

16

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JEFFREY NDUNGI SILA, Petitioner

Case: 2:25-cv-13066
Assigned To : **Murphy, Stephen J., III**
Referral Judge: **Ivy, Curtis, Jr**
Assign. Date : **9/26/2025**
Description: **HC JEFFREY NDUNGI
SILA v. RAYCRAFT (MC)**

vs

KEVIN RAYCRAFT, in his official capacity as Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE),
Acting Director of the Detroit Field Office, Respondent

COMBINED EMERGENCY EX-PARTE MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING
ORDER, PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AND WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

INTRODUCTION

Petitioner hereby submits the above-styled motion *Pro se* and requests liberal construction. He hereby incorporates fully and expressly the attached Declaration in Support. He apologizes if some of the details he provides therein are unnecessary for the determination of this request; his intention is only to provide the Court with a full and accurate picture. The factual summary follows:

Petitioner was lawfully admitted on a tourist visa around May 2016. On November 15, 2022, he was placed in removal proceedings and charged with overstaying his visa. Subsequently, pursuant to a hearing on December 23, 2025, an Immigration Judge(IJ) granted \$7,500 bond and he was released. For unknown reasons, ICE later refunded the bond. His next court date is in July 2026. On August 22, 2025, he got lost in Detroit and was encountered by Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) officers who detained him, despite explaining he had been granted bond by an IJ and had a pending court date and no circumstances had changed. Till now, he remains

detained at the Calhoun County Jail.

Petitioner did not receive any documents from ICE, which he would have shared with the Court as exhibits. He relies only on memory, to the best of his ability. He respectfully asks the Court to check the electronic filing record of EOIR and the Federal Courts, if necessary, for verification.

On the day he submitted this petition for mailing to the court, petitioner submitted a true copy for mailing to the Respondent as shown in his certificate of service. Nevertheless due to urgency, he requests for ex-parte consideration due to the continued and ongoing irreparable harm.

LEGAL STANDARD

This Court has recently held:

"A Court may issue a temporary restraining order without notice to the adverse party only if the movant sets forth "specific facts...clearly show[ing] that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result to the movant before the adverse party can be heard in opposition" and if "the movant's attorney certifies in writing any efforts made to give notice and the reasons why it should not be required." Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b) (1).

"[T]he purpose of a [temporary restraining order] under Rule 65 is to preserve the status quo so that a reasoned resolution of a dispute may be had." In determining whether to grant such relief, the Court must weigh four factors: "(1) whether the movant has a strong likelihood of success on the merits, (2) whether the movant would suffer irreparable injury absent preliminary injunctive relief, (3) whether granting the preliminary injunctive relief would cause substantial harm to others, and (4) whether the public interest would be served by granting the preliminary injunctive relief. "The standard for issuing a temporary restraining order is logically the same as for a preliminary injunction with emphasis, however, on irreparable harm given that the purpose of a temporary restraining order is to maintain the status quo." *Kaat v. Kingsbrook LLC*, 2023 US Dist LEXIS 435832023 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 43583 (E.D Mich 2023)

(internal citation and quotes omitted)

Petitioner meets all the factors:

(1) Likelihood of success on the merits

Several District Courts across the country, including this one, have recently been dealing with this very issue and consistently granting relief. In fact, Petitioner believes he might be slightly better situated because in most of the cases, the Courts had to decide whether an individual

who crossed the border "without admission" was entitled to a bond hearing .e.g. *Reyes v.*

Raycraft, 2025 WL 2609425 (E.D Mich Sept 8, 2025); *Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft*, 2025 WL 2496379

(E.D Mich August 28, 2025). This court, however, need not make that determination because

Petitioner was indeed lawfully admitted.

Another factor that perhaps weighs favorably for Petitioner is that most, if not all, of the recent

cases deal with the discretionary decision of DHS to release an alien encountered at the border

pending Immigration Court proceedings. However, neither is that the case here as Petitioner

was granted bond by an IJ. This necessarily reflects a finding of no risk of flight or

dangerousness by the IJ. The BIA has held that "where a previous bond determination has been

made by an Immigration Judge, no change should be made by a District Director absent a

change of circumstance." *Matter of Sugay*, 17 I. & N. Dec. 637, 640 (B.I.A. 1981).

