dismiss or stay his petition for writ of habeas corpus. Petitioner’s membership in the class certified in *D.V.D. v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.* is irrelevant to the question of whether the government has legal authority to hold him in Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) detention, and Respondents allege no legal authority permitting Petitioner’s recent re-detention after the expiration of the statutory removal period.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Juan Carlos Melgar Hernandez (“Petitioner”) was granted immigration relief in the form of deferral of removal under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”) on February 9, 2024. ECF 12-4. The only country the Immigration Judge designated for removal was Petitioner’s country of citizenship, El Salvador. *Id.* This is the country to which the Immigration Judge deferred removal under CAT because of the likelihood that Petitioner would be tortured upon removal there. *Id.* DHS released Petitioner from custody on April 16, 2024, under an Order of Supervision, and the statutory removal period expired on June 9, 2024. ECF 12 at 11; 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a).

Despite his compliance with the terms of his Order of Supervision, Petitioner was re-detained at the Baltimore Field Office on May 21, 2025, nearly one year after the expiration of his removal period. He immediately provided written notice of his fear of removal to any third country

since, given his lack of legal status in any nation besides El Salvador, he fears harm in any third country, especially without assurance that any proposed third country would not then remove him to El Salvador. While still detained at the Baltimore Field Office, he filed his Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus on May 23, 2025, to challenge the legality of his re-detention and seek his immediate release. ECF 1. DHS has since transferred him to the Winnfield Correctional Center in Louisiana where he remains detained with no foreseeable endpoint.

## II. JURISDICTION

This Court has jurisdiction over Petitioner's habeas corpus petition pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(1). Respondents' argument that 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) (hereinafter "1252(g)") bars this Court's jurisdiction reveals a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of relief that petitioner seeks: namely, immediate release from DHS custody. ECF 1 at 8. Petitioner challenges the government's legal authority to detain him, not its right to execute his removal order upon completion of the required third country removal procedures. *Id.* at 6–8. His petition for a writ of habeas corpus is not a request for a stay of his removal order. *Id.*; ECF 12 at 13. The government remains free to execute his removal order when and if it provides him with the procedural protections required to effectuate third country removals and identifies a country willing to receive him. *See D.V.D. v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, No. 25-10676-BEM at 2 (D. Mass. May 21, 2025) (memorandum on preliminary injunction) (describing the initial third country removal procedures required under the *D.V.D.* preliminary injunction). This authority is distinct, however, from authority to re-detain and hold him indefinitely pending that process and the Respondents have failed to allege any such authority to do so.

The Supreme Court was unequivocal regarding federal courts' authority to decide post-removal-period habeas claims in *Zadvydas v. Davis*. 533 U.S. 678 (2001). Reasoning that the petitioners challenged the *extent* of discretion statutorily granted to the Attorney General, rather

than the exercise of discretion itself, the Court rejected the claim that the petitioners' habeas claims were barred by 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii). *Id.* at 688. The Court then held that "2241 habeas corpus proceedings remain available as a forum for . . . challenges to post-removal-period detention." *Id.* And when it had the opportunity to analyze the meaning of 1252(g) in particular, the Court explained that this provision does not apply "to all claims arising from deportation proceedings," but rather "only to three discrete actions that the Attorney General may take: her 'decision or action' to 'commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders.'" *Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 482 (1999) (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g)) (emphasis in original) [hereinafter *AADC*]. The Fourth Circuit understands 1252(g) to "strip[] the federal courts of jurisdiction *only* to review challenges to the Attorney General's decision to exercise her discretion to initiate or prosecute these specific stages in the deportation process." *Bowrin v. U.S. I.N.S.*, 194 F.3d 483, 488 (4th Cir. 1999) (citing *AADC*, 525 U.S. at 482) (emphasis added). The Fourth Circuit's analysis in *Bowrin* "made plain that review of agency decisions involving pure questions of law" are not barred by 1252(g). *Abrego Garcia v. Noem*, No. 8:25-cv-00951-PX, 2025 WL 1014261, at \*8 (D. Md. April 6, 2025).

