# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

Douglas Menjivar,	)	
	)	Case No. 4:25-cv-02730
Petitioner,	)	
	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF
V.	)	HABEAS CORPUS
	)	
Randall Tate, Warden, Montgomery Processing Center;	)	
Bret Bradford, Director of Houston Field Office, U.S.	)	ORAL ARGUMENT
Immigration and Customs Enforcement; Kristi Noem,	)	REQUESTED
Secretary of the U.S. Department Homeland Security,	)	
and Pam Bondi, Attorney General of the United States,	)	
in their official capacities,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	
	_)	

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 1. Petitioner, Douglas Menjivar, files this petition for a writ of habeas corpus. He is detained by U.S. Immigration & Customs Enforcement at the Montgomery Processing Center in Conroe, Texas. Mr. Menjivar is a citizen of El Salvador. Mr. Menjivar has a hearing pending with the immigration court on his claim to withholding of removal under 8 C.F.R. §241.8(e). Mr. Menjivar has learned that his deportation to Mexico is imminent even though he has a statutory and regulatory right to a hearing on his claim to withholding of removal under 8 U.S.C. §1231(b)(3)(A). His removal from the United States would violate his right to seek protection. Accordingly, to vindicate Petitioner's statutory and regulatory rights, this Court should grant the instant petition for a writ of habeas corpus.
- 2. Petitioner asks this Court to find that removing Mr. Menjivar without a hearing on his withholding claim would violate his statutory and regulatory right to seek protection and

order the Respondents not to remove him from the United States until he has had a hearing and taken any necessary appeals.

# **JURISDICTION**

- 3. This action arises under the Constitution of the United States and the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 8 U.S.C. § 1101 et seq.
- 4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), and Article I, § 9, cl. 2 of the United States Constitution (Suspension Clause).
- 5. This Court may grant relief under the habeas corpus statutes, 28 U.S.C. § 2241 et. seq., the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 et seq., and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

#### **VENUE**

 Venue is proper because Petitioner is detained at Montgomery Processing Center in Conroe, Montgomery County, Texas, which is within the jurisdiction of this District.

#### REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

- 7. The Court must grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus or issue an order to show cause (OSC) to the respondents "forthwith," unless the petitioner is not entitled to relief.
  28 U.S.C. § 2243. If an order to show cause is issued, the Court must require respondents to file a return "within three days unless for good cause additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is allowed." Id. (emphasis added).
- 8. Courts have long recognized the significance of the habeas statute in protecting individuals from unlawful detention. The Great Writ has been referred to as "perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law of England, affording as it does a

swift and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or confinement." Fay v. Noia, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963) (emphasis added).

# **PARTIES**

- Petitioner is a native of El Salvador who is currently detained by U.S. Immigration &
   Customs Enforcement at the Montgomery County Processing Center in Conroe, Texas.
   He is in the custody, and under the direct control, of Respondents and their agents.
- 10. Respondent Randall Tate is the Warden of Montgomery Processing Center and he has immediate physical custody of Petitioner pursuant to the facility's contract with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to detain noncitizens and is a legal custodian of Petitioner. Respondent Tate is a legal custodian of Petitioner.
- 11. Respondent Bret Bradford is sued in his official capacity as the Director of the Houston Field Office of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Respondent Bradford is a legal custodian of Petitioner and has authority to release him.
- 12. Respondent Kristi Noem is sued in her official capacity as the Secretary of the U.S.

  Department of Homeland Security (DHS). In this capacity, Respondent Noem is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act and oversees U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the component agency responsible for Petitioner's detention and custody. Respondent Noem is a legal custodian of Petitioner.
- 13. Respondent Pam Bondi is sued in her official capacity as the Attorney General of the

  United States and the senior official of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). In that

  capacity, she has the authority to adjudicate removal cases and to oversee the Executive

Office for Immigration Review (EOIR), which administers the immigration courts and the BIA. Respondent Bondi is a legal custodian of Petitioner.