A. Waiver of Administrative Exhaustion is Warranted

It does not appear there is anything for Petitioner to exhaust as he was already granted bond

by an IJ and there has been no change in circumstances. Nevertheless, this Court has waived

the exhaustion requirements in similar proceedings. i.e. *Lopez-Campos; Reyes*.

"Waiver is appropriate when the interests of the individual weigh heavily against requiring administrative exhaustion, or exhaustion would be futile and unable to afford the petitioner the relief he seeks...Exhaustion is also excused when delay means hardship...Any delay results in the very harm [Petitioner] is trying to avoid...—detention...Aside from the waiver...a due process challenge generally does not require exhaustion...When the liberty of a person is at stake, every day that passes is a critical one...and the court cannot fault [Petitioner] for taking appropriate measures to pursue his claims through the habeas process with the expectation that his claims would be met with a sense of urgency, and he would receive a decision in a more expedient manner." *Lopez-Campos*. (citations and quotes omitted).

Further, having been in custody since August 22, 2025 under atrocious conditions, "[Petitioner] faces not only more, potentially unnecessary months in [detention], but also harm to his ability to mount a successful defense against his removal," *Reyes* (citations and quotes omitted). This is particularly critical here, given the looming deadline of October 3rd, 2025, for filing the crucial Reply to the Government's Response to his Petition for writ of *coram nobis* in the Northern

District of Texas.

Further,

B. Due Process

This Court has already found in *Lopez-Campos* that continued detention under similar circumstances is a "violation of due process" holding that "[f]reedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the very liberty that [the Due Process Clause] protects."

Petitioner also meets the 3 *Matthew* factors outlined in the Court's decision:

1. His liberty is at stake.
2. The risk of continued erroneous deprivation of liberty is not only high but ongoing.

given that an IJ already granted him bond, necessarily finding he is neither a risk of flight nor danger to the community (indeed as evidenced by his 2.5-year 100% clean record so far); but the government continues to detain him absent any change in circumstances.

3. The Government "has not and likely cannot show that it has a significant interest in [Petitioner's] continued detention" as there is no change in circumstances.

In *Dos Santos v. Noem*, no 1:25-cv-12052-JEK, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 157488 (D. Mass. Aug. 14, 2025) (cited by this Court in both *Lopez-Campos* and *Reyes*), the Court granted habeas relief under strikingly similar circumstances. *Dos Santos* had entered the United States through the Southern border in November 2017 and was encountered by CBP who issued an NTA commencing removal proceedings. An IJ released him on a \$15,000 bond in January 2018. He had resided in the United States since, subject to that IJ's 2018 bond order for over seven years. On May 30, 2025, he was encountered by ICE after a traffic stop. At that time, his removal proceedings concerning the 2017 NTA were still pending in the Immigration Court. ICE nevertheless obtained and executed a warrant for his arrest. The Court waived Administrative Exhaustion and ordered *dos Santos* released subject to the IJ's 2018 bond order.

Likewise, here, there is for example

"no evidence in the record to suggest that [Petitioner] violated the terms of his release on bond, failed to attend Immigration Court hearings, or engaged in criminal conduct." ICE appears to have arrested [Petitioner] for "no reason other than the fact that it encountered him by chance" when he got lost and explained he was in removal proceedings for overstaying his visa. But this was "not new information to ICE"; it had charged [Petitioner] with "precisely this reason when it issued him a Notice to Appear in [2022] and he was in the midst of removal proceedings pertaining to that charge at the time of his arrest...The government has accordingly failed to carry its burden to show that a change in circumstances supported its decision to revoke the Immigration

Judge's [2022] bond order...Unless and until ICE carries that burden at a hearing before an Immigration Judge, [Petitioner] must be released from custody pursuant to the [2022] bond order." *Dos Santos* (Substituting with Petitioner's circumstances).

Other district courts have also found that like Petitioner, similarly situated "individuals released from immigration custody on bond have a protectable liberty interest in remaining out of custody...to work, live at home, and be with family and friends to form the enduring attachments of normal life... and are entitled to a pre-deprivation hearing." *Oliveros v. Kaiser* 2025 WL 2677125 (N.D California, September 18, 2025) (listing cases).

