

1 Talia Housman (SBN 360341)
thousman@sfbar.org
2 The Justice and Diversity Center
50 Fremont St. Ste. 1700
3 San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 539-9792
4

5 *Attorney for Petitioners*

6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
8 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

9 HENRY EDUARDO BASTIDAS MENDOZA,
GUSTAVO GIRALDO MUNOZ, FAYE
10 WAGANE,

Petitioners,

11 v.
12

13 SERGIO ALBARRAN, Field Office Director of
the San Francisco Immigration and Customs
Enforcement Office; TODD LYONS, Acting
14 Director of United States Immigration and
Customs Enforcement; KRISTI NOEM,
15 Secretary of the United States Department of
Homeland Security, PAMELA BONDI,
16 Attorney General of the United States, acting in
their official capacities,
17

18 Respondents.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CASE NO. _____

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS**

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
CASE NO. _____

INTRODUCTION

1
2 1. Petitioners are three individuals who were arrested by Department of Homeland
3 Security (DHS) agents today, September 26, 2025, at their immigration court hearings in San
4 Francisco. Petitioners went to immigration court for what should have been routine preliminary
5 immigration hearings before an immigration judge. During their hearings, however, the
6 government orally moved to dismiss their cases. The government did so for the purpose of placing
7 them in so-called “expedited removal” proceedings. Minutes after Petitioners exited the
8 courtroom, DHS agents arrested them before they could leave the courthouse.

9 2. These arrests are part of a new, nationwide DHS strategy of sweeping up people
10 who attend their immigration court hearings, detaining them, and seeking to re-route them to fast-
11 track deportations. Since mid-May, DHS has implemented a coordinated practice of leveraging
12 immigration detention to strip people like Petitioners of their substantive and procedural rights and
13 pressure them into deportation. Immigration detention is civil and thus is permissible for only two
14 reasons: to ensure a noncitizen’s appearance at immigration hearings and to prevent danger to the
15 community. But DHS did not arrest and detain Petitioners—who demonstrably pose no risk of
16 absconding from immigration proceedings or danger to the community—for either of these
17 reasons. Instead, as part of its broader enforcement campaign, DHS detained Petitioners to strip
18 them of their procedural rights, force them to forfeit their applications for relief, and pressure them
19 into fast-track removal.

20 3. In immigration court, noncitizens have the right to pursue claims for relief from
21 removal (including asylum), be represented by counsel, gather and present evidence, and pursue
22 appeals. 8 U.S.C. § 1229(a). By dismissing an ongoing case, DHS—in its view—can transfer a
23 noncitizen’s case from removal proceedings in immigration court, governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1229a,
24 to cursory proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) called “expedited removal,” where the
25 procedural protections and opportunities to pursue relief from removal built into regular
26 immigration-court proceedings do not apply.

27 4. The Constitution protects Petitioners—and every other person present in this
28 country—from arbitrary deprivations of his liberty and guarantees him due process of law. The

1 government's power over immigration is broad, but as the Supreme Court has declared, it "is
 2 subject to important constitutional limitations." *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 695 (2001).
 3 "Freedom from bodily restraint has always been at the core of the liberty protected by the Due
 4 Process Clause from arbitrary governmental action." *Foucha v. Louisiana*, 504 U.S. 71, 80 (1992).

5 5. Petitioners respectfully seek a writ of habeas corpus ordering the government to
 6 immediately release them from their ongoing, unlawful detention, and prohibiting their re-arrest
 7 without a hearing to contest that re-arrest before a neutral decisionmaker. In addition, to preserve
 8 this Court's jurisdiction, Petitioners also request that this Court order the government not to
 9 transfer them outside of the District or deport them for the duration of this proceeding.

10 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

11 6. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal
 12 question), 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act), 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201–02 (Declaratory Judgment Act),
 13 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus), Article I, § 9, cl. 2 of the U.S. Constitution (the Suspension
 14 Clause), the Fourth and Fifth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, and 5 U.S.C. §§ 701-706
 15 (Administrative Procedure Act).

