Case	e 2:25-cv-02069-DWLJFM	Document 1	Filed 06/13/25	Page 1 of 12
				FILED LODGED
Liubov Zakhlenaia Name and Prisoner Number/			<u> </u>	RECEIVEDCOPY
Eloy Detention Cer				JUN 1 3 2025
Place of Confinement			CLE	Didition
1705 E Hanna Rd., Mailing Address			BY	DEPUTY
Eloy, AZ 85131 City, State, Zip Code				
12/0 12 1/2/1	Court of your change of address may	result in dismissal o	f this action.)	
	IN THE UNITED S			
	FOR THE DI	STRICT OF AF	UZONA	
Liubov Zakhlenaia		,)		
(Full Name of Peti	tioner))	CV2	5_02060 DUV DV4
	Petitioner,) C	ASE NO.	5-02069-PHX-DWLJFM supplied by the Clerk)
	vs.)	(10 be	supplied by the Clerk)
Fred Figueroa, ICF	E, Dept. of Homeland Security,)) Pl	ETITIONER UNDER	R 28 U.S.C. § 2241
(Name of Warden,	Jailor or authorized person	,	OR A WRIT OF HA	
having custody of	Petitioner)) в	Y A PERSON IN FEI	DERAL CUSTODY
	Respondent.)		
		PETITION		
	ou challenging in this petition?			
	nigration detention reau of Prisons sentence calculation	on or loss of good	-time credits	
□ Pro	bation, parole or supervised releas	se		
☐ Oth	er (explain):			
		1.1.1.1	i i a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	
(a) Name a Imn	nd location of the agency or court nigration and Customs Enforcement	ent, Dept. of Hom	eland Security	ngmg
(b) Case or	opinion number: N/A			60 97 97
(c) Decision	n made by the agency or court: To	o continue my det	tention in immigration	on custody beyond
six months foreseeable	after the final order of removal de under Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U	J.S. 678 (2001).	t removal to Senega	is not reasonably
		1		
		•	TO FEDERAL AND/OR LOC AND IS SUBJECT TO REJECT	PROPER FORM ACCORDING AL RULES AND PRACTICES TON BY THE COURT.
			BOUEDBACE LRC	1P 5.4
			(Rule	Number/Section)

	24 (date of final of	racij,	
Did you appeal the decision to a higher	agency or court?	Yes □	No 区
If yes, answer the following:		20	
(a) First appeal:			
(1) Name of the agency or court: _	N/A		
(2) Date you filed:	N/A		
(3) Opinion or case number:	N/A		
(4) Result:	N/A		
(5) Date of result:	N/A	······································	
(6) Issues raised:	N/A		
,			
(b) Second appeal:		на а сору о	f the decision.
(b) Second appeal:			The decision
(b) Second appeal: (1) Name of the agency or court: _	N/A		
(b) Second appeal:(1) Name of the agency or court:	N/A N/A		
(b) Second appeal:(1) Name of the agency or court:	N/A N/A		
(b) Second appeal: (1) Name of the agency or court:	N/A N/A N/A		
(b) Second appeal: (1) Name of the agency or court: _ (2) Date you filed:	N/A N/A N/A N/A		
(b) Second appeal: (1) Name of the agency or court: _ (2) Date you filed:	N/A N/A N/A N/A		
(b) Second appeal: (1) Name of the agency or court: _ (2) Date you filed:	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A		
(b) Second appeal: (1) Name of the agency or court: _ (2) Date you filed:	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A		
(b) Second appeal: (1) Name of the agency or court:	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A iled on your behalf a	nd a copy o	of the decision.
(b) Second appeal: (1) Name of the agency or court:	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	nd a copy o	of the decision.