Like the habeas petition at issue in *Bowrin*, Petitioner's habeas claim is not jurisdictionally barred by 1252(g). 194 F.3d at 488. Petitioner does not challenge the Attorney General's exercise of discretion to undertake any of the three enforcement actions delineated in 1252(g). ECF 1 at 6–8. Rather, Petitioner challenges the "extent of the Attorney General's authority under the post-removal-period detention statute," which raises a question of law. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 688. The issue presented by this habeas petition is whether the government possesses legal authority to re-detain and hold Petitioner in DHS custody. ECF 1 at 6–8. This question does not implicate any of

the narrow ground covered by 1252(g), and therefore this Court has jurisdiction to adjudicate Petitioner's claim under 8 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(1).

### III. ARGUMENT

#### A. Petitioner's *D.V.D.* Class Membership Does Not Bar His Habeas Petition.

Petitioner and Respondents agree that Petitioner is a member of the class certified in *D.V.D. v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, and that as a class member he is entitled to the procedural protections governing third country removals defined by the outcome of that litigation. *D.V.D. v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, No. 25-10676-BEM (D. Mass. April 18, 2025) (order granting class certification) [hereinafter "*D.V.D. Class Certification*"]; ECF 12 at 1. The parties dispute, however, whether DHS possessed the legal authority to re-detain Petitioner on May 21, 2025, and hold him indefinitely in DHS custody pending the outcome of the *D.V.D.* litigation and the government's attempts to identify a third country willing to receive him. ECF 12 at 10; ECF 1 at 6–8.

The *D.V.D.* class definition lacks any reference to whether its class members are detained. *D.V.D. Class Certification*, No. 25-10676-BEM at 23. Indeed, at the time the Court certified the class, two of the named plaintiffs were not detained. *Id.* at 8. Class members share an "identical interest" in receiving "an injunction mandating due-process protections prior to their removal to a third country." *Id.* at 33. Notably, class members seek *injunctive* relief, rather than release from detention pursuant to a habeas petition as Petitioner does here. ECF 1 at 8. Therefore, Petitioner is not seeking to "litigate issues raised in the class action," as he has not challenged any aspect of the third country removal procedures at issue in that case. ECF 12 at 6; ECF 1 at 6–8. Nor have Respondents alleged that class membership itself provides grounds for detention. *See generally* ECF 12.

Respondents' conflation of the issues at hand obscures the bottom line: There is no legal support for the contention that pending class action litigation *unrelated to detention* suspends class members' access to the writ of habeas corpus—a right so ancient and fundamental it has its roots in the Magna Carta, and the suspension of which the Constitution explicitly limits to very narrow circumstances. *See Boumediene v. Bush*, 553 U.S. 723, 739–40, 743 (explaining that the Framers saw “freedom from unlawful restraint as a fundamental precept of liberty,” tracing the roots of the writ of habeas corpus to the Magna Carta, and noting constitutionally “limited grounds for its suspension”); U.S. CONST. Art. 1 § 9, cl. 2 (“The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.”).

**B. Respondents' Re-detention of Petitioner Outside the Removal Period Was Unlawful.**

Respondents rely on 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6) and the Supreme Court's interpretation of that provision in *Zadvydas* as legal authority for its re-detention of Petitioner. ECF 12 at 10–11. However, both the statute and *Zadvydas* contemplate the legality of *continued* detention past the removal period. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 683 (explaining that § 1231(a)(6) provides that “the Government may *continue* to detain an alien who still remains here”) (internal quotations omitted) (emphasis added). Petitioner's situation is distinct because it involves his release from custody and subsequent re-detention more than a year later. ECF 1 at 6–7. Respondents concede that their re-detention of Petitioner fell outside the statutory removal period but contend that they were nevertheless permitted to re-arrest him because he is inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i). ECF 12 at 11. However, this claim has no merit, since Petitioner is not subject to the grounds of inadmissibility found at § 1182 as an individual who entered the United States with an immigrant visa. ECF 12-3 at 1; ECF 12 at 2.