16 7. Venue is proper in this district and division pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241(a) and 28
 17 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) and (e)(1) because Petitioners are physically detained within this district.

18 8. Petitioners are properly joined in this action because they jointly assert a right to
 19 release or a bond hearing and raise at least one question of law or fact common to all plaintiffs,
 20 namely their detention violates the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

21 PARTIES

22 9. Petitioner Henry Eduardo Bastidas Mendoza is a man from Venezuela. He has a
 23 pending application for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention
 24 Against Torture. He is presently in civil immigration detention at 630 Sansome Street in San
 25 Francisco.

26 10. Petitioner Gustavo Giraldo Munoz is a man from Colombia. He has a pending
 27 application for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against
 28

1 Torture. He is presently in civil immigration detention at 630 Sansome Street in San Francisco.

2 11. Petitioner Faye Wagane is a man from Senegal. He has a pending application for
3 asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture. He is
4 presently in civil immigration detention at 630 Sansome Street in San Francisco.

5 12. Respondent Sergio Albarran is the Field Office Director of the San Francisco
6 Immigration and Customs Enforcement Office. He is responsible for the administration of
7 immigration laws and the execution of immigration enforcement and detention policy within ICE's
8 San Francisco Area of Responsibility, including the detention of Petitioner. He maintains an office
9 and regularly conducts business in this district. He is sued in his official capacity.

10 13. Respondent Todd M. Lyons is the Acting Director of ICE. As the Senior Official
11 Performing the Duties of the Director of ICE, he is responsible for the administration and
12 enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States; routinely transacts business in this
13 District; and is legally responsible for pursuing any effort to detain and remove the Petitioner.
14 Respondent Lyons is sued in his official capacity.

15 14. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of Homeland Security and has ultimate
16 authority over DHS. In that capacity and through her agents, Respondent Noem has broad authority
17 over and responsibility for the operation and enforcement of the immigration laws; routinely
18 transacts business in this District; and is legally responsible for pursuing any effort to detain and
19 remove the Petitioner. Respondent Noem is sued in her official capacity.

20 15. Respondent Pamela Bondi is the Attorney General of the United States and the most
21 senior official at the Department of Justice. In that capacity and through her agents, she is
22 responsible for overseeing the implementation and enforcement of the federal immigration laws.
23 The Attorney General delegates this responsibility to the Executive Office for Immigration
24 Review, which administers the immigration courts and the BIA. Respondent Bondi is sued in her
25 official capacity.

26 **EXHAUSTION**

27 16. There is no requirement to exhaust because no other forum exists in which
28 Petitioners can raise the claims herein. There is no statutory exhaustion requirement prior to

1 challenging the constitutionality of an arrest or detention, or challenging a policy under the
 2 Administrative Procedure Act. Prudential exhaustion is not required here because it would be
 3 futile, and Petitioners will “suffer irreparable harm if unable to secure immediate judicial
 4 consideration of [their] claim.” *McCarthy v. Madigan*, 503 U.S. 140, 147 (1992). Any further
 5 exhaustion requirements would be unreasonable.

6 7 8 LEGAL BACKGROUND

9 ***A. The Constitution Protects Noncitizens Like Petitioners from Arbitrary Arrest and Detention.***

10 17. The Constitution establishes due process rights for “all ‘persons’ within the United
 11 States, including [noncitizens], whether their presence here is lawful, unlawful, temporary, or
 12 permanent.” *Hernandez v. Sessions*, 872 F.3d 976, 990 (9th Cir. 2017) (quoting *Zadvydas*, 533
 13 U.S. at 693). These due process rights are both substantive and procedural.

14 18. *First*, “[t]he touchstone of due process is protection of the individual against
 15 arbitrary action of government,” *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539, 558 (1974), including “the
 16 exercise of power without any reasonable justification in the service of a legitimate government
 17 objective,” *Cnty. of Sacramento v. Lewis*, 523 U.S. 833, 846 (1998).

