

MARIO PORTUGAL, SBN 337525  
Global Law Group San Diego, P.C.  
1455 Frazee Road, Suite 500  
San Diego, CA 92108  
Tel: (858) 833-2020  
Fax: (619) 829-3152

**Detained**

Attorney for Desmond Thierry NGU ANOMA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of: ) File No.: '25CV2505 BAS BLM  
NGU ANOMA, Desmond Thierry ) A   
Petitioner, ) **Consolidated Petition for Writ of  
Habeas Corpus and Injunction**  
v. )  
Warden of the Otay Mesa )  
Detention Facility, Current or Acting Field )  
Office Director, San Diego Field Office, )  
United States Immigration and Customs )  
Enforcement; Current or Acting Director, )  
United States Immigration and Customs )  
Enforcement; Current or Acting Secretary, )  
United States Department of Homeland )  
Security; and Current or Acting United )  
States Attorney General, )  
Respondents. )

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS  
PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2241**

RESPONDENT'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS  
In the Matter of Desmond Thierry NGU ANOMA  
Page - 1

1 Petitioner respectfully petitions this Honorable Court for a writ of habeas corpus to  
2 release Petitioner from detention and an injunction to obtain medical records due to Petitioner's  
3 medical condition, as follows:  
4

5 **INTRODUCTION**

6 1. Petitioner was detained by Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") at the Otay  
7 Mesa Detention Center pending removal proceedings since December 2, 2024. Petitioner was  
8 to be removed from the country on or about August 20, 2025.

9 2. However, Petitioner was granted Withholding of Removal under INA 241(b)(3) on or  
10 about August 20, 2025, as was recognized that Petitioner's return to Cameroon would subject  
11 him to a clear probability of persecution.

12 3. Despite this protection, ICE continues to detain him under a final order of removal,  
13 creating unlawful and indefinite custody, in violation of the Immigration and Nationality Act  
14 (INA), the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), and the Due Process Clause of the Fifth  
15 Amendment.

16 4. Petitioner suffers from hypertension, which has been exacerbated by the ongoing  
17 threat of removal and the uncertainty of his detention. His condition places him at heightened  
18 medical risk.

19 5. Petitioner's cousin is a U.S. citizen and is willing and able to be financially  
20 responsible for him. Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court issue a writ of habeas  
21 corpus, to release Petitioner so he can seek medical treatment for his medical complications.

22 6. Petitioner requests that this Court issue a writ of habeas corpus and order Petitioner's  
23 release due to medical concerns within 30 days unless Respondents schedule a hearing before  
24 an IJ where: (1) to continue detention, the government must establish by clear and convincing  
25

1 evidence that Petitioner presents a risk of flight or danger, even after consideration of  
2 alternatives to detention that could mitigate any risk that Petitioner's release would present;  
3 and (2) if the government cannot meet its burden, the IJ shall order Petitioner's release on  
4 appropriate conditions of supervision, taking into account Petitioner's ability to pay a bond.  
5

6 7. Additionally, Petitioner requests an injunction to obtain copies of the relevant medical  
7 records from Otay Mesa Detention Center concerning his medical complications.

## JURISDICTION

8. Petitioner was detained in the custody of Respondents at Otay Mesa Detention Center from December 2, 2024, until his attempted removal on August 20, 2025.

12 9. This action arises under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the U.S.  
13 Constitution. Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 (federal question), 2241 (habeas  
14 corpus); U.S. Const. art. I, § 2; (Suspension Clause); and 5 U.S.C. § 702 (Administrative  
15 Procedure Act. The Court may grant relief under the habeas corpus statutes, 28 U.S.C. § 2241 *et*  
16 *seq.*, the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*, and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C.  
17 § 1651.  
18

## **VENUE**

20 10. Venue is proper in this District because this is the district in which Petitioner was  
21 confined. *See Doe v. Garland*, 109 F.4th 1188, 1197-99 (9th Cir. 2024).

## STATEMENT OF FACTS

24 11. Petitioner is a noncitizen who was detained at Otay Mesa Detention Center pending  
25 immigration removal proceedings. Petitioner remains detained at Otay Mesa Detention Center.

<sup>26</sup> 12 Petitioner was detained in DHS custody since December 2, 2024

1 13. Petitioner suffers from hypertension. His worsening condition had been exacerbated by  
2 the ongoing threat of removal and indefinite custody.

3 14. Petitioner is still in DHS custody and requests release due to his medical complications.  
4 His release is justified on medical grounds and Petitioner poses no danger or flight risk.