Further, Respondents fail to allege any other legally sufficient grounds for their re-detention of Petitioner outside the removal period. To the extent Respondents rely on the regulations cited in the Notice of Revocation of Release, as a threshold matter this Notice was never properly served on Petitioner or his counsel. ECF 12 at 3; ECF 12-5; *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 241.4(l)(1) (requiring that “[u]pon revocation, the alien will be notified of the reasons for revocation of his or her release or parole.”). The Notice of Revocation’s proof of service contains several fatal defects. First, it does not have Petitioner’s signature, nor the signature of the serving DHS officer. ECF 12-5 at 2. Additionally, Petitioner’s counsel did not receive a copy, despite being his attorneys of record, and being present with him at the moment of his re-detention. *Id.*

Beyond the lack of service, the regulations cited in the Notice of Revocation do not provide Respondents legal authority for their re-detention of Petitioner. *See id.* at 1 (citing 8 C.F.R. §§ 241.4, 241.13); *see* ECF 12 at 3. Section 241.4 enumerates four specific bases for revocation of release, none of which the Notice of Revocation of Release cited or relied upon. 8 C.F.R. §§ 241.4(l)(2)(i)–(iv). And § 241.13 addresses the government’s authority for *continued* detention of noncitizens, not re-detention. 8 C.F.R. § 241.13. The Notice of Revocation of Release makes the bare and unsubstantiated allegation that there were “changed circumstances” meaning that Petitioner could now be “expeditiously removed from the United States.” ECF 12-5 at 1. However, Respondents have not shown that there has been a material change in circumstances from the time of Petitioner’s April 16, 2024, release from DHS custody, at which point the government was unable to remove Petitioner from the United States. ECF 1 at 4. The purported “current review by the Government of Mexico” is presumably pursuant to the Request for Acceptance of Alien, dated the same day as Petitioner’s arrest and re-detention. ECF 12-5 at 1; ECF 12-6 at 6. This bare initial contact with the Mexican Consulate is dated 20 days *after* Petitioner received his “Call-In Letter”

summoning him to be re-detained. ECF 1 at 6. Further, lacking a time stamp, it cannot even be said to precede the re-detention itself. ECF 12-6 at 6. Given these defects, the Request for Acceptance of Alien cannot form the basis of “changed circumstances” at the time Respondents decided to re-detain Petitioner. And with no evidence to indicate Mexico will accept him—much less that Mexico is even considering accepting him—Petitioner’s removal to that country can hardly be considered “expeditious.” ECF 12 at 3.

**C. Petitioner’s Re-Detention is Unreasonable Under *Zadvydas* and Therefore Unlawful.**

Respondents’ contention that Petitioner’s habeas petition is premature under the *Zadvydas* standard is incorrect for two reasons. ECF 12 at 11. First, the six-month presumption does not apply to Petitioner’s case or, in the alternative, can be rebutted. And second, Petitioner’s removal from the United States is not “reasonably foreseeable,” which makes his re-detention unlawful. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 699.

**i. The presumption of reasonableness does not apply to Petitioner or can be rebutted.**

The *Zadvydas* Court set forth the six-month framework to guide lower courts in the particular circumstances presented by that case: Two noncitizens whose detention continued uninterrupted following the removal period. *Id.* at 684–86. In contrast, Petitioner was released from detention in April 2024, following an Immigration Judge’s grant of Deferral of Removal under the Convention Against Torture in February 2024, and was re-detained more than a year later. ECF 1 at 5. This crucial difference in circumstances means the six-month presumption should not apply to Petitioner’s case. Petitioner is well outside the six-month period following his removal order, which is dated February 9, 2024. ECF 12-4. If the government were permitted to re-start the six-month clock each time it releases and subsequently re-detains an individual, there would be nothing preventing an infinite loop of release and re-detention. In other words, Respondents’



position contains no limiting principle to prevent indefinite detention, the very unconstitutional outcome the *Zadvydas* Court sought to avoid. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 689 (explaining that “the statute, read in light of the Constitution’s demands, limits an alien’s post-removal-period detention to a period reasonably necessary to bring about that alien’s removal from the United States. It does not permit indefinite detention.”).