18 19. These protections extend to noncitizens facing detention, as “[i]n our society
 19 liberty is the norm, and detention prior to trial or without trial is the carefully limited exception.”
 20 *United States v. Salerno*, 481 U.S. 739, 755 (1987). Accordingly, “[f]reedom from
 21 imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies
 22 at the heart of the liberty that [the Due Process] Clause protects.” *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690.

23 20. Substantive due process thus requires that all forms of civil detention—including
 24 immigration detention—bear a “reasonable relation” to a non-punitive purpose. *See Jackson v.*
 25 *Indiana*, 406 U.S. 715, 738 (1972). The Supreme Court has recognized only two permissible
 26 non-punitive purposes for immigration detention: ensuring a noncitizen’s appearance at
 27 immigration proceedings and preventing danger to the community. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690–
 28

92; *see also Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510 at 519–20, 527–28, 31 (2003).

21. *Second*, the procedural component of the Due Process Clause prohibits the government from imposing even permissible physical restraints without adequate procedural safeguards.

22. Generally, “the Constitution requires some kind of a hearing *before* the State deprives a person of liberty or property.” *Zinerman v. Burch*, 494 U.S. 113, 127 (1990). This is so even in cases where that freedom is lawfully revocable. *See Hurd v. D.C., Gov’t*, 864 F.3d at 683 (citing *Young v. Harper*, 520 U.S. 143, 152 (1997) (re-detention after pre-parole conditional supervision requires pre-deprivation hearing)); *Gagnon v. Scarpelli*, 411 U.S. 778, 782 (1973) (same, in probation context); *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471 (1972) (same, in parole context).

23. After an initial release from custody on conditions, even a person paroled following a conviction for a criminal offense for which they may lawfully have remained incarcerated has a protected liberty interest in that conditional release. *Morrissey* at 408 U.S. at 482. As the Supreme Court recognized, “[t]he parolee has relied on at least an implicit promise that parole will be revoked only if he fails to live up to the parole conditions.” *Id.* “By whatever name, the liberty is valuable and must be seen within the protection of the [Constitution].” *Id.*

24. This reasoning applies with equal if not greater force to people released from civil immigration detention at the border, like Petitioners. After all, noncitizens living in the United States like Petitioners have a protected liberty interest in their ongoing freedom from confinement. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690. And, “[g]iven the civil context [of immigration detention], [the] liberty interest [of noncitizens released from custody] is arguably greater than the interest of parolees.” *Ortega v. Bonnar*, 415 F. Supp. 3d 963, 970 (N.D. Cal. 2019).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. DHS Dramatically Expands the Scope of Expedited Removal.

25. For decades, DHS applied expedited removal exclusively in the border enforcement context, with only narrow exceptions to that general rule. From 1997 until 2002, expedited removal applied only to inadmissible noncitizens arriving at ports of entry. *See* Inspection and Expedited

1 Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum
2 Procedures; Final Rule, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312 (Mar. 6, 1997).

3 26. In 2002, the government for the first time invoked its authority to apply expedited
4 removal to persons already inside the country, but only for a narrow group of people who arrived
5 by sea, were not admitted or paroled, and were apprehended within two years of entry. *See* Notice
6 Designating Aliens Subject to Expedited Removal Under Section 235(b)(1)(A)(iii) of the
7 Immigration and Nationality Act, 67 Fed. Reg. 68924 (Nov. 13, 2002).

8 27. In 2004, the government authorized the application of expedited removal to
9 individuals who entered by means other than sea, but only if they were apprehended within 100
10 miles of a land border and were unable to demonstrate that they had been continuously physically
11 present in the United States for 14 days. *See* Designating Aliens for Expedited Removal, 69 Fed.
12 Reg. 48877 (Aug. 11, 2004).

