

1 Warren Craig
2 Human Rights First
3 3680 Wilshire Blvd.
4 Suite P04-414
5 Los Angeles, CA 90010
6 Telephone: (929) 613-0929
7 craigw@humanrightsfirst.org

Attorney for Petitioner-Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

D.D.

Petitioner-Plaintiff.

5

Christopher J. LAROSE, Senior Warden, Otay Mesa
Detention Center

Gregory J. ARCHAMBEAULT, Acting Field Office Director of San Diego Office of Detention and Removal, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; U.S. Department of Homeland Security;

26
27 Todd M. LYONS, Acting Director, Immigration
28 and Customs Enforcement, U.S. Department of
Homeland Security;

Kristi NOEM, in her Official Capacity, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; and

Pamela BONDI, in her Official Capacity, Attorney General of the United States:

Respondents-Defendants.

Case No. 3:25-cv-02581-BJC-JLB

**PETITIONER'S REPLY TO
RESPONDENTS' RESPONSE
IN OPPOSITION TO
PETITIONER'S HABEAS
PETITION AND APPLICATION
FOR TEMPORARY
RESTRANING ORDER**

1 The Petitioner, Mr. D., respectfully submits the following reply to the Respondents' Response in
2 Opposition to Petitioner's Habeas Petition and Application for Temporary Restraining Order.

3 I. **ARGUMENT**

4 **A. The district court has jurisdiction to consider Mr. D.'s habeas petition.**

5 This court has jurisdiction to grant Mr. D., a detainee in custody of the United States, habeas relief
6 pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 2241. The Respondents argument that 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) deprives this Court of
7 jurisdiction to hear Mr. D's claim has been rejected by multiple district courts within the Southern District
8 of California. *See Vasquez Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02180-DMS-MMP, 2025 WL 2549431, at *4 (S.D.
9 Cal. Sept. 3, 2025); *Gao v. LaRose*, No.: 25-cv-2084-RSH-SBC, 2025 WL 2770633, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Sept.
10 26, 2025). Furthermore, the Ninth Circuit has also rejected the proposition that § 1252(g) bars habeas
11 challenges to immigration detention. *See Bello-Reyes v. Gaynor*, 985 F.3d 696, 700 n.4 (9th Cir. 2021).

12 Section 1252(g) provides that “no court shall have jurisdiction to hear any cause or claim by or on
13 behalf of any alien arising from the decision or action by the Attorney General to commence proceedings,
14 adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders against any alien under this chapter.” As the Court in *Gao*
15 noted, “The Supreme Court has interpreted the jurisdiction-stripping provision in Section
16 1252(g) provisions narrowly, limiting it to “three discrete actions”: the “‘decision or action’ to
17 ‘commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders.’” 2025 WL 2770633, at *2
18 (quoting *Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 482 (1999)). The Supreme Court
19 later explained that it did not read §1252(g) “to sweep in any claim that can technically be said to ‘arise
20 from’ the three listed actions of the Attorney General. Instead, we read the language to refer to just those
21 three specific actions themselves.” *Gao*, 2025 WL 2770633, at *2 (quoting *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583
U.S. 281, 294 (2018)). The district court, noting that the petitioner was merely seeking to review the
legality of his detention under the Due Process Clause rather than relitigate the Immigration Judge’s order

1 in his removal proceedings, concluded that the petitioner's claim is not barred by § 1252(g). *Gao*, 2025
2 WL 2770633, at *2. The district court added, "Respondents have not cited any authority in which a court
3 was found to lack subject matter jurisdiction over such a habeas claim." *Id.*

4 In *Vasquez-Garcia*, the district court likewise determined that § 1252(g) should be read narrowly.
5 2025 WL 2549431, at *4. The district court reasoned,

6 Section 1252(g) 'does not prohibit challenges to unlawful practices merely because they
7 are in some fashion connected to removal orders.'" *Ibarra-Perez v. United States*, No. 24-
8 631, at *18 (9th Cir. Aug. 27, 2025). Specifically, § 1252(g) does not bar due process
9 claims. *Walters v. Reno*, 145 F.3d 1032, 1032 (9th Cir. 1998). "[The plaintiffs'] objective
10 was not to obtain judicial review of the merits of their . . . proceedings, but rather to enforce
11 their constitutional rights to due process in the context of those proceedings." *Id.* at 1052.