## **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

- 14. Petitioner is a 50-year-old citizen of El Salvador. He is married to United States citizen Monica Logan, who is undergoing treatment for advanced stage breast cancer. Mr. Menjivar has lived with Ms. Logan for the last 10 years.
- 15. Petitioner entered the United States for the first time in September 2004 and was apprehended upon entry. He was placed into removal proceedings and failed to appear for his hearing and the immigration judge ordered his deportation on March 1, 2005. Mr. Menjivar was unaware of his order of deportation.
- 16. Petitioner returned to El Salvador in December 2012 to care for his ailing father. Due to threats made against him by members of the Salvadoran police working with criminal gangs, Petitioner fled to the United States in May 2013, where he was apprehended and detained by U.S. immigration authorities, first at Polk County Detention Center and then at Joe Corley detention Center.
- 17. While at Joel Corley, Petitioner made a claim that, while in detention he was sexually assaulted by four Salvadoran nationals bearing Ms-13 tattoos. Petitioner stated that his effort at reporting these crimes was rebuffed.
- 18. Upon his apprehension at the U.S. border, Petitioner expressed a fear of harm if deported to El Salvador and was referred to an asylum officer for a "Reasonable Fear Interview." On August 26, 2013, the asylum office determined that Mr. Menjivar did have a reasonable fear of torture should he be returned to El Salvador and placed Mr. Menjivar into "withholding-only" proceedings.

- 19. On February 26, 2014, the Immigration Judge denied Mr. Menjivar's applications for withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture. Mr. Menjivar appealed that decision and the Board of Immigration Appeals affirmed on January 15, 2015.
- 20. On March 27, 2015, U.S. Immigration & Customs Enforcement released Mr. Menjivar from custody and placed him on an order of supervision. From May 6, 2015 until June 10, 2025, Mr. Menjivar reported faithfully to ICE offices under the terms of the order of supervision.
- 21. On January 29, 2024, Mr. Menjivar filed a motion to reopen his withholding-only proceedings before the Board of Immigration Appeals asserting ineffective assistance of counsel.
- 22. On September 19, 2024, the Board of Immigration Appeals granted Mr. Menjivar's motion to reopen stating that Mr. Menjivar "has established that he was prejudiced by the actions or inactions of his prior attorney and a reasonable probability that the result of the removal proceedings would have been different had the errors not occurred." The Board found that "based upon the constitutionally deficient performance by prior counsel, the applicant has he established that he was prejudiced by his prior counsel's actions."
- 23. Since the Board's decision in September 2024, Petitioner has been waiting for the immigration court to schedule a hearing on his claim to withholding.
- 24. On June 10, 2025, while reporting to ICE as he has regularly for the past ten years,

  Respondents took Petitioner into custody and have informed him that they will deport
  him either today (6/11) or tomorrow (6/12) despite the fact that he has not gotten the
  hearing promised by the Board's order reopening the case.

# LEGAL FRAMEWORK

- 25. An individual who enters the United States after having been previously deported or departing the United States under an order of removal is subject to having the original order of removal reinstated. 8 U.S.C. §1231(a)(5). Such an individual does not have a right to be brought before an immigration judge for new removal proceedings.
- 26. However, an individual who expresses a fear of returning to their home country, the individual "shall be immediately referred to an asylum officer for an interview to determine whether the alien has a reasonable fear of persecution or torture." 8 C.F.R. §241.8(e).
- 27. If an individual establishes in such an interview a reasonable possibility of persecution or torture, the DHS shall issue a Notice of Referral to the Immigration Judge for withholding of removal proceedings, where the applicant gets an opportunity to obtain the protection of withholding of removal or the Convention Against of Torture.8 C.F.R. §208.2(c)(2).
- 28. The immigration judge in withholding-only proceedings must conduct a hearing and take testimony and receive evidence but may only consider those issues that relate to eligibility to withholding of removal or Convention Against Torture relief. 8 C.F.R. §208.2(c)(3)(i).
- 29. If the immigration judge rules against a grant of withholding of removal or protection under the Convention Against Torture, an individual is allowed only one motion to reopen which must be filed within 90 days.
- 30. The 90-day deadline can be equitably tolled due to extraordinary circumstances in the form of ineffective assistance of counsel. *See.*, e.g., *Matter of Grijalva*, 21 1.&N.Dec.

472 (BIA 1996). Equitable tolling of motion deadlines requires the applicant to demonstrate: (1) diligent pursuit of rights; and (2) an extraordinary circumstance prevented him from timely filing the motion.

#### **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

# COUNT ONE Violation of Fifth Amendment Right to Due Process

The allegations in the above paragraphs are realleged and incorporated herein.