13 28. In 2019, at the direction of President Trump, DHS published a Federal Register
14 Notice authorizing the application of expedited removal to certain noncitizens arrested anywhere
15 in the country who could not affirmatively show that they had been continuously present for two
16 years. *See* Designating Aliens for Expedited Removal, 84 Fed. Reg. 35409 (July 23, 2019). The
17 District Court for the District of Columbia entered a preliminary injunction preventing the rule
18 from taking effect, which the D.C. Circuit later vacated. *Make the Rd. New York v. McAleenan*,
19 405 F. Supp. 3d 1, 11 (D.D.C. 2019), *vacated sub nom. Make the Rd. New York v. Wolf*, 962 F.3d
20 612, 618 (D.C. Cir. 2020).

21 29. In 2021, President Biden directed the DHS Secretary to review the rule expanding
22 expedited removal and consider whether it comported with legal and constitutional requirements,
23 including due process. In 2022, DHS rescinded the rule. *See* Rescission of the Notice of July 23,
24 2019, Designating Aliens for Expedited Removal, 87 Fed. Reg. 16022 (Mar. 21, 2022).

25 30. While the 2019 expansion was in effect, the government applied expedited removal
26 to persons inside the country in an exceedingly small number of cases. Thus, from 1997 to 2025,
27 with limited exceptions, immigration authorities generally did not apply expedited removal to
28 noncitizens apprehended far from the border, or individuals anywhere in the United States

(including near the border) who had been residing in the country for more than fourteen days.

31. This state of affairs changed drastically on January 20, 2025, the day that President Trump took office for his second term. That day, President Trump signed Executive Order 14159, “Protecting the American People Against Invasion,” the purpose of which was “to faithfully execute the immigration laws against all inadmissible and removable aliens, particularly those aliens who threaten the safety or security of the American people.” Exec. Order No. 14,159, 90 C.F.R. § 8443 (Jan. 20, 2025). The order directed the Secretary of Homeland Security to take various actions “to ensure the efficient and expedited removal of aliens from the United States.” *Id.*

32. To implement this Executive Order, DHS issued a notice immediately authorizing application of expedited removal to certain noncitizens arrested anywhere in the country who cannot show “to the satisfaction of an immigration officer” that they have been continuously present in the United States for at least two years. 90 Fed. Reg. 8139 (published Jan. 24, 2025).

33. On January 23, 2025, the Acting Secretary of Homeland Security issued a memorandum “provid[ing] guidance regarding how to exercise enforcement discretion in implementing” the new expedited-removal rule. The guidance directed federal immigration officers to “consider . . . whether to apply expedited removal” to “any alien DHS is aware of who is amenable to expedited removal but to whom expedited removal has not been applied.” As part of that process, the guidance encourages officers to “take steps to terminate any ongoing removal proceeding and/or any active parole status.”¹

34. Under the administration’s expanded approach to expedited removal, hundreds of thousands of noncitizens who have lived in the country for years are at imminent risk of summary removal without any hearing, meaningful process, access to counsel, or judicial review—regardless of the strength of their ties to the United States.

B. To Place More People in Expedited Removal, DHS Undertakes New Campaign of Courthouse Arrests and Detention.

¹ Benjamine C. Huffman, *Guidance Regarding How to Exercise Enforcement Discretion*, Dep’t of Homeland Sec. (Jan. 23, 2025), https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/2025-01/25_0123_er-and-parole-guidance.pdf.

1 35. Since mid-May 2025, DHS has initiated an aggressive new enforcement campaign
2 targeting people who are in regular removal proceedings in immigration court, many of whom
3 have pending applications for asylum or other relief. This “coordinated operation” is “aimed at
4 dramatically accelerating deportations” by arresting people at the courthouse and placing them
5 into expedited removal.²

6 36. The first step of this enforcement operation typically takes place inside the
7 immigration court. When people arrive in court for their master calendar hearings, DHS attorneys
8 orally file a motion to dismiss the proceedings—without any notice to the affected individual.
9 Although DHS regulations do not permit such motions to dismiss absent a showing that the
10 “[c]ircumstances of the case have changed,” 8 C.F.R. § 239.2(a)(7), (c), DHS attorneys do not
11 conduct any case-specific analysis of changed circumstances before filing these motions to
12 dismiss.