(2) Irreparable injury absent preliminary injunctive relief

Petitioner continues to suffer immense, irreparable injury in continued detention. The unlawful detention of physical liberty is the quintessential irreparable harm. Additionally, he continues to suffer medical harms as outlined in his declaration paragraph 22.

"It is well established that the deprivation of constitutional rights unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury...When an alleged deprivation of a constitutional right is involved, most courts hold that no further showing of irreparable injury is necessary....[When] [a] Petitioner is re-detained without a pre-detention hearing before a neutral decisionmaker, the deprivation of liberty that Petitioner faces is likely unconstitutional and is an immediate and irreparable harm." *Oliveros*.

This harm is precisely what petitioner continues to endure each day; it is not speculative but ongoing this very minute and will not stop absent the swift intervention of this Court.

Moreover, as this Court has found in the exhaustion context above, further unnecessary detention and inability to mount a successful defense constitute irreparable harms. *Lopez-Campos; Reyes*.

(3) Granting the preliminary injunctive relief would not cause substantial harm to the

government

Without the requested preliminary injunctive relief, further detention continues to pose a significant threat to Petitioner's health and liberty interest. The IJ already ordered him released on bond. Nothing has changed. Respondents risk only a short delay in detaining Petitioner if Respondents ultimately show that detention is warranted.

(4) The public interest would be served by granting the preliminary injunctive relief

"The public has an interest in the orderly and efficient administration of this country's immigration laws but also a strong interest in upholding procedural protections against unlawful detention...Furthermore, the government has no legitimate interest in detaining individuals who have been determined not to be a danger to the community and whose appearance at future immigration proceedings can be reasonably ensured by a lesser bond or alternative conditions." *Oliveros*.

CONCLUSION


In view of above circumstances, Petitioner respectfully requests the same relief requested by other similarly situated Petitioners, and consistently granted by the courts -- Orders requiring the Respondent, his agents and employees to:

1. Immediately release him from custody.
2. Be enjoined and restrained from re-detaining Petitioner without notice and a pre-deprivation hearing before a neutral decisionmaker where the Government bears the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that changed circumstances render him a danger to the community or a flight risk, and that no conditions other than his detention would be sufficient to prevent such harms.

3. Return his seized property including Driver's Licence, expired & current passports, and International Driving Permit.
4. Be enjoined from transferring his case from the Kansas City Immigration Court where it is pending and where he currently resides with his family.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeffrey Sila

Jeffrey Sila A# 
 Calhoun County Jail
 185 E Michigan Ave
 Battle Creek, MI 49014

Certificate of Service

Petitioner hereby certifies that on this 21st Day of September, 2025 he submitted to the Detention Center Officers a true copy of this **Combined Emergency Ex-Parte Motion For Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction And Writ Of Habeas Corpus** for mailing via USPS in a postage pre-paid envelope addressed to the:

United States District Court
 Eastern District of Michigan,
 231 West Lafayette Blvd Room 599
 Detroit MI 48226


for electronic filing which will automatically notify all parties of record;

and another true copy addressed to:

Kevin Raycraft
 ICE Detroit Field Office
 985 Michigan Ave Suite 207
 Detroit MI 48226

Respectfully Submitted

Jeffrey Sila

Jeffrey Sila A# 
 Calhoun County Jail
 185 E Michigan Ave
 Battle Creek, MI 49014

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

DECLARATION IN SUPPORT

Under penalty of perjury, Petitioner states the following facts as true to the best of his knowledge and belief:

1. Petitioner is a citizen of Kenya who was lawfully admitted on a tourist visa on about May 30th, 2016 and granted a period of 6 months set to expire sometime around end of November 2016. However on September 11th, 2016 while attempting to board a flight back to Kenya, in full compliance with the terms of his visa, he was arrested at the Los Angeles International Airport. What followed was a lengthy and arduous struggle for justice, that is still ongoing.
2. Petitioner was sentenced to 87 months and 1 year Supervised release for an alleged violation of conversion of a treasury check on August 9th, 2016 under 18 USC 641 & 1028A. He is diligently pursuing relief and currently has a pending extraordinary writ of *coram nobis* based on what he believes is a meritorious claim of actual innocence. This is as a result of the government's own on-the record admissions of an *inaccura[te]* indictment at trial; and subsequent concessions on appeal that petitioner did not commit the offense of its "corrected" version of that indictment. (Case number 3:16-cr-448-B Northern District of Texas).
3. Petitioner completed his sentence without a single incident or infraction ever--100% clean prison record and was released on November 15, 2022. He was immediately taken into ICE custody in Adelanto, California and charged with overstaying his tourist visa. ICE denied discretionary bond. At a subsequent custody redetermination hearing on December 23, 2022 before the Immigration Judge (hereinafter "IJ") with counsel, Mr. Brent Newton, the IJ found Petitioner's convictions were not an "aggravated felony" "theft offense", and granted bond in the amount of \$7,500. The IJ also administratively closed his proceedings to allow the Petitioner to pursue relief from his criminal convictions and also to allow USCIS to adjudicate his pending I-130 petition based on his US Citizen mother. Petitioner's mother posted the bond and he was released on the same day. ICE installed an ankle monitor and instructed him to report to the ICE office