(3	3) Opinion or case number:	N/A
(4	4) Result:	N/A
(5	5) Date of result:	N/A
(6	6) Issue raised:	N/A
		ed on your behalf and a copy of the decision. ner agency or court, explain why you did not: On October 23, 2024,
the opp det I ar adr juri	e Immigration Judge affirmed the CI portunity to fight my case, and since tention center as soon as possible. It m still detained. It is important to no ministrative remedies in 28 U.S.C. §	FI denial and issued a removal order. I was not afforded the E I had exhausted my remedies, I was hoping to just leave this has been over seven months since the removal order was issued and the that there is no statutory requirement of exhaustion of E 2241— exhaustion is a prudential requirement, rather than a 638 F. 3d at 1203 n.3; Arando Marquez v. INS, 346 F.3d 892, 897
5. Other t	than the appeals listed above, have y ed in this petition? Yes	you filed any other petitions, applications or motions concerning the No 区
If yes,	answer the following:	
(a) Na	me of agency or court N/A	
(b) Da	te you filed: N/A	
(c) Op	pinion or case number: N/A	
(d) Re	sult: N/A	
(e) Da	ate of result: N/A	
(f) Iss	sues raised: N/A	
Attach,	, if available, a copy of any brief filed on	your behalf and a copy of the decision.

6. For this petition, state every ground on which you claim that you are being held in violation of the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. Attach additional pages if you have more than four grounds. State the <u>facts</u> supporting each ground.

CAUTION: To proceed in the federal court, you must ordinarily first exhaust (use up) your available administrative remedies on each ground on which you request action by the federal court.

GROUND ONE: In Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678 (2001), the U.S. Supreme Court found that aliens with a final order of removal should not be detained beyond a 180-day period unless there is evidence that the alien's removal is significantly likely to occur in the reasonably foreseeable future. Since my order of removal became final over a seven months ago, and since my removal is not significantly likely to occur in the reasonably foreseeable future, my continued detention is in violation of Zadvydas.

- (a) Supporting FACTS (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim):
- 1. I am not a United States citizen. I am a native of Russia.
- 2. My native language is Russian.
- 3. I do not have a criminal history in the U.S., Russia, or any other country.
- 4. On or about September 23, 2024, I arrived at the Nogales, Arizona port of entry requesting admission into the United States.
- 5. On October 8, 2024, I had a credible fear interview with an asylum officer.
- 6. On or about October 18, 2024, I was informed of the negative credible fear finding and an IJ Review hearing was scheduled.
- 7. On October 23, 2024, the Immigration Judge affirmed the CFI denial and issued a removal order. I was not aware that I could file a motion for reconsideration before the Asylum Office within seven days of the Immigration Judge's order, so I never filed it. When I found out about this option, the seven-day deadline had passed.
- 8. I have been willing to cooperate with the Russian consulate in attempts to obtain my travel documents.
- 9. I have cooperated fully with ICE but have received no documentation or further information apart from the Custody Review Determinations.
- 10. I have been on my best behavior while I await my deportation.
- 11. I have been detained in ICE's custody for over eight (8) months, and it has been over seven (7) months since I received my final order of removal. However, I am still detained, and I have yet to receive travel documents or any updates from ICE to make it significantly likely that travel documents will be procured in the reasonably foreseeable future.

(b) Did you exhaust all available administrative remedies relating to Ground One?(c) If yes, did you present the issue to:	Yes 🗆	No □
☐ The Board of Immigration Appeals ☐ The Office of General Counsel ☐ The Parole Commission		
☐ Other:		
(d) If you did not exhaust all available administrative remedies relating to Ground On	ne, explain	why:
N/A		
N/A		

P

7. Are you challenging your conviction or sentence in any of the grounds raised above? Yes □ No 🗷 (Claims challenging a federal conviction or sentence may only be raised in a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255, unless the § 2255motion is legally inadequate in ineffective.)

Case 2:25-cv-02069-DWL--JFM Document 1 Filed 06/13/25 Page 5 of 12 Yes 🗆 No 🗷 (a) Have you filed a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255? If yes, answer the following: (1) Name of court: N/A (2) Case number: N/A (3) Opinion or case number: N/A (4) Result: N/A (5) Date of result: _____ N/A (6) Issues raised: N/A Attach, if available, a copy of any brief filed on your behalf and a copy of the decision. (b) Explain why the remedy under § 2255 is inadequate or ineffective: N/A 8. If this case concerns immigration removal proceedings, answer the following: (a) Date you were taken into immigration custody:

No 🗷

Yes

(b) Date of removal or reinstatement order: October 23, 2024

(1) Date you filed: N/A

(3) Result: N/A

(2) Case number: N/A

8

(c) Did you file an appeal with the Board of Immigration Appeals?