If this Court finds the six-month presumption does apply to Petitioner’s case, he can rebut the presumption that his re-detention is reasonable. The six-month presumption of reasonableness is not a per se rule, but rather a starting point to guide lower courts. *Id.* at 699, 701 (explaining that such presumptions are useful to “guide lower court determinations” and noting the “independent review” that such courts must undertake); *see also Cesar v. Achim*, 542 F.Supp.2d 897, 903 (E.D. Wis. 2008) (explaining that “[t]he *Zadvydas* Court did not say that the presumption is irrebuttable, and there is nothing inherent in the operation of the presumption itself that requires it to be irrebuttable.”); *Trinh v. Homan*, 466 F.Supp.3d 1077, 1093 (C.D. Cal. 2020) (quoting *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 700–01) (noting that “*Zadvydas* established a ‘guide’ for approaching detention challenges, not a categorical prohibition on claims challenging detention less than six months.”).

The Court’s central holding in *Zadvydas* was that removal must be reasonably foreseeable to permit a noncitizen’s detention beyond the 90-day removal period. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 699. If the reviewing court finds that removal is not reasonably foreseeable, it “should hold continued detention . . . no longer authorized by statute.” *Id.* at 699–700. This is an individualized inquiry that requires a federal court’s review of the “set of particular circumstances” presented by the case at hand. *Id.* at 699. Since Petitioner can show that his removal is not “reasonably foreseeable,” he can rebut the presumption of reasonableness if this Court does find it applies to his case.

**ii. Petitioner’s re-detention is unreasonable under *Zadvydas*.**



Whether removal is “reasonably foreseeable,” therefore permitting detention under *Zadvydas*, is a fact-bound, individualized inquiry. *See id.* at 702 (vacating the lower court decisions and remanding to allow those courts to analyze the facts of those particular cases in light of the court’s holding). The facts of Petitioner’s case demonstrate plainly that his removal from the United States is not “reasonably foreseeable.” *Id.*; *see also* ECF 1 at 7 (explaining that Petitioner cannot be removed to his only country of citizenship and DHS has not identified a country that has agreed to receive him). Respondents and Petitioner agree that Petitioner is a *D.V.D.* class member. ECF 12 at 7; *see supra* Section III.A. Respondents and Petitioner also agree that as a class member, Petitioner is entitled to the procedural protections defined by that litigation prior to his removal to any third country not designated during his removal proceedings. ECF 12 at 5. However, since the *D.V.D.* litigation is ongoing, Petitioner does not yet have access to the procedural protections that case will eventually define. *See* ECF 12 at 9 (noting that the *D.V.D.* class action suit remains pending). And to counsel’s knowledge, Respondents have not even begun the initial procedures outlined in the *D.V.D.* Memorandum on Preliminary Injunction, which requires DHS to grant noncitizens the opportunity to demonstrate a “‘reasonable fear’ of removal to the third country.” *D.V.D. v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, No. 25-10676-BEM at 2 (D. Mass. May 21, 2025) (memorandum on preliminary injunction). Given these facts, Petitioner is trapped in limbo, and his re-detention pending the outcome of ongoing litigation and not-yet-initiated third country removal procedures is not just unreasonable but is, in fact, arbitrary.

Once DHS does provide Petitioner the opportunity to demonstrate his reasonable fear of removal to Mexico, the country to which it apparently seeks to remove him, Petitioner is likely to succeed in demonstrating that his fear of removal to Mexico is reasonable. He is afraid to be removed to Mexico, in particular because he lacks Mexican legal status and fears that Mexico will

repatriate him to El Salvador, a country where a U.S. Immigration Judge determined it was more likely than not that Petitioner would be tortured. ECF 12-4; *see also D.V.D. v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, No. 25-10676-BEM at 25–26 (D. Mass. Mar. 23, 2025) (class action complaint) (explaining how one plaintiff, who had won protection in immigration court preventing his removal to Guatemala, was deported to Mexico and from there deported to Guatemala). And after he establishes his reasonable fear, Petitioner must have the opportunity to seek relief from removal to Mexico in immigration court, a process which regularly takes multiple years. *See Asylum in the United States*, AM. IMMIGR. COUNCIL (May 9, 2025) <https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/fact-sheet/asylum-united-states/> (“Individuals with an immigration court case who were ultimately granted relief such as asylum in FY 2024 waited more than 1,283 days on average for that outcome.”). The significant procedural hurdles that Respondents must clear before they are permitted to remove Petitioner from the United States demonstrate that Petitioner’s removal is not “reasonably foreseeable.” *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 699.