in Kansas City, Missouri sometime in January 2023.

4. Sometime in February 2023, during a scheduled check-in, the Deportation Officer removed the ankle monitor, refunded the bond, and told Petitioner that ICE had no "further requirements" from Petitioner and to "stay out of trouble". Petitioner went on to reside with his mother and sister and has maintained the same address since. During that time he also renewed his passport and applied for an Employment Authorization Document with USCIS. His mother received the check from the Department of the Treasury approximately four months later around June 2023. On November 15 2023, Petitioner successfully completed his term of supervised release without a single incident and 100% clean record.
5. Sometime in October 2023, around 8 months after application, Petitioner received a letter from USCIS denying his Employment Authorization Document (EAD) because he needed to first obtain a "deferred action letter" from USCIS. He immediately submitted an application for this letter which remains pending to date. Petitioner was thus unable to obtain a driver's license in Kansas because he had "no status" and no EAD. Because of this, sometime in December 2023, he was compelled to briefly travel to Washington State for about a week for the sole purpose of taking a driving test and obtaining a Driver's License as the law there allows it. He was thankful to finally be able to lawfully drive and help his mother and sister with tasks as such as shopping, dropping off and picking up his nephews from school & games, and even facilitating maintenance as mundane as oil changes which can be challenging and stressful for women.
6. Lacking an EAD, Petitioner could not legally accept employment. He could not dare to knowingly violate any laws. He had to get creative. He began to learn how to day trade Index Options. He spent hundreds of hours educating himself on the subject and practicing with paper trading. Subsequently, his sister and mother generously gifted him some funds to trade with live. After suffering many losses and only very few wins, he finally began to get consistently profitable from around June 2025. His confidence slowly began trickling back. He had at last began making tiny bits of progress toward rebuilding his life; after enduring the severe hardship of being incarcerated for 6 years and the stigma that follows even after release. Finally, things were beginning to turn around for him. Or so he thought.
7. Around December 20th, 2024, Petitioner was notified by his counsel, Mr. Newton that his application for COA on his 2255 motion, which had focused on a narrow issue of

venue, had been summarily dismissed. Afterwards, Mr. Newton explained he did not believe there were any further prospects for relief and was no longer willing to represent Petitioner and wished Petitioner well. He advised to file a *Pro Se* Petition for Certiorari with the Supreme Court. Around March 2025, Petitioner submitted such Petition but it was returned as inadequate. He was given 60 days to amend it or have it dismissed.

8. In the process of thoroughly reviewing the entire record, transcripts and pleadings, he stumbled upon the government's admissions of the inaccurate indictment and lack of proof for what it viewed as the "accurate" version. Apparently every attorney had failed to spot this error. Upon this discovery, he abandoned the Cert. Petition and promptly mailed to the District Court the writ of *coram nobis* described at *2 above around June 20th, 2025; but it was electronically filed around June 26th, 2025.
9. Around June 30th, Petitioner received from Mr. Newton an email with an attachment of a letter he had received in the mail from the Department of Homeland Security (hereinafter, DHS). DHS had filed a motion to re-calendar the proceedings before the IJ in Adelanto, California. Based on Petitioner's understanding of no longer having representation, he promptly mailed a *Pro se* opposition to the Court and one to DHS counsel. Around July 7th, Mr. Newton shared an electronic filing notification from the Immigration Court that his *Pro Se* filings had been rejected for lack of a Certificate of Service. That was erroneous because Petitioner's filings *did*, in fact, contain the required Certificate of Service. Petitioner tried calling the Clerk of Court the same day unsuccessfully as the Courts were already closed at that time. The following day, around July 8th, Mr. Newton shared another email of electronic notification from the court—the IJ had granted DHS' motion noting that it was "unopposed" and set a date for in-person appearance on or about July 7, 2026 at the Kansas City Immigration Court in Kansas City, Missouri.
10. Petitioner promptly filed a timely motion to reconsider to the IJ, pointing out the erroneous rejection by the Clerk and attaching the original motion yet again, along with the USPS mailing receipts proving service to DHS. He also explained to the court that he was diligently pursuing relief in the Northern District of Texas from his criminal convictions, that he believed he had meritorious claims that had a high likelihood of success. He also added that obtaining *coram nobis* relief would unlock additional avenues of relief from removal, potentially even obviating the need for the removal proceedings themselves; that it was most appropriate and efficient to continue