12 *Id.* The district court noted that the petitioners were not contesting the charges brought against them or the
13 initiation of their removal proceedings, but rather they were seeking a bond hearing to determine their
14 detention status during removal proceedings. *Id.* Because the petitioners were "enforcing their
15 constitutional rights to due process in the context of removal proceedings—not the legitimacy of the
16 removal proceedings or any removal order," the district court concluded that § 1252(g) did not apply. *Id.*

17 In the instant case, Mr. D does not challenge the Respondents' decision to commence removal
18 proceedings against him, adjudicate his removal case, or to execute any removal order. Instead, Mr. D
19 seeks to review the legality of his detention under the Due Process Clause and enforce his constitutional
20 rights to due process in the context of removal proceedings. As the Ninth Circuit and the aforementioned
21 district courts have determined, such actions are not barred under § 1252(g). Accordingly, this Court has
jurisdiction to hear Mr. D's claims.

B. Mr. D. is likely to succeed on his constitutional claim for relief under the Due Process Clause.

1. As multiple courts in this district have held, noncitizens subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) have a constitutional right under the Due Process Clause against prolonged mandatory detention.

“It is well established that the Fifth Amendment entitles [noncitizens] to due process of law in deportation proceedings.” *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 523 (2003) (quoting *Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 306 (1993)). Yet, the Respondents argue that Mr. D. has no due process rights other than those afforded to him by Congress because he is because he is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b).¹ ECF 6 at pgs. 5-8. However, the two district courts within the Southern District of California that have addressed this argument have resoundingly rejected it. *See Gao*, 2025 WL 2770633, at *3; *Kydryali v. Wolf*, 499 F. Supp. 3d 768 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2020). Indeed, in a decision dated September 26, 2025, Judge Robert S. Huie noted that most courts have rejected this argument.² *See Gao*, 2025 WL 2770633, at *3 (citing *Abdul-Samed v. Warden of Golden State Annex Det. Facility*, No. 25-cv-98-SAB-HC, 2025 WL 2099343, at *6 (E.D. Cal. July 25, 2025)); *see also Kydryali*, 499 F. Supp. 3d at 772 n. 2 (collecting cases).

¹ The Respondents claim that Mr. D. is detained under § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii) rather than § 1225(b)(2). ECF 6 at 5. However, Section 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii), which provides for detention of noncitizens who have established a credible fear following an interview, does not apply in this case because Mr. D. was never given a credible fear interview. Rather, as the documents submitted by the Respondents show, Mr. D. was purportedly processed under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(f), see ECF 6, Exh 1, and was then provided with a more limited assessment for relief under the Convention Against Torture. See ECF 6, Exh 3. The Respondents also claim that Mr. D. is an “arriving alien;” however, that definition does not apply because the Respondent entered the United States without inspection. See 8 C.F.R. 1.2 (defining “arriving alien” as, *inter alia*, “an applicant for admission coming or attempting to come into the United States at a port-of-entry”). However, for the purpose of this Motion, the Court need not decide whether the Respondent is detained under § 1225(b)(1) or § 1225(b)(2). Both subsections impose mandatory detention, and the Supreme Court and Ninth Circuit have treated both subsections interchangeably. See *Jennings*, 1238 S. Ct. at 842-43; *Rodriguez v. Marin*, 909 F.3d 252 (9th Cir. 2018). While not an issue for the instant motion, Mr. D. asserts that the only applicable authority for his detention is 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a); however, Mr. D. concedes that the Board of Immigration Appeals and/or Attorney General’s interpretation of these statutes, whether *Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. 66 (BIA 2025), and *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), or, as the Respondents’ claim, *Matter of M-S-*, 27 I&N Dec. 509 (AG 2019), would subject him to mandatory detention.