(4) Date of result:

	N/A	~		
		N/A		
	Attach, if available, a copy of a	ny brief filed on your behalf and a copy	of the decision.	
(d)	Did you file an appeal wi	th the federal court of appeals?	Yes □	No 🗷
	(1) Name of the court:	N/A		
	(2) Date you filed:	N/A		
	(3) Case number:	N/A		
	(4) Result:	N/A		
	(5) Date of result:	N/A		
	(6) Issues raised:	N/A		
nmed e no	titioner asks that the Court g diately grant me supervised t t available in habeas corpus	grant the following relief: To order the release or any other relief to which F cases.)	he Department of H etitioner may be en	omeland Security to titled. (Money damages
	Spanes H.			
gna	ture of Petitioner			
		OU	03/25	
igna	ture of attorney, if any	Date	•	

Certificate of Service

I Liubov Zakhlenaiaz		hereby certify that a copy of the attached was sent by U.S. mail	
the people listed	below, on the date indicate	ed below.	
Signature	Marnes .	Date 06 03 25	

Fred Figueroa Warden Eloy Detention Center 1705 E Hanna Rd. Eloy, AZ 85131

Field Office Director Immigration and Customs Enforcement 2035 N. Central Ave. Phoenix, AZ 85004

Secretary of Department of Homeland Security Nebraska Avenue Center, NW Washington DC 20528

William P. Barr Attorney General U.S. Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Ave., NW Washington, DC 20530

U.S. Attorney for the District of Arizona Two Renaissance Square 40 N. Central Ave. Suite 1200 Phoenix, AZ 85004-4408

EXHIBIT A



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW ELOY IMMIGRATION COURT

Respondent Name:

ZAKHLEBNAIA, LIUBOV

To:

ZAKHLEBNAIA, LIUBOV 1705 E HANNA ROAD ELOY, AZ 85131



Riders:

In Credible Fear Review Proceedings
Initiated by the Department of Homeland Security
Date:

10/23/2024

ORDER OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE

On 10/23/2024, a review of the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS's) negative credible fear determination was held in this matter. This Court considered testimony and any documentary evidence submitted regarding the Applicant's fear of persecution or torture.

Upon de novo consideration, the Court makes the findings below —

[Complete section 1, then complete section 2 only if applicable.]

(1) — Final Rule ("FR") limitation on asylum eligibility

A. The Applicant

☑ Is covered by the asylum limitation at 8 C.F.R. § 1208.35(a)(1), because the Applicant
entered the United States during the time and in the manner described in § 1208.13(g), and
there is not a significant possibility that the Applicant could establish that they are described
under section 3(b) of the Presidential Proclamation of June 3, 2024, as amended by the
Presidential Proclamation of September 27, 2024. See 8 C.F.R. §§ 1208.13(g), 1208.35(a)(1)
[If this box is checked, proceed to Part B.]

or

☐ Is not covered by the asylum limitation at 8 C.F.R. § 1208.35(a)(1), because there is a
significant possibility that the Applicant could establish that they are described under section
3(b) of the Presidential Proclamation of June 3, 2024, as amended by the Presidential
Proclamation of September 27, 2024. See 8 C.F.R. § 1208.35(b)(2)(ii). [If this box is
checked, proceed to Part C.]

or

☐ Is no	ot covered by the asylum limitation at 8 C.F.R. § 1208.35(a)(1), because there is a
significa	nt possibility that the Applicant could establish that they did not enter the United
States du	uring the time and in the manner described in § 1208.13(g). See 8 C.F.R. §§
	(g): 1208.35(b)(2)(i). [If this box is checked, proceed to Section 2.]