administrative closure for now, given the uncertainty of the length of time cases take winding up the Federal Courts.

11. Approximately two weeks later, around July 24th, 2025, Petitioner received mail at his home from the Immigration Court Clerk stating that his filing for reconsideration had been rejected by the Court because Petitioner is "represented by counsel." Petitioner decided not to press the issue further, hoping that his *coram nobis* petition would have been fully litigated before his next court date in the Immigration Court, and that the USCIS would have granted the straight-forward I-130 petition filed by his US Citizen mother in 2021.
12. Around July 30th 2025, Petitioner was fortunate to get approved for an automobile loan and took delivery of one. This was a huge milestone. He was making modest profits from day-trading and felt he could treat himself to something nice after suffering for so long in the past decade. He was also able supplement his income legally through independent contractor driving gigs. He paid taxes and registration fees of almost \$6000. He had also filed Federal and State taxes. He felt good about contributing to the economy. The darkness was finally beginning to lift. Dawn was coming. The weeks of August were exciting and pleasant. It felt dreamy.
13. Around August 20th, 2025, Petitioner embarked on an exciting road trip from Kansas City to New York with a companion M.W who was visiting from Kenya. It felt great to enjoy the new automobile and scenic drive. Petitioner cannot recall a time he had felt more alive. It felt like being born again. The journey brought them to the city of Detroit on the evening of Friday August 22, 2025. That is when everything came to an abrupt and tragic halt at around 9PM.
14. Petitioner accidentally and suddenly found himself near the Windsor Tunnel to Canada with no way to turn. He explained to the Customs and Border Patrol (hereinafter CBP) officer that he did not intend to proceed to Canada. Until now, Petitioner had never encountered Law Enforcement. 100% clean record. Not even as much as a traffic ticket. No history of drug or alcohol use whatsoever.
15. The officer demanded identification and lawful status. Petitioner explained he was in removal proceedings and had a court date in July 2026. Petitioner was instructed to park the vehicle and along with M.W go to secondary inspection while the vehicle was thoroughly searched. After a lengthy interrogation M.W was told she was free to go at around midnight. Being a stranger in a strange city and country and knowing no one

apart from me M.W was suddenly abandoned in the middle of the night.

16. Interrogation of Petitioner continued throughout the night with lots of fingerprinting. His driver's licence, expired passport, current passport and International Driving Permit were seized. No receipt was given. At some point he was called to sign some forms which he was informed he would receive copies of "soon after." Upon standing up from the bench, his left leg felt numb and weak and he fell. He didn't think much of it and attributed it to sitting down for too long on the hard bench surface.
17. Around 5AM, he was informed he had been detained. The nightmare had began. Just as his future was beginning to brighten it abruptly darkened again. He was placed in a small cold cell with no windows and bright lights that were never turned off. It was impossible to tell whether it was day or night. Sleeping was next to the floor with tiny blankets that barely provided any warmth. Nothing to do but stare at the walls. Untold mental torture. Worse than anything ever experienced in the penal Bureau of Prisons.
18. The vehicle was towed because there was no one available to pick it up. A CBP officer assured that all a family member needed to do was to state Petitioner's name to the towing company along with their Driver's licence and it would be handed over. Far from the case. A family member who had just experienced a miscarriage had to incur significant financial expense to fly all the way from Kansas to pick up the vehicle. Additionally she encountered difficulty with the towing company placing unreasonable demands for a copy of Petitioner's Driver's Licence, (which had been seized by the CBP), insurance and registration and a notarized letter from Petitioner. All of which were in his sole possession and extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain. Not forgetting the vehicle was racking up exorbitant storage charges daily. (It ended up accumulating over \$1100 in towing fees. Having now missed car loan payments, his stellar credit is irreparably ruined and vehicle is at risk of being repossessed. All that hefty financial expense—taxes & fees, towing charges seemingly for nothing.)
19. That Saturday afternoon, August 23, 2025, Petitioner was summoned by the officers and once again fell as soon as he had stood up. His left leg felt increasingly weak and he could barely lift it up. This was concerning, because he had never had any major prior medical issues. He informed one of the officers who advised him to perform "stretching exercises". To no avail.
20. The following day, Sunday afternoon, August 24, 2025 he fell again under similar