² The Respondents cite to two decisions in the Western District of New York and one decision in Southern District of Texas which have held otherwise, but the Respondents have not identified any decision in this district or any other district court within the jurisdiction the Ninth Circuit that has accepted this position. See ECF 6 at p.7.

1 In *Kydrali*, Judge Anthony J. Battaglia determined that the government’s argument “would not be
2 constitutionally defensible” in light of recent Supreme Court and Ninth Circuit case law. 499 F. Supp. 3d
3 at 770. The district court quoted the Supreme Court decision in *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690
4 (2001), which stated:

5 A statute permitting indefinite detention of an alien would raise a serious constitutional
6 problem. The Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause forbids the Government to deprive
any person of liberty without due process of law. Freedom from imprisonment—from
government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the
liberty that Clause protects.

7 *Id.* at 770-71. The district court also cited to the Ninth’s Circuit’s decision in *Rodriguez v. Marin*, 909
8 F.3d 252, 257 (9th Cir. 2018), which following remand from the Supreme Court in *Jennings* to consider
9 whether the Due Process Clause prohibits prolonged mandatory immigration detention, left in place in a
10 permanent injunction in the Central District of California requiring individualized bond hearings for
noncitizens who have been detained for longer than six months, remarking:

11 We have grave doubts that any statute that allows for arbitrary prolonged detention without
any process is constitutional or that those who founded our democracy precisely to protect
against the government’s arbitrary deprivation of liberty would have thought so. Arbitrary
civil detention is not a feature of our American government. “[L]iberty is the norm, and
detention prior to trial or without trial is the carefully limited exception.” *United States v.
Salerno*, 481 U.S. 739, 755, 107 S.Ct. 2095, 95 L.Ed.2d 697 (1987). Civil detention violates
due process outside of “certain special and narrow nonpunitive circumstances.” *Zadvydas
v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690, 121 S.Ct. 2491, 150 L.Ed.2d 653 (2001) (internal quotation
marks and citation omitted).

15 *Rodriguez*, 909 F. 3d at 256-27; *Kydrali*, 499 F. Supp. 3d at 772.

16 The district court also found that the Respondents’ reliance on the Supreme Court’s 1953 decision
17 in *Shaughnessy v. United States ex rel. Mezei*, 345 U.S. 206, 207-09 (1953) was misplaced and
18 distinguishable. *Kydrali*, 499 F. Supp. 3d at 772. On this point, the district court stated as follows:

19 *Mezei* concerned an alien who, prior to filing his habeas petition, had already been
20 permanently excluded from the United States on security grounds. 345 U.S. at 207, 73 S.Ct.
625 (“This case concerns an alien immigrant permanently excluded from the United States
on security grounds but stranded in his temporary haven on Ellis Island because other

1 countries will not take him back.”). Unlike Mr. Mezei, Petitioner is not alleged to present
2 national security concerns, has not been permanently excluded from the United States, and
3 seeks a bond hearing prior to a conclusive decision on his application for admission. As
4 such, the Court finds *Mezei* inapposite. *See Rosales-Garcia v. Holland*, 322 F.3d 386, 413–
5 14 (6th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (noting that the *Mezei* Court is limited to the national security
context in which it was decided); *Lett v. Decker*, 346 F. Supp. 3d 379, 386 (S.D.N.Y.
2018) (“*Mezei* may compel the conclusion that arriving aliens already excluded on national
security grounds are not entitled to a bond hearing prior to their arranged deportation.
However, *Mezei* does not compel the categorical conclusion that all arriving aliens may be
subject to prolonged confinement without a bond hearing.”).

6 *Id.* Additionally, as noted above, Mr. D., unlike the noncitizen in *Mezei*, is not an “arriving alien” because
7 he was not charged with inadmissibility at a point of entry. *See* 8 C.F.R § 1.2.

8 After considering these arguments, the district court in *Kydrali* concluded, “guided by basic
9 notions of due process gleaned from recent Supreme Court and Ninth Circuit case law, the Court joins the
10 majority of courts across the country in concluding that an unreasonably prolonged detention under
11 U.S.C. § 1225(b) without an individualized bond hearing violates due process.” 499 F. Supp. 3d at 772.