13 37. Even though individuals are supposed to have ten days to respond to a motion to
14 dismiss, some IJs have granted the government’s oral motion on the spot and immediately
15 dismissed the case. This is consistent with recent instructions from the Department of Justice to
16 immigration judges stating that they may allow the government to move to dismiss cases orally,
17 in court, without a written motion, and to decide that motion without allowing the noncitizen an
18 opportunity to file a response.

19 38. Despite these instructions, some IJs have still asked DHS to re-file the motion as a
20 written motion and continued proceedings to allow individuals to file their response. A smaller
21 group of IJs have expressly denied the motion to dismiss on the record or in a written order.

22 39. The next step of DHS’s new campaign takes place outside the courtroom. ICE
23 officers, in consultation with DHS attorneys and officials, station themselves in courthouse waiting
24 rooms, hallways, and elevator banks. When an individual exits their immigration hearings, ICE

25 _____
26 ² Arelis R. Hernández & Maria Sacchetti, *Immigrant Arrests at Courthouses Signal New Tactic*
27 *in Trump’s Deportation Push*, Wash. Post, May 23, 2025,
28 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/immigration/2025/05/23/immigration-court-arrests-ice-trump/>;
see also Hamed Aleaziz, Luis Ferré-Sadurní, & Miriam Jordan, *How ICE is Seeking to Ramp Up*
Deportations Through Courthouse Arrests, N.Y. Times, May 30, 2025,
<https://www.nytimes.com/2025/05/30/us/politics/ice-courthouse-arrests.html>.

officers—typically masked and in plainclothes—immediately arrest the person and detain them. ICE officers execute these arrests regardless of how the IJ rules on the government’s motion to dismiss. On information and belief, they typically do not have an arrest warrant.

40. Once the person has been transferred to a detention facility, the government places the individual in expedited removal. In cases in which the IJ did not dismiss the person’s removal proceedings, DHS attorneys unilaterally transfer venue of the case to a “detained” immigration court, where they renew their motions to dismiss—again with the goal of putting the person in expedited removal.

41. DHS is aggressively pursuing this arrest and detention campaign at courthouses throughout the country. In New York City, for example, “ICE agents have apprehended so many people showing up for routine appointments this month that the facilities” are “overcrowded,” with “[h]undreds of migrants . . . sle[eping] on the floor or sitting upright, sometimes for days.”³

42. The same is true at the San Francisco Immigration Court, where Petitioners were arrested. Over the last month, dozens of people have been arrested and detained after attending their routine immigration hearings.⁴

43. DHS’s aggressive tactics at immigration courts appear to be motivated by the Administration’s imposition of a new daily quota of 3,000 ICE arrests.⁵ In part as a result of this campaign, ICE’s arrests of noncitizens with no criminal record have increased more than 800%

³ Luis Ferré-Sadurní, *Inside a Courthouse, Chaos and Tears as Trump Accelerates Deportations*, N.Y. Times, June 12, 2025, <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/06/12/nyregion/immigration-courthouse-arrests-trump-deportation.html>.

⁴ Sarah Ravani, *ICE Arrests Two More at S.F. Immigration Court, Advocates Say*, S.F. Chron., June 12, 2025, <https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/sf-immigration-court-arrests-20374755.php>; Margaret Kadifa & Gustavo Hernandez, *Immigrants fearful as ICE Nabs at least 15 in S.F., Including Toddler*, Mission Local, June 5, 2025, <https://missionlocal.org/2025/06/ice-arrest-san-francisco-toddler/>; Tomoki Chien, *Undercover ICE Agents Begin Making Arrests at SF Immigration Court*, S.F. Standard, May 27, 2025, <https://sfstandard.com/2025/05/27/undercover-ice-agents-make-arrests-san-francisco-court/>.

