

1 Irene C. Freidel  
2 (*pro hac vice to be filed*)  
3 ifreidel@pairproject.org  
4 Political Asylum/Immigration Representation (PAIR) Project  
5 98 N. Washington Street, Suite 106  
6 Boston, MA 02114  
7 Tel: 617-742-9296 ext. 314  
8 Fax: 617-742-9385

9 Stacy Tolchin (SBN 217431)  
10 Stacy@tolchinimmigration.com  
11 Megan Brewer (SBN 268248)  
12 Megan@tolchinimmigration.com  
13 Law offices of Stacy Tolchin  
14 776 E. Green St., Suite 210  
15 Pasadena, CA 91101  
16 Tel: (213) 622-7450  
17 Fax: (213) 622-7233

18 Counsel for Petitioner

19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
20 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

21 ARTEM VASKANYAN,

22 Petitioner,

23 v.

24 James Janecka, Warden, Adelanto ICE  
25 Processing Center, Thomas Giles, Los Angeles  
26 ICE Field Office Director, Todd Lyons, Acting  
27 Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs  
28 Enforcement, Kristi Noem, Secretary of the U.S.  
Department of Homeland Security; Pamela  
Bondi; Attorney General of the United States.

Respondents.

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

**Petition for Writ of  
Habeas Corpus**

**Oral Argument  
Requested**

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2 1. Petitioner Artem Vaskanyan, (“Petitioner” or “Mr. Vaskanyan”) came  
3 to the United States as a refugee in 1993. Upon information and belief, he is  
4 currently detained in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS),  
5 Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) (“ICE” or “government”) at the  
6 Adelanto ICE Processing Center in Adalanto, CA. Mr. Vaskanyan is stateless. He  
7 has been detained by DHS for more than 180 days following the entry of a final  
8 order of removal.  
9

10  
11 2. Mr. Vaskanyan was ordered removed to Russia, or in the alternative,  
12 Azerbaijan, by the Boston Immigration Court in April 2012. He has been detained  
13 in ICE custody since November 12, 2024. Mr. Vaskanyan cannot be removed from  
14 the United States to either Russia or Azerbaijan as he is a citizen of neither country.  
15 He also cannot be removed to another country without being afforded notice and an  
16 opportunity to be heard. He has been provided with no such notice. *See* Preliminary  
17 Injunction in *D.V.D. v. U.S. DHS*, No. 25-10676 (D. Mass. April 18, 2025). That  
18 order precludes removal of noncitizens like Mr. Vaskanyan to any third country  
19 without advance notice and an opportunity to be heard. A copy of that order can be  
20 found here: [https://immigrationlitigation.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/64-Class-](https://immigrationlitigation.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/64-Class-Cert-PI-Order.pdf)  
21 [Cert-PI-Order.pdf](https://immigrationlitigation.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/64-Class-Cert-PI-Order.pdf).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1           3. In *Zadvydas v. Davis*, the Supreme Court emphasized that, “[f]reedom  
2 from imprisonment— from government custody, detention, or other forms of  
3 physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that [the Due Process] Clause  
4 protects.” 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001) (citation omitted).

6           4. The Court underscored that civil detention is thus only constitutionally  
7 permissible in “special and narrow nonpunitive circumstances, where a special  
8 justification . . . outweighs the individual’s constitutionally protected interest in  
9 avoiding physical restraint.” *Id.* at 690 (citations omitted) (internal quotations  
10 omitted). The Court thus concluded that, “[a] statute permitting indefinite detention  
11 of [a noncitizen] would raise a serious constitutional problem.” *Id.* at 690, 680  
12 (“[T]here is reason to believe that [Congress] doubted the constitutionality of more  
13 than six months’ detention.”).

17           5. While ICE is generally permitted up to ninety days to effectuate the  
18 removal of a person with a final order of removal, 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(1)(A), if the  
19 government is unable to comply with this removal period, the government “may”  
20 continue detention beyond the 90-day removal period if a noncitizen falls within  
21 certain broad categories of removability or is determined “to be a risk to the  
22 community or unlikely to comply with the order of removal.” 8 U.S.C. §1231(a)(6).  
23 However, the Supreme Court has held that this period is limited to “a period  
24  
25  
26

1 reasonably necessary to bring about that [noncitizen's] removal from the United  
2 States.” *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 689. This is because the primary purpose of post-  
3 order detention is to “assure[e] the [noncitizen's] presence at the moment of  
4 removal.” *Id.* at 702. This government interest in “preventing flight,” however, “is  
5 weak or nonexistent where removal seems a remote possibility at best.” *Id.* at 690.  
6