12 In *Gao*, the district court held likewise, concluding, “This Court agrees with the majority position
13 that a petitioner detained under Section 1225(b)(1) may assert a due process challenge to prolonged
14 mandatory detention without a bond hearing.” 2025 WL 2770633, at *3. The district court in *Gao*
15 distinguished the Supreme Court’s decision in *Department of Homeland Security v. Thuraissigiam*, 591
16 U.S. 103 (2020), which the Respondents rely on in this action, as follows:

17 This Court likewise agrees with those district courts that interpret *Thuraissigiam* as
18 circumscribing an arriving alien’s due process rights to *admission*, rather than limiting that
19 person’s ability to challenge *detention*. *See A.L. v. Oddo*, 761 F. Supp. 3d 822, 825 (W.D.
20 Pa. 2025) (“Nowhere in [Thuraissigiam] did the Supreme Court suggest that arriving aliens
being held under § 1225(b) may be held indefinitely and unreasonably with no due process
implications, nor that such aliens have no due process rights whatsoever.”); *Hernandez v.
Wofford*, No. 25-cv-986-KES-CDB (HC), 2025 WL 2420390, at *3 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 21,
2025) (“Although the Supreme Court has described Congress’s power over the ‘policies
and rules for exclusion of aliens’ as ‘plenary,’ and held that this court must generally ‘defer
to Executive and Legislative Branch decisionmaking in that area,’ it is well-established
that the Due Process Clause stands as a significant constraint on the manner in which the
political branches may exercise their plenary authority’—through detention or otherwise.”)
(citations omitted); *Padilla v. ICE*, 704 F. Supp. 3d 1163, 1171–72 (W.D. Wash.

1 2023) (“The holding in *Thuraissigiam* does not foreclose Plaintiffs’ due process claims
2 which seek to vindicate a right to a bond hearing with certain procedural protections.”).

2 *Gao*, 2025 WL 2770633, at *3.

3 For the same reasons as described in *Gao* and *Kydrali*, the Court in this instant action should reject
4 the government’s contention that Mr. D. has no constitutional right against prolonged detention. Such a
5 position would not only create a split within this district, and more broadly among district courts within
6 the Ninth Circuit, but it would also be inconsistent with Ninth Circuit’s and Supreme Court’s respective
7 decisions in *Rodriguez* and *Zadydas*, as discussed above. This Court should instead join the vast majority
8 of district courts that have held that noncitizens who are subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)
9 have a due process right against prolonged detention without an individualized bond hearing.

9 **2. The facts of Mr. D.’s case demonstrate that his detention has become prolonged in violation of
10 the Due Process Clause.**

10 Mr. D. has been detained for over seven months with no clear end in sight as a result of multiple
11 lengthy delays caused by the government. Yet, the Respondents argue that Mr. D.’s detention has not
12 become so unreasonable as to require an initial bond hearing. ECF 8 at pgs. 8-9. For reasons discussed
13 below, the Respondents’ argument misses the mark.

14 First, the Respondents suggest that Mr. D. has not been detained long enough because petitioners
15 in certain other cases where district courts have granted relief have been detained longer.³ See ECF 6 at
16 p.8. However, Mr. D. has now been detained for over seven months in a private for-profit prison under
17 conditions that district courts within this district have described as “not dissimilar to criminal
18 confinement” *Gao*, 2025 WL 2770633, at *3, and “indistinguishable from penal confinement.” *Kydrali*,

19 ³ The Respondents cite to one decision by a district court within this district which stated, “In general, as detention continues
20 past a year, courts become extremely wary of permitting continued custody absent a bond hearing.” ECF 6 at p.8 (citing
Sibomana v. LaRose, No. 22-cv-933-LL-NLS, 2023 WL 3028093, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 20, 2023)). However, the inverse is
not necessarily true. In fact, the district court in *Gao* granted relief for a petitioner who was detained for around ten months.
See 2025 WL 2770633, at *4-5.