⁵ Ted Hesson & Kristina Cooke, *ICE’s Tactics Draw Criticism as it Triples Daily Arrest Targets*, Reuters, June 10, 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/world/us/ices-tactics-draw-criticism-it-triples-daily-arrest-targets-2025-06-10/>; Alayna Alvarez & Brittany Gibson, *ICE Ramps Up Immigration Arrests in Courthouses Across the U.S.*, Axios, June 12, 2025, <https://www.axios.com/2025/06/12/ice-courthouse-arrests-trump>.

1 since before January.⁶

2 44. The new courthouse arrest and detention campaign is a sharp break from DHS's
3 previous practices, when immigration officers avoided arrests at courthouses given the concern
4 that such enforcement actions would deter people from appearing for their proceedings and
5 complying with court orders.⁷

6 45. In fact, DHS officials previously permitted ICE officers to conduct "civil
7 immigration enforcement action . . . in or near a courthouse" only in highly limited
8 circumstances, such as when "it involves a national security threat," or "there is an imminent risk
9 of death, violence, or physical harm." These limitations were necessary, DHS explained, because
10 "[e]xecuting civil immigration enforcement actions in or near a courthouse may chill individuals'
11 access to courthouses, and, as a result, impair the fair administration of justice."⁸ The new policy
12 includes no such limiting language.⁹

13 46. The government's new campaign is also a significant shift from previous DHS
14 practice of re-detaining noncitizens only after a material change in circumstances. *See Saravia v.*
15 *Sessions*, 280 F. Supp. 3d 1168, 1197 (N.D. Cal. 2017), *aff'd sub nom. Saravia for A.H. v.*
16 *Sessions*, 905 F.3d 1137 (9th Cir. 2018) (describing prior practice).

17 ***C. Petitioners are Unlawfully Arrested and Detained Pursuant to DHS's New Policy.***

18 **Mr. Bastidas Mendoza**

19 47. Mr. Bastidas Mendoza fled Venezuela and arrived in the United States in March
20

21 ⁶ José Olivares & Will Craft, *ICE Arrests of Migrants with No Criminal History Surging under*
22 *Trump*, The Guardian, June 14, 2025, [https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/jun/14/ice-](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/jun/14/ice-arrests-migrants-trump-figures)
[arrests-migrants-trump-figures](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/jun/14/ice-arrests-migrants-trump-figures).

23 ⁷ Hamed Aleaziz, Luis Ferré-Sadurní, & Miriam Jordan, *How ICE Is Seeking to Ramp Up*
24 *Deportations Through Courthouse Arrests*, N.Y. Times, May 30, 2025,
<https://www.nytimes.com/2025/05/30/us/politics/ice-courthouse-arrests.html>.

25 ⁸ A true and correct copy of DHS' April 27, 2021 *Civil Immigration Enforcement Actions in or*
Near Courthouses memorandum from Tae Johnson and Troy Miller is attached hereto as Exhibit
1.

26 ⁹ A true and correct copy of ICE's January 21, 2025 *Interim Guidance: Civil Immigration*
27 *Enforcement Actions in or near Courthouses* memorandum from Caleb Vitello is attached hereto
28 as Exhibit 2. A true and correct copy of ICE's May 27, 2025 *Civil Immigration Enforcement*
Actions In or Near Courthouses memorandum from Todd M. Lyons is attached hereto as Exhibit
3.

1 2024. He was apprehended by immigration officials at the border. They determined he posed
2 little if any flight risk or danger to the community and released him into the community under 8
3 USC § 1226a to wait for her immigration court date. He thereafter moved to California. In June
4 2024, he applied for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention
5 Against Torture. He has complied with all of his ICE and immigration court obligations and has
6 no criminal history anywhere in the world.