7  
8 6. In *Zadvydas*, the Supreme Court held that noncitizens cannot be  
9 detained indefinitely if the government is unable to carry out their removal. Instead,  
10 detention after a final order of removal is authorized only when removal is  
11 reasonably foreseeable. As a guide to courts, the Supreme Court in *Zadvydas*  
12 established a presumption that detention after a final order of removal was  
13 reasonably foreseeable for up to six months. Detention after a final order may be  
14 unlawful even when six months have not passed. The presumption of  
15 reasonableness up to the six-month mark is just that—a presumption that can be  
16 rebutted.  
17

18  
19  
20 7. Mr. Vaskanyan has been detained for more than six (6) months in ICE  
21 custody. He is stateless and therefore removal is not foreseeable. Moreover, a final  
22 order of removal was entered against Mr. Vaskanyan on April 26, 2012 and  
23 therefore ICE has had more than a decade to prepare for his removal. Yet, ICE has  
24 not and, upon information and belief, cannot effectuate his removal because Mr.  
25  
26

1 Vaskanyan is stateless. Therefore, Mr. Vaskanyan respectfully petitions this Court  
2 and requests that an order be entered for his immediate release under reasonable  
3 conditions of supervision.  
4

5 8. Pending the adjudication of this Petition, Petitioner respectfully  
6 requests that the Court use its authority under 28 U.S.C. § 2243 to order  
7 Respondents to file a return within three days, unless they can show good cause for  
8 additional time. See 28 U.S.C. § 2243. Petitioner respectfully requests a return in  
9 three days given that ICE has recently transferred Petitioner to California from  
10 Buffalo, NY without notice, and he was previously transferred to Buffalo, NY from  
11 Central Falls, RI also without notice. Each transfer requires Petitioner to find new  
12 counsel to try to protect his rights.  
13  
14  
15

16 9. Pending the adjudication of this Petition and in order to comport with  
17 due process, Petitioner also respectfully requests Respondents be ordered to provide  
18 at least seventy-two (72) hours notice of any movement of Mr. Vaskanyan from  
19 California.  
20

21 **PARTIES**

22 10. Petitioner Artem Vaskanyan is ethnically Armenian. He was admitted  
23 to the United States in 1993 as a refugee from Azerbaijan. He has continuously  
24 lived in the United States since his arrival here. If released from ICE custody, he  
25  
26

---

1 will live with his US citizen brother and mother in Massachusetts.

2 11. Respondent Thomas Giles is the Field Office Director for the Los  
3 Angeles Field Office of ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations. He is sued in  
4 his official capacity only. Field Office Director Giles is charged with exercising  
5 authority over the removal operations carried out by ICE in the Los Angeles  
6 geographic region, which includes the Adelanto ICE Processing Center, and for  
7 determinations on whether and where Petitioner is to be detained prior to removal.  
8  
9

10 12. Respondent James Janecka is sued in his official capacity as Warden of  
11 the Adelanto ICE Processing Center, the ICE facility at which Petitioner is currently  
12 detained.  
13

14 13. Respondent Todd Lyons is named in his official capacity as the Acting  
15 Director for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. As the Senior Official  
16 Performing the Duties of the Director of ICE, he is responsible for the administration  
17 and enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States and is legally  
18 responsible for pursuing any effort to remove the Petitioner; and as such is a legal  
19 custodian of Mr. Vaskanyan.  
20  
21

22 14. Respondent Kristi Noem is sued in her official capacity as the Secretary  
23 of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS). In this capacity, Respondent  
24 Noem is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the Immigration  
25  
26

---

1 and Nationality Act and oversees U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement the  
2 component agency responsible for Mr. Bagira's detention and custody. Respondent  
3 Noem is a legal custodian of Mr. Vaskanyan.  
4

5 15. Respondent Pamela Bondi is sued in her official capacity as the  
6 Attorney General of the United States and the senior official of the U.S.  
7 Department of Justice (DOJ). In that capacity, she has the authority to adjudicate  
8 removal cases and to oversee the Executive Office for Immigration Review  
9 (EOIR), which administers the immigration courts and the BIA. Respondent Bondi  
10 is a legal custodian of Mr. Vaskanyan.  
11  
12

13 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

14 16. This Court has jurisdiction under the United States Constitution. U.S.  
15 Const. art. I § 9, cl. 2 ("The privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be  
16 suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may  
17 require.").