Further, even if Respondents were eventually permitted to remove Petitioner to Mexico, history shows that it is unlikely that Respondents would be able to successfully arrange for his removal to that country, or any other third country. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 702 (explaining that the reasonableness inquiry requires consideration of the “likelihood of successful future negotiations” for the noncitizen’s removal); *see also Kumarasamy v. Att’y Gen. of United States*, 453 F.3d 169, 171 n.1 (3d Cir. 2006) (quoting Weissbrodt, David & Laura Danielson, *Immigration Law and Procedure* 303 (5th ed. 2005)) (noting that “[i]n practice, however, non-citizens who are granted restrictions on removal are almost never removed from the U.S.”); *See Zetouna v. Duran*, No. 4:CV-07-CV-0716, 2007 WL 1799780 (M.D. Penn. June 20, 2007) (quoting Immigration Judge who acknowledged the reality that “the likelihood of finding an alternate country of removal

is probably slim to none”); Ex. 1, DHS Removal Data<sup>1</sup> (demonstrating that DHS was only able to remove a single Salvadoran citizen to a third country throughout the four years of the Biden administration).

Respondents’ paltry initial inquiry to the Mexican consulate does not negate this reality. *See supra* Section III.B (arguing that this contact does not constitute “changed circumstances”); *see also Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 702 (explaining that noncitizens seeking release from detention need not disprove “any prospect of removal—no matter how unlikely or unforeseeable”). This outcome would leave Petitioner in “removable-but-unremovable limbo,” just like the petitioners in *Zadvydas*. *Castaneda v. Perry*, 95 F.4th 750, 757 (4th Cir. 2024) (quoting *Jama v. Immigr. & Customs Enft.*, 543 U.S. 335, 347 (2005)). The *Castaneda* court noted that “[w]ith nowhere to send them, the government simply continued to hold the [*Zadvydas*] petitioners in detention, with no plans to release them,” rendering their detention “potentially permanent.” *Id.* (citing *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 684–86, 691). Similarly, if this Court were to adopt Respondents’ position, the only event that could end Petitioner’s detention would be his removal from the United States—a day that might be years away, or that may never come.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, Petitioner respectfully requests this Court to assume jurisdiction over this matter, deny the Respondents’ motion to dismiss, declare that Respondents’ actions or omissions violate the Immigration and Nationality Act and/or the Due Process Clause

---

<sup>1</sup> For the complete raw data for FY 2020 through FY 2023, visit <https://deportationdata.org/data/ice.html> and select “Removals (deportations).” Exhibit 1 excerpts each removal classified under “[5C] Relief Granted—Withholding of Deportation / Removal” or “[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal—Deferred Action Granted.” It highlights the five individuals in those categories who were removed to countries other than their country of origin. The rest of the deported individuals presumably won withholding or CAT relief with respect to a country different than their country of origin or their withholding or CAT relief was later terminated, neither of which situation applies to Petitioner.

of the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, order Petitioner's immediate release from DHS custody, and grant any further relief this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Adam Crandell  
Adam Crandell, Bar No. 29463  
adam@myMDlegal.com  
Eldridge Crandell, L.L.C.  
217 N. Charles Street, 3rd Floor  
Baltimore, MD 21201  
(443) 559-4384  
*Counsel for Petitioner*