В.	If the Applicant is covered by the limitation on asylum eligibility at 8 C.F.R. § 1208.35(a)(1)
	☐ There is a significant possibility the Applicant could establish an exception based on exceptionally compelling circumstances. See 8 C.F.R. § 1208.35(a)(2)(i). [If this box is checked, proceed to Part C.]
	or
	☑ There is not a significant possibility that the Applicant could establish an exception based on exceptionally compelling circumstances. See 8 C.F.R. § 1208.35(a)(2)(i). [If this box is checked, proceed to Part D.]
C.	If the Applicant is not covered by the limitation on asylum eligibility at 8 C.F.R. § 1208.35(a)(1) because there is a significant possibility the Applicant could establish that they are described in section 3(b) of the Proclamation, see 8 C.F.R. § 1208.35(b)(2)(ii); or if there is a significant possibility they could establish an exception based on exceptionally compelling circumstances under 8 C.F.R. § 1208.35(a)(2)(i), the Applicant
	☐ Has established a significant possibility of eligibility for asylum under section 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), withholding of removal under section 241(b)(3) of the Act, or withholding of removal under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). [If this box is checked, vacate.]
	☐ Has not established a significant possibility of eligibility for asylum under section 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), withholding of removal under section 241(b)(3) of the Act, or withholding of removal under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). [If this box is checked, affirm.]
D.	If the Applicant is covered by the limitation on asylum eligibility at 8 C.F.R. § 1208.35(a) (1), and there is not a significant possibility that they could establish an exception based on exceptionally compelling circumstances, the Applicant
	☐ Has established a reasonable probability (substantially more than a reasonable possibility, but somewhat less than more likely than not) of persecution or torture. See 8 C.F.R. § 1208.35(b)(2)(iii). [If this box is checked, vacate.]
	☐ Has not established a reasonable probability (substantially more than a reasonable possibility, but somewhat less than more likely than not) of persecution or torture. See 8 C.F.R. § 1208.35(b)(2)(iii). [If this box is checked, affirm.]
(2) —]	Lawful pathways condition on asylum eligibility
1000 co. 500	The Applicant
4.85J	☑ Is covered by the presumption of asylum ineligibility at 8 C.F.R. § 1208.33(a)(1)-(2),
	or
	☐ Is not covered by the presumption of asylum ineligibility at 8 C.F.R. § 1208.33(a)(1)-(2).
В	If the Applicant is covered by the presumption of asylum ineligibility

There is a significant possibility the Applicant could establish that the presumption does not apply or that they meet an exception to or can rebut the presumption under 8 C.F.R. § 1208.33(a)(3),
or
There is not a significant possibility the Applicant could establish that the presumption does not apply or that they meet an exception to or can rebut the presumption under 8 C.F.R. § 1208.33(a)(3).
C. If the Applicant is not covered by the presumption or has rebutted the presumption, the Applicant
☐ Has established a significant possibility of eligibility for asylum under section 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), withholding of removal under section 241(b)(3) of the Act, or withholding of removal under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). [If this box is checked, vacate.]
☐ Has not established a significant possibility of eligibility for asylum under section 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), withholding of removal under section 241(b)(3) of the Act, or withholding of removal under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). [If this box is checked, affirm.]
D. If the Applicant is covered by the presumption and has not rebutted the presumption, the Applicant
Has established a reasonable possibility of persecution (meaning a reasonable possibility of being persecuted because of their race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership in a particular social group) or torture. [If this box is checked, vacate.]
Has not established a reasonable possibility of persecution (meaning a reasonable possibility of being persecuted because of their race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership in a particular social group) or torture. [If this box is checked, affirm.]
Based on the findings above, the Court issues the following order -
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT: ☐ The DHS credible fear determination is AFFIRMED, and the case is returned to DHS for remova of the Applicant. ☐ The DHS and the four determination is VACATED.
☐ The DHS credible fear determination is VACATED .
This is a final order. There is no appeal from this decision.

Wands

Immigration Judge: MABRY III, WILLIAM 10/23/2024

Certificate of Service

This document was served:

Via: [M] Mail | [P] Personal Service | [E] Electronic Service | [U] Address Unavailable

To: [] Noncitizen | [M] Noncitizen c/o custodial officer | [] Noncitizen's atty/rep. | [M] DHS

Respondent Name: ZAKHLEBNAIA, LIUBOV | A-Number:

Riders:

Date: 10/23/2024 By: Jess Ridgeway, Court Staff