1 499 F.Supp.3d at 773 (quoting *Jamal A. v. Whitaker*, 358 F. Supp. 3d 853, 858–59 (D. Minn. 2019)).

2 Moreover, as noted above, the Ninth Circuit, following remand from the Supreme Court to determine the

3 constitutional question, left in place an injunction that requires individualized bond hearings for detainees

4 within the Central District of California once their detention passes the six-month mark, citing “grave”

5 constitutional concerns. *See Rodriguez*, 909 F.3d at 256. Similarly, in *Zadvydas*, the Supreme Court,

6 noting that “there is reason to believe that [Congress] doubted the constitutionality of more than six months

7 detention,” determined that the six-month mark was the appropriate period of time when detention would

8 become presumptively unreasonable in the post-removal order context. 533 U.S. at 680. In the Northern

9 District of California, a district court applied a bright line six-month rule as the length of time when

10 detention without a bond hearing becomes prolonged under the Due Process Clause. *Rodriguez v. Nielsen*,

11 2019 WL 7491555, at *6 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 7, 2019). Even if this Court declines to adopt a bright line rule,

12 the Court should find that detention in excess of six months is a factor weighing in the petitioner’s favor.

13 A contrary determination would produce an anomalous result where detainees in the Central and Northern

14 Districts of California are afforded bond hearings at the six-month mark, but detainees in Southern District

15 have to wait a longer, but unspecified amount of time before their detention becomes unconstitutional,

16 leaving detainees to guess how long is too long. Consistent with the authorities cited above, the Court

17 should find that Mr. D.’s detention in excess of seven months is a factor that weights in his favor in

18 determining whether his detention has becomes prolonged.

19 The Respondents also argue that the anticipated length of Mr. D’s detention does not raise due

20 process concerns, noting that Mr. D. is scheduled for an individual hearing on his applications for relief

21 on November 7, 2025 and claiming that “[t]here is no indication that any final decision by the IJ would

22 be delayed.” ECF 6 at pgs. 8-9. However, absent intervention from this Court, there is substantial reason

23 to believe that Mr. D’s detention will last much longer. First, contrary to the government’s assertion,

1 delays in issuing a decision following individual hearings are quite common. *See* ECF 2-1 at ¶ 21. Second,
2 regardless of the result of the hearing on November 7th, it is likely that either side (or both) will appeal to
3 the Board of Immigration Appeals. Mr. D. fully intends to appeal any adverse ruling against him, and the
4 Department of Homeland Security may also file an appeal if Mr. D. is granted relief. *Id.* at ¶ 22. Such an
5 appeal would likely last six months or longer, and the case could be delayed for an additional period of
6 time if the case is further appealed to the Ninth Circuit or remanded back to the Immigration Court for
7 more proceedings. *See id.* Indeed, the lengthy time associated with appeals has been a major factor that
8 other district courts in this district have considered when analyzing the total anticipated length of
9 detention. *See Durand v. Allen*, 2024 WL 711607, at *5 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 21, 2024); *Sibomana*, WL 302809,
10 at *4; *Sanchez-Rivera v. Matuszewski*, 2023 WL 139801, at *6 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2023). Yet, in their
11 response in opposition, the government failed to address this factor. Given that Mr. D. could remain
12 detained for months if not years while his proceedings remain pending, the anticipated length of detention
13 is another factor that weighs strongly in Mr. D.’s favor.

14 Finally, the Respondents claim that “there is no indication of any delay in the removal proceedings
15 by the government.” ECF 6 at p.9. However, the Respondents do not address the more than three-month
16 delay that occurred between the day Mr. D was detained on March 2, 2025 and the date of his first hearing
17 on June 16, 2025. ECF 2-1 at ¶¶ 4-9. Nor do the Respondents address the multiple delays that were caused
18 by multiple continuances ordered by the Immigration Judge over the Summer of 2025. *Id.* at ¶¶ 11-18.
19 The Respondents have also not provided an explanation as to why the parole requests submitted by Mr.
20 D’s counsel never received a response. *Id.* at ¶¶ 8, 13. The district court in *Gao* considered this to be a
21 favor weighing in favor of the petitioner in that case. *See* 2025 WL 2770633, at *4 (“Although Petitioner
Petitioner’s Reply Brief

1 did not provide any explanation for this lack of response.”). As such, the government caused delays in this
2 case also weigh in Mr. D’s favor.