5 15. Absent intervention by this Court, Petitioner cannot and will not be released in order to  
6 seek medical attention, nor will he be able to obtain copies of the medical records from Otay  
7 Mesa Detention Center concerning his medical complications.

8  
9  
10 **LEGAL ARGUMENT**

11 16. Courts have recognized the significance of the habeas statute in protecting individuals  
12 from unlawful detention, which affords “a swift and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal  
13 restraint or confinement.” *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963); *see also Yong v. INS*, 208  
14 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2000) (noting that habeas statute requires expeditious determination  
15 of petitions).

16 17. The Court must grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus or issue an order to show  
17 cause to Respondents “forthwith,” unless Petitioner is not entitled to relief. 28 U.S.C. § 2243.

18 18. “It is well established that the Fifth Amendment entitles [noncitizens] to due process of  
19 law in deportation proceedings.” *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 523 (2003) (quoting *Reno v.*  
20 *Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 306 (1993)).

21 19. Due process requires “adequate procedural protections” to ensure that the government’s  
22 asserted justification for physical confinement “outweighs the individual’s constitutionally  
23 protected interest in avoiding physical restraint.” *Zadvydas, v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001)  
24 (internal quotation marks omitted).

1 20. In the immigration context, the Supreme Court has recognized two valid purposes for  
2 civil detention—to mitigate the risks of danger to the community and to prevent flight. *Id.*;  
3 *Demore*, 538 U.S. at 528.  
4

5 21. The test for procedural due process claims, the *Mathews* test balances: (1) the private  
6 interest threatened by governmental action; (2) the risk of erroneous deprivation of such interest  
7 and the value of additional or substitute safeguards; and (3) the government interest. *Mathews v.*  
8 *Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 335 (1976); *see also Sho v. Current or Acting Field Off. Dir.*, No.  
9 1:21CV-01812 TLN AC, 2023 WL 4014649, at \*3 (E.D. Cal. June 15, 2023), *report and*  
10 *recommendation adopted*, No. 1:21-CV-1812-TLN-AC, 2023 WL 4109421 (E.D. Cal. June 21,  
11 2023) (using *Mathews* factors to assess a habeas petitioner's due process claims and collecting  
12 cases doing the same). Here, each factor weighs in Petitioner's favor, and Petitioner's release is  
13 justified due to his medical complications. Petitioner poses no danger to the community nor is a  
14 flight risk.  
15

16 22. Additionally, the Petitioner's injunction should be granted to have Otay Mesa Detention  
17 Center produce the medical records concerning his medical complications. To be granted a  
18 preliminary injunction, one must establish "that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is  
19 likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities  
20 tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest." *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def.*  
21 *Council*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008).  
22

23 23. Here, each factor tips in Petitioner's favor. Petitioner is likely to succeed on the merits  
24 of his claim to obtain copies of his protected health information ("PHI") from Otay Mesa  
25 Detention Center. Seeing as Petitioner and his attorneys of record are requesting a release of his  
26 PHI in writing from Otay Mesa Detention Center, Petitioner can show his likelihood of  
27

1 obtaining said records by providing written authorization from Petitioner himself and his legal  
2 representatives. Second, Petitioner will suffer irreparable harm if copies of his medical records  
3 are not released by Otay Mesa Detention Center. The harm he will suffer due to his worsening  
4 hypertension and medical complications he is facing cannot be compensated by monetary  
5 damages. The physical, emotional, and mental harm Petitioner will suffer without knowing the  
6 exact nature of his medical complications is sufficiently serious. The physical harm to Petitioner  
7 himself is potentially permanent and sufficiently serious to demonstrate irreparable harm if  
8 Petitioner does not obtain copies of his medical records. Finally, the balance of equities clearly  
9 tips in Petitioner's favor and an injunction is in the public interest. Petitioner's interest in his  
10 own health and well-being clearly outweighs the government's and Otay Mesa Detention  
11 Center's interest in holding his medical records. An order for his medical records to be released  
12 so Petitioner can obtain copies prevents further physical, emotional, and mental harm to  
13 Petitioner and his family, and furthers public health.

14  
15 24. Thus, Petitioner should be granted a preliminary injunction to obtain copies of his  
16 relevant medical records from Otay Mesa Detention Center.

17  
18 Respectfully Submitted,

19  
20 /S/ Mario Portugal  
21 Mario Portugal, Esq.  
22 Attorney for the Petitioner