7 48. On September 26, 2025, Mr. Bastidas Mendoza appeared in-person at San
8 Francisco Immigration Court for a master calendar hearing before Immigration Judge Joseph
9 Park. The government made an oral motion to dismiss his case. The Immigration Judge did not
10 rule on the motion. Instead, he gave Mr. Bastidas Mendoza time to respond and reset his hearing
11 to March 15, 2028, for a final hearing on the merits of his asylum application.

12 **Mr. Giraldo Munoz**

13 49. Mr. Giraldo Munoz fled Colombia and arrived in the United States in July 2023.
14 He was apprehended by immigration officials at the border. They determined he posed little if
15 any flight risk or danger to the community and released him into the community under 8 USC §
16 1226a to wait for his immigration court date. He thereafter moved to California. In July 2024, he
17 applied for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against
18 Torture. He has complied with all of his ICE and immigration court obligations and has no
19 criminal history anywhere in the world.

20 50. On September 26, 2025, Mr. Giraldo Munoz appeared in-person at San Francisco
21 Immigration Court for a master calendar hearing before Immigration Judge Joseph Park. The
22 government made an oral motion to dismiss his case. The Immigration Judge did not rule on the
23 motion. Instead, he gave Mr. Giraldo Munoz time to respond and reset his hearing to March 14,
24 2028, for a final hearing on the merits of his case.

25 **Mr. Wagane**

26 51. Mr. Wagane fled Senegal and arrived in the United States in August 2023. He was
27 apprehended by immigration officials at the border. They determined he posed little if any flight
28 risk or danger to the community and released him into the community under 8 USC § 1226a to

1 wait for his immigration court date. He thereafter moved to California. In October 2024, he
 2 applied for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against
 3 Torture. He has complied with all of his ICE and immigration court obligations and has no
 4 criminal history anywhere in the world.

5 52. On September 26, 2025, Mr. Wagane appeared in-person at San Francisco
 6 Immigration Court for a master calendar hearing before Immigration Judge Joseph Park. The
 7 government made an oral motion to dismiss his case. The Immigration Judge did not rule on the
 8 motion. Instead, he gave Mr. Wagane time to respond and reset his hearing to May 21, 2026, for
 9 a final hearing on the merits of his case.

10 53. Because Petitioners have never been determined to be a flight risk or danger to
 11 the community, their ongoing detention is not related to either of the permissible justifications
 12 for civil immigration litigation. Their detention does not further any legitimate government
 13 interest.

14
 15 ***D. As a Result of Their Arrest and Detention, Petitioners are Suffering Ongoing and
 Irreparable Harm.***

16 54. Petitioners are being deprived of their liberty without any permissible justification.
 17 The government previously released them on their own recognizance because they did not pose
 18 sufficient risk of flight or danger to the community to warrant detention.

19 55. None of that has changed. Upon information and belief, Petitioners have no
 20 criminal record, and there is no basis to believe that they pose any public-safety risk. Nor are
 21 Petitioners, who were arrested *while appearing in court for their immigration cases*, conceivably
 22 a flight risk. To the contrary, Petitioners complied with their ICE and immigration court
 23 obligations.

24 ///

25 **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

26 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

27 **Violation of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution**

(Substantive Due Process—Detention)

56. Petitioners repeat and re-allege the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.

57. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment protects all “person[s]” from deprivation of liberty “without due process of law.” U.S. Const. amend. V. “Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that [the Due Process] Clause protects.” *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690.

58. Immigration detention is constitutionally permissible only when it furthers the government’s legitimate goals of ensuring the noncitizen’s appearance during removal proceedings and preventing danger to the community. *See id.*

59. Petitioners are not flight risks or dangers to the community. Respondents’ detention of Petitioners is therefore unjustified and unlawful. Accordingly, Petitioners are being detained in violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

60. Moreover, Petitioners’ detention is punitive as it bears no “reasonable relation” to any legitimate government purpose. *Id.* (finding immigration detention is civil and thus ostensibly “nonpunitive in purpose and effect”). Here, the purpose of Petitioners’ detention appears to be “not to facilitate deportation, or to protect against risk of flight or dangerousness, but to incarcerate for other reasons”—namely, to meet newly-imposed DHS quotas and transfer immigration court venue away from an IJ who refused to facilitate DHS’s new expedited removal scheme. *Demore*, 538 U.S. at 532–33 (Kennedy, J., concurring).