3 In sum, Mr. D has been detained in excess of seven months in prison-like conditions with
4 significant delays caused by the government and no end to his detention in sight. Under such
5 circumstances, Mr. D is likely to succeed on his claim that his detention without an individualized bond
6 hearing has become prolonged in violation of the Due Process Clause.

7 **C. Mr. D has shown irreparable harm from the ongoing deprivation of his
8 constitutional rights.**

9 As the Ninth Circuit has held, “It is well established that the deprivation of constitutional rights
10 ‘unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury.’” *Melendres v. Arpaio*, 695 F.3d 990, 1002 (9th Cir. 2012)
11 (quoting *Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347, 373 (1976)). As shown above, Mr. D is being subject to prolonged
12 detention in violation of his right to due process; thus, he has “unquestionably” established irreparable
13 injury in this case. While the Respondents claim that any alleged harm “is essentially inherent in
14 detention,”⁴ ECF 6 at p.9, the Ninth Circuit has recognized in “concrete terms the irreparable harms
15 imposed on anyone subject to immigration detention” including “subpar medical and psychiatric care in
16 ICE detention facilities.” *Hernandez v. Sessions*, 872 F.3d 976, 995 (9th Cir. 2017). The Respondents also
17 fail to address any of the individualized harm that Mr. D is experiencing in detention, such as physical
18 ailments, post-traumatic stress disorder, and anxiety and depression. *See* ECF 2 at p.12. Moreover, as the
19 Ninth Circuit has explained, “[I]t follows inexorably from our conclusion that the government’s current
20 policies are likely unconstitutional—and thus that [Petitioners] will likely be deprived of their physical