# **Exhibit 1**

Departure Date	Departure Country	Case Category	Final (C Final Order Dat Birth Country	Citizenship Country
<b>5C - Relief Granted - Withholding of Removal/Deportation</b>				
12/16/2019	EL SALVADOR	[5C] Relief Granted - Withholding of Deportation / Removal	YES	EL SALVADOR
1/2/2020	MEXICO	[5C] Relief Granted - Withholding of Deportation / Removal	YES	MEXICO
2/6/2020	MEXICO	[5C] Relief Granted - Withholding of Deportation / Removal	YES	MEXICO
4/2/2020	MEXICO	[5C] Relief Granted - Withholding of Deportation / Removal	YES	MEXICO
3/26/2020	MEXICO	[5C] Relief Granted - Withholding of Deportation / Removal	YES	ECUADOR
5/14/2020	MEXICO	[5C] Relief Granted - Withholding of Deportation / Removal	YES	MEXICO
5/25/2020	HONDURAS	[5C] Relief Granted - Withholding of Deportation / Removal	YES	HONDURAS
10/13/2020	CHINA	[5C] Relief Granted - Withholding of Deportation / Removal	YES	CHINA
10/16/2020	EL SALVADOR	[5C] Relief Granted - Withholding of Deportation / Removal	YES	EL SALVADOR
10/20/2020	MEXICO	[5C] Relief Granted - Withholding of Deportation / Removal	YES	MEXICO
1/14/2021	MEXICO	[5C] Relief Granted - Withholding of Deportation / Removal	YES	MEXICO
1/20/2021	MEXICO	[5C] Relief Granted - Withholding of Deportation / Removal	YES	MEXICO
3/23/2021	LEBANON	[5C] Relief Granted - Withholding of Deportation / Removal	YES	LEBANON
2/10/2022	CANADA	[5C] Relief Granted - Withholding of Deportation / Removal	YES	CUBA
6/1/2022	CANADA	[5C] Relief Granted - Withholding of Deportation / Removal	YES	ITALY
2/20/2023	INDONESIA	[5C] Relief Granted - Withholding of Deportation / Removal	YES	INDONESIA
6/1/2023	MEXICO	[5C] Relief Granted - Withholding of Deportation / Removal	YES	MEXICO

**5D - Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted**

10/4/2019	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	12/19/2013	MEXICO	MEXICO
10/8/2019	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	10/8/2019	MEXICO	MEXICO
10/16/2019	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	2/28/2018	MEXICO	MEXICO
10/17/2019	ARGENTINA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	7/23/2019	ARGENTINA	ARGENTINA
10/24/2019	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	10/23/2019	MEXICO	MEXICO
10/25/2019	POLAND	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	7/1/2019	POLAND	POLAND
11/4/2019	SPAIN	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	9/25/2019	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	SPAIN
11/14/2019	JAPAN	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	10/21/2019	JAPAN	JAPAN
11/19/2019	PANAMA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	9/27/2019	PANAMA	PANAMA
12/1/2019	GUATEMALA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	11/20/2019	GUATEMALA	GUATEMALA
12/10/2019	NIGERIA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	10/17/2019	NIGER	NIGERIA
12/29/2019	TUNISIA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	9/6/2019	TUNISIA	TUNISIA
1/10/2020	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	1/10/2020	EL SALVADOR	EL SALVADOR
1/10/2020	TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	11/3/2019	TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO	TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO
2/7/2020	GUATEMALA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	2/3/2020	GUATEMALA	GUATEMALA
2/19/2020	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	2/18/2020	MEXICO	MEXICO
3/17/2020	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	4/17/2019	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
3/26/2020	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	3/26/2020	CHINA	CHINA
4/21/2020	JAMAICA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	1/31/2020	JAMAICA	JAMAICA
5/14/2020	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	5/11/2020	MEXICO	MEXICO
5/22/2020	PHILIPPINES	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	9/15/1999	PHILIPPINES	PHILIPPINES
6/9/2020	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	6/4/2020	MEXICO	MEXICO