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violation of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution

(Procedural Due Process—Detention)

61. Petitioners repeat and re-allege the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.

62. As part of the liberty protected by the Due Process Clause, Petitioners have a weighty liberty interest in avoiding re-incarceration after their release. *See Young v. Harper*, 520 U.S. 143, 146–47 (1997); *Gagnon v. Scarpelli*, 411 U.S. 778, 781–82 (1973); *Morrissey v. Brewer*,

1 408 U.S. 471, 482–83 (1972); *see also Ortega*, 415 F. Supp. 3d at 969–70 (holding that a
2 noncitizen has a protected liberty interest in remaining out of custody following an IJ’s bond
3 determination).

4 63. Accordingly, “[i]n the context of immigration detention, it is well-settled that due
5 process requires adequate procedural protections to ensure that the government’s asserted
6 justification for physical confinement outweighs the individual’s constitutionally protected
7 interest in avoiding physical restraint.” *Hernandez*, 872 F.3d at 990 (cleaned up); *Zinerman*, 494
8 U.S. at 127 (Generally, “the Constitution requires some kind of a hearing *before* the State
9 deprives a person of liberty or property.”). In the immigration context, for such hearings to
10 comply with due process, the government must bear the burden to demonstrate, by clear and
11 convincing evidence, that the noncitizen poses a flight risk or danger to the community. *See Singh*
12 *v. Holder*, 638 F.3d 1196, 1203 (9th Cir. 2011); *see also Martinez v. Clark*, 124 F.4th 775, 785,
13 786 (9th Cir. 2024).

14 64. Petitioners’ re-detention without a pre-deprivation hearing violated due process.
15 Long after deciding to release Petitioners from custody on their own recognizance, Respondents
16 re-detained Petitioners with no notice, no explanation of the justification of their re-detention,
17 and no opportunity to contest their re-detention before a neutral adjudicator before being taken
18 into custody.

19 65. Petitioners have a profound personal interest in their liberty. Because they
20 received no procedural protections, the risk of erroneous deprivation is high. And the government
21 has no legitimate interest in detaining Petitioners without a hearing; bond hearings are conducted
22 as a matter of course in immigration proceedings, and nothing in Petitioners’ records suggested
23 that they would abscond or endanger the community before a bond hearing could be carried out.
24 *See, e.g., Jorge M.F. v. Wilkinson*, 2021 WL 783561, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 1, 2021); *Vargas v.*
25 *Jennings*, 2020 WL 5074312, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 2020) (“the government’s concern that
26 delay in scheduling a hearing could exacerbate flight risk or danger is unsubstantiated in light of
27 petitioner’s strong family ties and his continued employment during the pandemic as an essential
28 agricultural worker”).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Petitioners respectfully request that this Court:

1. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
2. Issue a writ of habeas corpus ordering Respondents to immediately release Petitioners from custody;
3. Declare that Petitioners' arrest and detention violate the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.
4. Enjoin Respondents from transferring Petitioners outside this District or deporting Petitioners pending these proceedings;
5. Enjoin Respondents from re-detaining Petitioners unless their re-detention is ordered at a custody hearing before a neutral arbiter in which the government bears the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, that Petitioners are a flight risk or danger to the community;
6. Award Petitioners their costs and reasonable attorneys' fees in this action as provided for by the Equal Access to Justice Act and 28 U.S.C. § 2412; and
7. Grant such further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Date: September 26, 2025

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Talia Housman

Talia Housman (SBN 360341)
thousman@sfbay.org
The Justice and Diversity Center
50 Fremont St. Ste. 1700
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 539-9792

Attorney for Petitioners