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
5510
5511
5512
5513
5514
5515
5516
5517
5518
5519
5520
5521
5522
5523
5524
5525
5526
5527
5528
5529
5530
5531
5532
5533
5534
5535
5536
5537
5538
5539
55310
55311
55312
55313
55314
55315
55316
55317
55318
55319
55320
55321
55322
55323
55324
55325
55326
55327
55328
55329
55330
55331
55332
55333
55334
55335
55336
55337
55338
55339
55340
55341
55342
55343
55344
55345
55346
55347
55348
55349
55350
55351
55352
55353
55354
55355
55356
55357
55358
55359
55360
55361
55362
55363
55364
55365
55366
55367
55368
55369
55370
55371
55372
55373
55374
55375
55376
55377
55378
55379
55380
55381
55382
55383
55384
55385
55386
55387
55388
55389
55390
55391
55392
55393
55394
55395
55396
55397
55398
55399
553100
553101
553102
553103
553104
553105
553106
553107
553108
553109
553110
553111
553112
553113
553114
553115
553116
553117
553118
553119
553120
553121
553122
553123
553124
553125
553126
553127
553128
553129
553130
553131
553132
553133
553134
553135
553136
553137
553138
553139
553140
553141
553142
553143
553144
553145
553146
553147
553148
553149
553150
553151
553152
553153
553154
553155
553156
553157
553158
553159
553160
553161
553162
553163
553164
553165
553166
553167
553168
553169
553170
553171
553172
553173
553174
553175
553176
553177
553178
553179
553180
553181
553182
553183
553184
553185
553186
553187
553188
553189
553190
553191
553192
553193
553194
553195
553196
553197
553198
553199
553200
553201
553202
553203
553204
553205
553206
553207
553208
553209
553210
553211
553212
553213
553214
553215
553216
553217
553218
553219
553220
553221
553222
553223
553224
553225
553226
553227
553228
553229
553230
553231
553232
553233
553234
553235
553236
553237
553238
553239
553240
553241
553242
553243
553244
553245
553246
553247
553248
553249
553250
553251
553252
553253
553254
553255
553256
553257
553258
553259
553260
553261
553262
553263
553264
553265
553266
553267
553268
553269
553270
553271
553272
553273
553274
553275
553276
553277
553278
553279
553280
553281
553282
553283
553284
553285
553286
553287
553288
553289
553290
553291
553292
553293
553294
553295
553296
553297
553298
553299
553300
553301
553302
553303
553304
553305
553306
553307
553308
553309
553310
553311
553312
553313
553314
553315
553316
553317
553318
553319
553320
553321
553322
553323
553324
553325
553326
553327
553328
553329
553330
553331
553332
553333
553334
553335
553336
553337
553338
553339
553340
553341
553342
553343
553344
553345
553346
553347
553348
553349
553350
553351
553352
553353
553354
553355
553356
553357
553358
553359
553360
553361
553362
553363
553364
553365
553366
553367
553368
553369
553370
553371
553372
553373
553374
553375
553376
553377
553378
553379
553380
553381
553382
553383
553384
553385
553386
553387
553388
553389
553390
553391
553392
553393
553394
553395
553396
553397
553398
553399
553400
553401
553402
553403
553404
553405
553406
553407
553408
553409
553410
553411
553412
553413
553414
553415
553416
553417
553418
553419
553420
553421
553422
553423
553424
553425
553426
553427
553428
553429
553430
553431
553432
553433
553434
553435
553436
553437
553438
553439
553440
553441
553442
553443
553444
553445
553446
553447
553448
553449
553450
553451
553452
553453
553454
553455
553456
553457
553458
553459
553460
553461
553462
553463
553464
553465
553466
553467
553468
553469
553470
553471
553472
553473
553474
553475
553476
553477
553478
553479
553480
553481
553482
553483
553484
553485
553486
553487
553488
553489
553490
553491
553492
553493
553494
553495
553496
553497
553498
553499
553500
553501
553502
553503
553504
553505
553506
553507
553508
553509
553510
553511
553512
553513
553514
553515
553516
553517
553518
553519
553520
553521
553522
553523
553524
553525
553526
553527
553528
553529
553530
553531
553532
553533
553534
553535
553536
553537
553538
553539
553540
553541
553542
553543
553544
553545
553546
553547
553548
553549
553550
553551
553552
553553
553554
553555
553556
553557
553558
553559
553560
553561
553562
553563
553564
553565
553566
553567
553568
553569
553570
553571
553572
553573
553574
553575
553576
553577
553578
553579
553580
553581
553582
553583
553584
553585
553586
553587
553588
553589
553590
553591
553592
553593
553594
553595
553596
553597
553598
553599
553600
553601
553602
553603
553604
553605
553606
553607
553608
553609
553610
553611
553612
553613
553614
553615
553616
553617
553618
553619
553620
553621
553622
553623
553624
553625
553626
553627
553628
553629
553630
553631
553632
553633
553634
553635
553636
553637
553638
553639
553640
553641
553642
553643
553644
553645
553646
553647
553648
553649
553650
553651
553652
553653
553654
553655
553656
553657
553658
553659
553660
553661
553662
553663
553664
553665
553666
553667
553668
553669
553670
553671
553672
553673
553674
553675
553676
553677
553678
553679
553680
553681
553682
553683
553684
553685
553686
553687
553688
553689
553690
553691
553692
553693
553694
553695
553696
553697
553698
553699
553700
553701
553702
553703
553704
553705
553706
553707
553708
553709
553710
553711
553712
553713
553714
553715
553716
553717
553718
553719
553720
553721
553722
553723
553724
553725
553726
553727
553728
553729
553730
553731
553732
553733
553734
553735
553736
553737
553738
553739
5537340
5537341
5537342
5537343
5537344
5537345
5537346
5537347
5537348
5537349
5537350
5537351
5537352
5537353
5537354
5537355
5537356
5537357
5537358
5537359
5537360
5537361
5537362
5537363
5537364
5537365
5537366
5537367
5537368
5537369
55373610
55373611
55373612
55373613
55373614
55373615
55373616
55373617
55373618
55373619
55373620
55373621
55373622
55373623
55373624
55373625
55373626
55373627
55373628
55373629
55373630
55373631
55373632
55373633
55373634
55373635
55373636
55373637
55373638
55373639
55373640
55373641
55373642
55373643
55373644
55373645
55373646
55373647
55373648
55373649
55373650
55373651
55373652
55373653
55373654
55373655
55373656
55373657
55373658
55373659
55373660
55373661
55373662
55373663
55373664
55373665
55373666
55373667
55373668
55373669
55373670
55373671
55373672
55373673
55373674
55373675
55373676
55373677
55373678
55373679
55373680
55373681
55373682
55373683
55373684
55373685
55373686
55373687
55373688
55373689
55373690
55373691
55373692
55373693
55373694
55373695
55373696
55373697
55373698
55373699
553736100
553736101
553736102
553736103
553736104
553736105
553736106
553736107
553736108
553736109
553736110
553736111
553736112
553736113
553736114
553736115
553736116
553736117
553736118
553736119
553736120
553736121
553736122
553736123
553736124
553736125
553736126
553736127
553736128
553736129
553736130
553736131
553736132
553736133
553736134
553736135
553736136
553736137
553736138
553736139
553736140
553736141
553736142
553736143
553736144
553736145
553736146
553736147
553736148
553736149
553736150
553736151
553736152
553736153
553736154
553736155
553736156
553736157
553736158
553736159
553736160
553736161
553736162
553736163
553736164
553736165
553736166
553736167
553736168
553736169
553736170
553736171
553736172
553736173
553736174
553736175
553736176
553736177
553736178
553736179
553736180
553736181
55