18 17. This Court also has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal  
19 question), 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus), and 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act).  
20  
21

22 18. This Court has jurisdiction to grant injunctive relief in this case  
23 pursuant to the Declaratory Judgement Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201.  
24

25 19. While only the federal circuit courts have jurisdiction to review  
26  
27  
28

1 removal orders through petitions for review, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a), federal district  
2 courts have jurisdiction to hear habeas corpus petitions brought by people in  
3 immigrant detention to challenge the lawfulness of their detention. *See Demore v.*  
4 *Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 516-17 (2003); *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 687 (2001).

6 20. Venue is proper in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of  
7 California. Upon information and belief, Petitioner is currently detained at the  
8 Adelanto ICE Processing Center in Adelanto, California, which is within the  
9 Central District of California. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e).

11  
12 **RELEVANT FACTS**

13 21. Mr. Vaskanyan was born on or about November 16, 1979 in the Soviet  
14 Republic of Azerbaijan within the USSR. He is a Christian Armenian.

15  
16 22. Mr. Vaskanyan and his family were forced to flee the Soviet Republic  
17 of Azerbaijan in approximately 1986, when Mr. Vaskanyan was only a child,  
18 because they were at risk of falling victim to the Azerbaijanis' ethnic cleansing of  
19 Armenians living in Azerbaijan. Mr. Vaskanyan, his mother, and other family  
20 members left their lives and property in the Soviet Republic of Azerbaijan and fled  
21 to Russia.  
22

23  
24 23. Mr. Vaskanyan and his relatives lived in Russia temporarily until they  
25 were granted refugee status in the United States.  
26

1           24. Mr. Vaskanyan never became a citizen of Russia. He also never lived  
2 in the post-Soviet, independent Republic of Azerbaijan and therefore never  
3 acquired citizenship there. The country to which Mr. Vaskanyan was a citizen, the  
4 Soviet Republic of Azerbaijan, no longer exists. The current Republic of  
5 Azerbaijan continues to pursue a campaign of genocide against ethnic Armenians.  
6 See U.S. Department of State Azerbaijan 2023 Human Rights Report, publicly  
7 available at [https://www.state.gov/wp-](https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/528267_AZERBAIJAN-2023-HUMAN-RIGHTS-REPORT.pdf)  
8 [content/uploads/2024/03/528267\\_AZERBAIJAN-2023-HUMAN-RIGHTS-](https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/528267_AZERBAIJAN-2023-HUMAN-RIGHTS-REPORT.pdf)  
9 [REPORT.pdf](https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/528267_AZERBAIJAN-2023-HUMAN-RIGHTS-REPORT.pdf).

10  
11  
12  
13           25. Following his arrival in the United States as a refugee in 1993, Mr.  
14 Vaskanyan became a lawful permanent resident. He was a child without father  
15 figure in his life; he did not speak English and had a second-grade education when  
16 he was forced to flee the Soviet Republic of Azerbaijan; and he carried the  
17 memories of the atrocities of ethnic cleansing in his child's mind.  
18

19  
20           26. At the age of nineteen, Mr. Vaskanyan was arrested when he  
21 participated in a home invasion with several other people. Declaration of Artem  
22 Vaskanyan (Exhibit A hereto). In December 2001, he was convicted in the  
23 Hampden County Superior Court of Massachusetts on charges including home  
24 invasion, assault and battery, and armed assault. See *Commonwealth v. Vaskanyan*,  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 *Artem R.*, Case No. 0079CR01691. Even though he was not the shooter in the  
2 incident, Mr. Vaskanyan was sentenced to consecutive sentences totaling 30 to 35  
3 years' imprisonment, with a parole eligibility after greater than 20 years.  
4

5 27. During his time in criminal custody, ICE initiated immigration removal  
6 proceedings. Without counsel and while in criminal custody, Mr. Vaskanyan  
7 appeared before an Immigration Judge in the Boston Immigration Court and was  
8 ordered removed on April 26, 2021.  
9