9/2/2020	COLOMBIA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	7/1/2020	COLOMBIA	COLOMBIA
9/3/2020	BULGARIA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	7/13/2020	BULGARIA	BULGARIA
9/9/2020	COSTA RICA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	6/30/2020	COSTA RICA	COSTA RICA
9/29/2020	LIBERIA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	5/13/2020	LIBERIA	LIBERIA
10/20/2020	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	10/20/2020	MEXICO	MEXICO
10/20/2020	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	9/16/2020	MEXICO	MEXICO
10/28/2020	KYRGYZSTAN	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	8/21/2014	KYRGYZSTAN	KYRGYZSTAN
10/30/2020	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	10/29/2020	MEXICO	MEXICO
11/2/2020	PHILIPPINES	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	9/21/2020	PHILIPPINES	PHILIPPINES
11/7/2020	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	10/1/2020	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
11/16/2020	PAKISTAN	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	7/9/2020	PAKISTAN	PAKISTAN
11/25/2020	NICARAGUA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	11/2/2020	NICARAGUA	NICARAGUA
12/15/2020	GUATEMALA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	9/30/2020	GUATEMALA	GUATEMALA
12/22/2020	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	12/17/2020	MEXICO	MEXICO
3/15/2021	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	2/5/2020	MEXICO	MEXICO
3/30/2021	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	3/20/2019	MEXICO	MEXICO
4/6/2021	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	5/27/2020	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
7/7/2021	MEXICO	[16] Reinstated Final Order	YES	3/7/2019	MEXICO	MEXICO
7/22/2021	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	7/21/2021	MEXICO	MEXICO
8/5/2021	HONDURAS	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	12/27/2019	HONDURAS	HONDURAS
9/2/2021	KYRGYZSTAN	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	4/6/2020	KYRGYZSTAN	KYRGYZSTAN
9/7/2021	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	2/27/2019	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
9/21/2021	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	8/10/2021	MEXICO	MEXICO
9/23/2021	INDONESIA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	8/19/2009	INDONESIA	INDONESIA
9/24/2021	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	11/27/2017	MEXICO	MEXICO
10/28/2021	INDIA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	1/16/2020	INDIA	INDIA
1/31/2022	SOUTH KOREA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	10/26/2020	SOUTH KOREA	SOUTH KOREA
2/2/2022	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	1/26/2022	MEXICO	MEXICO
3/22/2022	BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	2/22/2022	BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA	BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA
3/31/2022	JAMAICA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	1/18/2022	JAMAICA	JAMAICA
4/14/2022	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	4/11/2022	MEXICO	MEXICO
5/5/2022	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	5/5/2022	MEXICO	MEXICO
5/11/2022	EL SALVADOR	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	8/13/1986	EL SALVADOR	EL SALVADOR
6/23/2022	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	6/22/2022	MEXICO	MEXICO
7/5/2022	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	6/6/2022	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
8/2/2022	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	6/6/2022	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
9/29/2022	COLOMBIA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	8/15/2022	COLOMBIA	COLOMBIA
10/6/2022	PHILIPPINES	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	8/30/2022	PHILIPPINES	PHILIPPINES
10/13/2022	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	10/29/2018	MEXICO	MEXICO
11/30/2022	SOUTH AFRICA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	4/15/2020	SOUTH AFRICA	SOUTH AFRICA
12/6/2022	MEXICO	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	11/16/2015	MEXICO	MEXICO
12/15/2022	COLOMBIA	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	10/27/2022	COLOMBIA	COLOMBIA
1/27/2023	HONDURAS	[5D] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	1/12/2023	HONDURAS	HONDURAS



2/1/2023	COLOMBIA	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	1/12/2023	COLOMBIA	COLOMBIA
2/6/2023	COLOMBIA	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	12/28/2022	COLOMBIA	COLOMBIA
2/13/2023	MEXICO	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	2/7/2023	MEXICO	MEXICO
2/20/2023	MEXICO	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	2/20/2023	MEXICO	MEXICO
2/24/2023	MEXICO	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	1/13/2023	MEXICO	MEXICO
3/8/2023	MEXICO	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	3/8/2023	MEXICO	MEXICO
4/6/2023	MEXICO	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	3/23/2023	MEXICO	MEXICO
4/29/2023	MEXICO	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	4/7/2023	MEXICO	MEXICO
5/22/2023	COLOMBIA	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	4/18/2023	COLOMBIA	COLOMBIA
6/1/2023	MEXICO	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	5/25/2023	MEXICO	MEXICO
7/12/2023	MEXICO	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	7/12/2023	MEXICO	MEXICO
7/12/2023	MEXICO	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	7/12/2023	MEXICO	MEXICO
7/12/2023	MEXICO	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	7/12/2023	MEXICO	MEXICO
7/12/2023	MEXICO	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	7/12/2023	MEXICO	MEXICO
7/12/2023	MEXICO	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	7/12/2023	MEXICO	MEXICO
7/12/2023	MEXICO	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	7/12/2023	MEXICO	MEXICO
8/24/2023	MEXICO	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	8/24/2023	MEXICO	MEXICO
9/5/2023	MEXICO	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	5/22/2023	MEXICO	MEXICO
9/7/2023	COLOMBIA	[SD] Final Order of Deportation / Removal - Deferred Action Granted	YES	8/16/2023	COLOMBIA	COLOMBIA