1 liberty unconstitutionally in the absence of the injunction—that [Petitioners] have also carried their burden
2 as to irreparable harm.” *Hernandez*, 872 F.3d at 995; *see also Garcia-Vasquez*, 2025 WL 2549431, *7
3 (finding irreparable harm in the habeas context based on unlawful immigration detention). Thus, Mr. D
4 has shown irreparable harm from the ongoing violation of his right to due process.

5 **C. The balance of equities and public interest favor granting a temporary restraining order.**

6 As Mr. D has shown a violation of his right to due process, “it would not be equitable or in the
7 public’s interest to allow [a party] . . . to violate the requirements of federal law, especially when there are
8 no adequate remedies available.” *Ariz. Dream Act Coal. v. Brewer*, 757 F.3d 1053, 1069 (9th Cir. 2014)
9 (quoting *Valle del Sol Inc. v. Whiting*, 732 F.3d 1006, 1029 (9th Cir. 2013)). Further, as multiple district
10 courts in this district have held, “The public interest in enforcement of immigration laws, although
11 significant, does not override the public interest in protecting the safeguards of the
12 Constitution.” *Domingo-Ros v. Archambeault*, 2025 WL 1425558, at *5 (S.D. Cal. May 18, 2025);
13 *Garcia-Vasquez*, 2025 WL 2549431, *7. Thus, these factors also favor Mr. D.

14 **II. CONCLUSION**

15 For the foregoing reasons, and those stated in Mr. D’s motion for a temporary restraining order,
16 this Court should grant Mr. D’s motion and enjoin the Respondents from continuing to detain Mr. D unless
17 they provide him within 14 days an individualized bond hearing at which the government bears the burden
18 of proof to establish by clear and convincing evidence that his detention is justified because he is either a
19 flight risk or a danger to the community.

1 Respectfully submitted this 10th day of October, 2025.

2 *By counsel,*

3 s/ Warren Craig
4 Warren Craig
5 Attorney for the Petitioner-Plaintiff
6 3680 Wilshire Blvd.
7 P04-414
8 Los Angeles, CA 90010
9 Phone: (929) 613-0929
10 craigw@humanrightsfirst.org

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on October 10, 2025, I electronically filed the foregoing document using the CM/ECF system, which will serve counsel for the Respondents.

Dated: 10/10/2025

s/ Warren Craig

Warren Craig
Attorney for the Petitioner-Plaintiff
3680 Wilshire Blvd.
PO4-414
Los Angeles, CA 90010
Phone: (929) 613-0929
craigw@humanrightsfirst.org