10 28. Because Mr. Vaskanyan was only nineteen years old at the time of his  
11 crimes, which did not involve murder, his sentence was presumptively  
12 unconstitutional under Article 26 of the Massachusetts Declaration of Rights. *See*  
13 *Diatchenko v. District Attorney for the Suffolk Dist.*, 466 Mass. 655 (2013 (it was a  
14 violation of Article 26 to sentence a juvenile convicted of first-degree murder to life  
15 without parole based on their brain maturation), *Commonwealth v. Mattis*, 493  
16 Mass. 216 (2024) (it is a violation of Article 26 to sentence an emerging adult—age  
17 eighteen, nineteen, or twenty at the time of their first-degree murder crimes—to life  
18 without parole based on their brain maturation), and *Commonwealth v. Perez*, 477  
19 Mass. 677 (2017) (the sentence of a juvenile convicted of crimes less than murder  
20 that has a parole eligibility greater than fifteen years is presumptively a violation of  
21 Article 26's proportionality mandate).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1           29. On September 2, 2024, the Massachusetts Superior Court resentedenced  
2 Mr. Vaskanyan to immediate parole eligibility. At that time, Mr. Vaskanyan had  
3 accrued five (years) of good time. He also over-served his prison sentence by nine  
4 years for a non-homicide case where he was not the principal actor. *See* Exhibit B  
5 hereto.  
6

7  
8           30. On May 7, 2024, Mr. Vaskanyan also had a hearing with the Advisory  
9 Board of Pardons. Following the hearing, the Board recommended to  
10 Massachusetts Governor Maura Healey that she grant Mr. Vaskanyan's request for  
11 executive clemency in the form of a commutation. All seven of the Board members  
12 voted in favor of commutation. *See* In the Matter of Artem Vaskanyan W70367  
13 Petition for Commutation Report and Recommendation (Advisory Board of  
14 Pardons) dated October 10, 2024. Exhibits B & C hereto.  
15

16  
17           31. On November 12, 2024, Mr. Vaskanyan was released from criminal  
18 custody and transferred to ICE custody. He benefited from "Release to parole  
19 supervision" or RTS without the need for a parole hearing, based upon his  
20 completion of credits earned through programming and education. *See* Exhibit D  
21 hereto, Certificate of Mandatory Release to Supervision Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 127,  
22 §130B dated November 8, 2024. The Certificate states that Mr. Vaskanyan would  
23 be released on supervision until his sentence expires on June 11, 2025. Mr.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Vaskanyan had been assigned a parole officer and would be obligated and  
2 committed to following his parole conditions upon release. Mr. Vaskanyan's  
3 brother's home in Massachusetts had been visited and approved for Mr. Vaskanyan  
4 to live in while he remained on parole, and Mr. Vaskanyan would wear a  
5 monitoring bracelet upon his release until June 11, 2025.  
6

7  
8 32. While incarcerated, Mr. Vaskanyan grew up. He obtained a bachelor's  
9 degree from Boston University (Exhibit E hereto), attended over thirty certificate  
10 programs (Exhibit F hereto), learned English and Spanish, wrote several books, and  
11 earned five years of "good time." Mr. Vaskanyan is a model for rehabilitation. Mr.  
12 Vaskanyan is now 45 years old, and he is deeply remorseful for his crime. *See*  
13 Exhibit A hereto (Declaration of Artem Vaskanyan).  
14

15  
16 33. The Massachusetts Advisory Board of Pardons recognized Mr.  
17 Vaskanyan's tremendous accomplishments in its recommendation to the governor  
18 (Exhibit C hereto):  
19

20 Mr. Vaskanyan explained that, during his incarceration, he has  
21 undergone spiritual and intellectual growth, which began by avoiding  
22 negativity and taking responsibility for his actions. After his transfer to  
23 a lower security facility, he devoted himself to learning English and  
24 Spanish, eventually graduating from Boston University in 2020. He  
25 has published two poetry books and a novel. He has also completed  
26 over thirty programs, maintained employment, and sought out culinary  
27 arts training. His goals for re-entry into the community include  
28 working as a chef and obtaining a master's degree in fine arts and  
poetry.



1 receive Mr. Vaskanyan into their home. *See* Exhibit O hereto (Declaration of Edgar  
2 Vaskanyan); Exhibit P hereto (Declaration of Evelina Vaskanyan).