- 31. The Board of Immigration Appeals determined that his proceedings were constitutionally deficient due to ineffective assistance of counsel and reopened Petitioner's withholding only proceedings for a new hearing. Failure to allow Respondent to have a hearing that complies with the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment's guarantee of due process violates Petitioner's rights.
- 32. For these reasons, Petitioner's imminent removal violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

# COUNT TWO Violation of 8 U.S.C. §1231(b)(3) and Implementing Regulations

The allegations in the above paragraphs are realleged and incorporated herein.

- 33. Having passed a reasonable fear interview, petitioner is entitled to a hearing on his withholding of removal/ Tortue Convention Claims before he can be removed from the U.S.
- 34. For these reasons, Petitioner's removal 8 U.S.C. §1231(b)(3) and 8 C.F.R. §208.2(c)(2).

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Petitioner respectfully requests this Court to grant the following:

- 1. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- 2. Issue an Order to Show Cause ordering Respondents to show cause why this Petition should not be granted within three days.
- Declare that Petitioner's removal violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment,
   8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(3) and 8 C.F.R. §208.2(c)(2);
- 4. Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus ordering Respondents to cease efforts to remove the Petitioner until the Petitioner can have a full and fair hearing before the immigration judge and exhaust any appeals.
- Award Petitioner attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act, and on any other basis justified under law; and
- 6. Grant any further relief this Court deems just and proper.

Dated: June 11, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Brian Scott Green
Brian Scott Green
Colorado Bar ID # 560876
Law Office of Brian Green
9609 S University Boulevard
#630084

Highlands Ranch, CO 80130

Tel: (443) 799-4225

Email: briangreen@greenUSimmigration.com

# VERIFICATION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2242

I represent Petitioner, Douglas Menjivar, and submit this verification on his behalf. I hereby verify that the factual statements made in the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated this 11th day of June, 2025.

s/Brian Scott Green

Brian Scott Green Law Office of Brian Green 9609 S University Boulevard, #630084 Littleton, CO 80130 Phone (443) 799-4225 BrianGreen@greenUSimmigration.com JS 44 (Rev. 03/24) Case 4:25-cv-02730 Document Cov Files pro6/11/25 in TXSD Page 1 of 1

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

l. (a) PLAINTIFFS	(a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS			
Douglas Menjiv	jivar			Randall Tate, Bret Bradford, Kristi Noem, & Pam Bondi			
• /	O) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Montgomery County  (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant  (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,	Address, and Telephone Numbe	er)		Attorneys (If Known)			
Brian S. Green, Law Office of Brian Green, 9609 S Univ. Blvd., #630084, Littleton, CO 80130; (443) 799-4225			U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of Texas 1000 Louisiana, Suite 2300, Houston, TX 77002				
		· · ·		1000 Eddiolaria	, Odite 2000, Flod Stori,	. 17/1/002	
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. CI		RINCIPAL PARTIES (		
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government	Not a Party)	Citizo	(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State	CF DEF		
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizo	en of Another State	2 Incorporated and Proof Business In A		
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 3 Foreign Nation	6 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			1 -		Click here for: Nature of S		
CONTRACT 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR		DRFEITURE/PENALTY 25 Drug Related Seizure	BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES  375 False Claims Act	
120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgmen 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise  REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	365 Personal Injury Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus:  463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 335 Death Penalty Other:	75 75 375	LABOR  O Cher  LABOR  Fair Labor Standards Act  Labor/Management Relations  Railway Labor Act  Family and Medical Leave Act  Cher Labor Litigation  Employee Retirement Income Security Act  MMIGRATION  Note In the security Act  MIGRATION  MIGRATION  Note In the security Act  MIGRATION  MIGRATION	423 Withdrawal	376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antirust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit (15 USC 1681 or 1692) 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information Act 896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedur Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X")	in One Box Only)	Conditions of Confinement					
1 Original 2 Re	moved from 3	Remanded from Appellate Court	Reo	(specify	r District Litigation	10,702 102	
	28 U.S.C. Section 13			Do not cite jurisdictional stat . Section 2241 (habeas cos	tutes unless diversity); rpus) and 28 U.S.C. Section 224	43	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ON Brief description of ca	ause:		detention of a non-citizen.			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	S IS A CLASS ACTION 23, F.R.Cv.P.	N D	EMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions):	MDCE			DOCKETANADER		
		JUDGE	mor:	OR BEOOF	DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT		OF RECORD			
6/11/2025		s/Brian Scott Green	1				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY							
RECEIPT# A	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JUE	OGE	