

ANDRES ORTIZ LAW

ANDRES ORTIZ (CSBN 279239)

4201 LONG BEACH BLVD., STE 326

LONG BEACH, CA 90807

PH. 657-243-3768

ANDRES.ORTIZ@ANDRESORTIZLAW.COM

Attorneys for Omid Delkash

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

Omid Delkash,

Petitioner,

v.

Kristi Noem, Secretary of the Department
of Homeland Security; et. al,

Respondents.

Case No.: 2:25-cv-04638

**NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL
AUTHORITIES**

Filed pursuant to FRCP 28(j)

NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES

Undersigned counsel files this notice of supplemental authorities. Since the Petitioner filed his motion for preliminary injunction, three California district court cases have been issued that provide guidance to this court. Specifically, these opinions discuss whether ICE had the constitutional or regulatory authority to detain a noncitizen without notice or an opportunity to challenge the detention. The cases are as follows:

Notice of Supplemental Authorities

Quoc Chi Hoac, Petitioner, v. Moises Becerra, et al., Respondents., discussed the government's authority to detain a noncitizen without following the regulations governing revoking an order of supervision (OSUP). No. 2:25-CV-01740-DC-JDP, 2025 WL 1993771, at *4 (E.D. Cal. July 16, 2025). Specifically, the court held the noncitizen was likely to win on the merits of his petition because the government failed to follow its own procedures when revoking the OSUP. Like cited in the Petitioner's brief, the relief of this unlawful action is release from custody. *See* Dckt. 8 (*citing Ceesay v. Kurzdorfer*, -- F.Supp.3d--, No. 25-CV-267-LJV, 2025 WL 1284720 (W.D.N.Y. May 2, 2025)).

Phong Phan, Petitioner, v. Moises Beccerra, Respondent., provides a nearly identical analysis as *Quoc Chi Hoac*. No. 2:25-CV-01757-DC-JDP, 2025 WL 1993735, at *6 (E.D. Cal. July 16, 2025). However, it also discusses the concept of granting the TRO, in this case the preliminary injunction to maintain the status quo during the litigation. While the court stated the temporary release was akin to granting a permanent injunction. *See* Dckt. 6. The Petitioner believes that the scope of the release under a preliminary injunction would be temporary and subject to the conditions set by this Court, as discussed in *Phan*.

Finally, *Guillermo M. R. v. Kaiser*, establishes that relief is warranted under the *Matthews v. Eldridge* test. No. 25-CV-05436-RFL, 2025 WL 1983677, at *4-10 (N.D. Cal. July 17, 2025).

///

///

///

///

///

Notice of Supplemental Authorities

DATED: July 23, 2025
Long Beach, California

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Andres Ortiz
Andres Ortiz, Esq.
Andres Ortiz Law
Attorney for the Petitioner

Notice of Supplemental Authorities

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to FRCP 28(j), the Petitioner provides authorities that were published after his filed his motion for preliminary injunction. He certifies that the total word count is 294 words.

DATED: July 23, 2025
Long Beach, California

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Andres Ortiz
Andres Ortiz, Esq.
Andres Ortiz Law
Attorney for the Petitioner

Notice of Supplemental Authorities

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing *Notice of Supplemental Authorities* in *Omid Delkash v. Noem et. al*, with the Clerk of the Court for the Central District of California by using the appellate CM/ECF July 15, 2025, for filing and transmittal of Notice of Electronic Filing

/s/ Andres Ortiz
Andres Ortiz, Esq.
Attorney for Petitioner

Notice of Supplemental Authorities