3  
4 37. Edgar Vaskanyan works full-time in Clinical and Support Options at  
5 Friends of the Homeless shelter in Springfield, Massachusetts. He provides case  
6 management for people of all ages from eighteen years of age and older, including  
7 disabled, veterans, seniors, previously incarcerated individuals, and those who have  
8 struggled with domestic violence, substance use, or both. Edgar is well-equipped to  
9 help his brother re-integrate successfully into society. Exhibit O.  
10

11  
12 38. Other individuals are also ready and willing to help Artem reintegrate  
13 to the community. *See* Exhibit Q (letter from Pastor Fedor Songorov); Exhibit R  
14 (letter offering support services by Thrive Communities in Lowell, MA). Each of  
15 these supports are significantly favorable factors that will enable to Mr. Vaskanyan  
16 to successfully transition to a safe and stable life outside of custody.  
17

18  
19 39. Since he was ordered removed by the Boston Immigration Court in  
20 2012, Mr. Vaskanyan has fully cooperated with ICE's efforts to obtain travel  
21 documents for him and has proactively reached out to the consulates of Russia and  
22 Azerbaijan on numerous occasions to obtain travel documents. He began these  
23 efforts while he was still in criminal custody. Exhibit S hereto.  
24

25 40. As far back as ten years ago, Ms. Vaskanyan contacted the Russian  
26

---

1 embassy to determine if he had any legal status in Russia. In 2014, the Federal  
2 Migration Service of Russia informed him there was no record of him living in  
3 Russia as a child and that Russia would not recognize or accept him as a citizen.  
4  
5 *See Exhibit T.*

6  
7 41. Mr. Vaskanyan also contacted the consulate for the Republic of  
8 Azerbaijan on numerous occasions and cooperated with all requests for  
9 documentation. *See, e.g., Exhibit S & U.*

10  
11 42. On or about February 1, 2025, without notice, ICE transferred Mr.  
12 Vaskanyan from the Wyatt Detention Facility in Central Falls, RI to the Buffalo  
13 Federal Detention Facility in Batavia, NY.

14  
15 43. On or about February 10, 2025, ICE issued a Decision to Continue  
16 Detention on the ostensible grounds that Mr. Vaskanyan poses “a danger to the  
17 community, to the safety of other persons, or to property” and poses “a significant  
18 flight risk.” *See Exhibit V hereto.*

19  
20 44. On or about April 2, 2025, Mr. Vaskanyan filed a habeas petition with  
21 the Western District of New York on the ground that he is stateless and his removal  
22 was not reasonably foreseeable. *See Vaskanyan v. Kurzdorfer, et al., Case 1:25-cv-*  
23 *00295-JLS (W.D.N.Y.).*

24  
25 45. On May 7, 2025, ICE interviewed Mr. Vaskanyan and provided no  
26

---

1 information or indication that it had any reason to believe it could obtain travel  
2 documents for him to Russia or Azerbaijan.

3  
4 46. On May 20, 2025, ICE notified Mr. Vaskanyan's counsel that  
5 Azerbaijan had made the decision that it would not provide travel documents for  
6 him. Exhibit W hereto.

7  
8 47. On May 22, 2025, the District Court dismissed Mr. Vaskanyan's  
9 petition because it had been filed before Mr. Vaskanyan had been in ICE custody  
10 for 180 days.

11  
12 48. Subsequently to May 7, 2025, and for the first time since his order of  
13 removal in 2012, ICE asked Mr. Vaskanyan to submit a citizenship application to  
14 Armenia. While he is ethnically Armenian, Mr. Vaskanyan has never lived in  
15 Armenia, has no relatives in Armenia, and does not speak Armenian. Mr.  
16 Vaskanyan has no claim to citizenship in Armenia.

17  
18 49. ICE did not release Mr. Vaskanyan upon his 180-day custody review  
19 despite that Mr. Vaskanyan is not a danger to the community, he is not a flight risk,  
20 and ICE has not been able to obtain a travel document for Mr. Vaskanyan since his  
21 removal order was issued in 2012 because he is stateless as set forth in Article I of  
22 the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons. *See* U.N. General  
23 Assembly, *Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons*, United Nations,  
24  
25  
26

1 Treaty Series, Vol. 360, 136 (Sept. 28, 1954)<sup>1</sup> (“stateless person’ means a person  
2 who is not considered as a national by any State under the operation of its law.”).

3  
4 50. Mr. Vaskanyan is not a danger to the community, and in light of the  
5 fact that Mr. Vaskanyan spent nine additional years in criminal custody than what  
6 was constitutional for his age and convictions, he should not be subject to further  
7 incarceration by Respondents because he is allegedly a danger to the community.  
8

9 51. Mr. Vaskanyan has matured and relentlessly pursued self-improvement.  
10 He has obtained a formal college education and earned a wide range of vocational  
11 and skill-based certificates, and self-published several books. He has participated in  
12 collective group study, and engaged in extensive restorative justice and non-  
13 violence training, as well as healing circles. Mr. Vaskanyan’s age at the time of his  
14 crime, the time that has passed since the crime, and the extensive evidence of his  
15 rehabilitation and capacity for change area all significant mitigating factors  
16 supporting the conclusion that Mr. Vaskanyan is not a current threat to public  
17 safety. Indeed, Mr. Vaskanyan was released from state custody through the RTS  
18 program because of the substantial “good time” he accrued in prison. Individuals  
19 who have gotten to know Mr. Vaskanyan speak highly of him and his good  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25  
26 <sup>1</sup> Available at [https://treaties.un.org/doc/Treaties/1960/06/19600606%2001-49%20AM/Ch\\_V\\_3p.pdf](https://treaties.un.org/doc/Treaties/1960/06/19600606%2001-49%20AM/Ch_V_3p.pdf).

1 character. *See* Exhibits G-I; K-N.

2 52. Mr. Vaskanyan is not a flight risk. Mr. Vaskanyan has been separated  
3 from his mother and brother for 24 years. He and they want nothing more than to be  
4 reunited as a family and to live together in Springfield, Massachusetts. *See* Exhibits  
5 O and P. Mr. Vaskanyan has no reason or desire to run off and live elsewhere in the  
6 United States. He would not jeopardize his ability to obtain lawful work and other  
7 benefits flowing from an Order of Supervision by failing to check-in with ICE or  
8 adhere to supervision requirements.  
9

10  
11  
12 53. On or about June 9, 2025, without notice to counsel and upon  
13 information and belief, Respondents transferred Mr. Vaskanyan to a facility in  
14 California.  
15

### 16 **LEGAL ARGUMENT**

17 54. If a person “provides good reason to believe that there is no significant  
18 likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future,” the Government must  
19 either “respond with evidence sufficient to rebut that showing” or release them  
20 from detention under supervision. *Id.* at 701.  
21

22 55. The government’s “good faith efforts” to remove an individual  
23 sufficient to meet this standard. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 702. As the length of  
24 detention grows, the period of time that would be considered the “reasonably  
25  
26

1 foreseeable future” conversely shrinks. *Id.* at 701.

2  
3 56. If a court finds removal *is* reasonably foreseeable, the court may still  
4 order release and may consider the risk posed by the individual to community  
5 safety in determining whether to do so. *Id.* While dangerousness may justify  
6 immigrant detention in certain cases, the Court “uph[o]ld[s] preventive detention  
7 based on dangerousness only when limited to specially dangerous individuals and  
8 subject to strong procedural protections.” *Id.* at 690-91.

9  
10 57. Mr. Vaskanyan is currently detained under DHS’s 8 U.S.C. §  
11 1231(a)(6) authority. His detention is thus under the direct purview of *Zadvydas*.

12  
13 58. The government’s inability to deport Mr. Vaskanyan since they first  
14 took him into custody – and having had the opportunity to obtain proof of Mr.  
15 Vaskanyan’s citizenship to Azerbaijan, Russia, or now Armenia, beginning in 2012  
16 - provides strong evidence that there does not exist a significant likelihood that they  
17 will be able to remove Petitioner in the reasonably foreseeable future.

18  
19  
20 59. Accordingly, unless Respondents can supply sufficient evidence to the  
21 contrary, they should immediately release Mr. Vaskanyan from their custody  
22 because his “continued detention [has become] unreasonable and [is] no longer  
23 authorized by statute.” *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 699- 700. In facilitating Mr.  
24 Vaskanyan release, Respondents may implement appropriate supervision  
25  
26







1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

By: S/Irene C. Freidel  
Irene C. Freidel  
*(pro hac vice to be filed)*  
ifreidel@pairproject.org  
Political Asylum/Immigration  
Representation (PAIR) Project  
98 N. Washington Street, Suite 106  
Boston, MA 02114  
Tel: 617-742-9296 ext. 314  
Fax: 617-742-9385

STACY TOLCHIN (SBN 217431)  
*Stacy@tolchinimmigration.com*  
MEGAN BREWER (SBN 268248)  
*Megan@tolchinimmigration.com*  
LAW OFFICES OF STACY TOLCHIN  
776 E. Green St., Suite 210  
Pasadena, CA 91101  
Tel: (213) 622-7450  
Fax: (213) 622-7233

Pro Bono Attorneys for Petitioner-  
Plaintiff