circumstances. The officer who was present informed the supervisor and an ambulance was called. He was rushed to the Detroit Medical Center where he was immediately admitted and remained for four days. He was advised to follow up with a neurologist as soon as possible.

21. On Wednesday, August 27, 2025 around 3PM he was discharged, handcuffed and transported back to the dreadful Windsor Tunnel Cells. A day later on Thursday, August 28, 2025, he was handcuffed and bundled up into the tiny space of the back of a Border Patrol SUV where his knees could barely fit and painfully rubbed against the metal surface, for the treacherous 2-hour drive to Calhoun County Jail. He was then housed in 23 hour lockdown in solitary confinement.
22. A day later on Friday, August 29, 2025, he was released into the general population amongst other ICE detainees where he remains to this day. The food is mostly bread and pasta; constipation is inevitable. Detainees are mostly locked down, awakened at 5AM with bright lights and loud sounds for standing count, and then again at 7AM for standing count again. But detainees are prohibited from leaving their bed until 7:30AM. Locked down again at 11:45AM until 12:30PM for count again, then again at 5:45PM to 7:30PM for 6PM and 7PM counts again and then finally locked down again at 9:45PM for 10PM count again. There is little time for any meaningful uninterrupted sleep. The hard sleeping surfaces without sheets nor pillow and the cold temperatures exacerbate the pain and numbness in his leg. He is yet to be seen by a neurologist as advised at the Detroit Medical Center. Mobility is difficult in the sandals provided by the jail. A request for medical shoes remains pending to this date. Petitioner suffers from severe allergy flares due to the dirty air conditioning vents located high up resulting in incessant sneezing and watery eyes even as he types up this motion in extremely cold temperatures with no warm clothing, shivering. Having spent significant time in several penal institutions for criminal detention, he can attest that the conditions are way worse, and far from being the required "meaningfully different from a penal institution for criminal detention." *Hamama v. Adducci*, 285 F. Supp. 3d 997; 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 421(E.D. Mich. 2018).
23. On Monday September 8th, 2025 Petitioner's mother accompanied by his sister arrived at the ICE office in Kansas City in hand the IJ's order granting \$7,500 bond and with a cashier's check for the same. They explained that they had tried to post bond through the online bond processing system "ICE CeBonds" but received a denial each time, with the system indicating "bond not permitted" or similar. They were rudely rejected by the

agent with the remarks "what you are holding is trash...he already got his chance and ruined it...he is illegal...he is going to be deported."


They then headed to a local Immigration attorney who immediately filed a request for bond electronically with the EOIR. A day later the clerk in the Kansas City Immigration Court rejected the filing saying Michigan was the only appropriate venue. However, the attorney mentioned he had no way of doing so because it had yet to be docketed in Michigan so there was nothing else to do but *wait*. Until *whenever* DHS would move the case to Michigan. Or file a habeas petition. But he added he was not licensed to practice in Michigan and we needed to find yet another attorney. That's when Petitioner by sheer luck stumbled upon some cases like his where a TRO had been granted, and because of financial inability to hire another attorney in Michigan, filed the instant petition *Pro Se*.

24. Perhaps most worrisome, with much difficulty, Petitioner recently learnt through his family that the government had filed a response to his *coram nobis* petition on September 3rd 2025 and his reply was due to be electronically filed 30 days from then i.e. October 3rd, 2025. The law library computer at the jail is outdated and the law library app on the tablet is almost always unavailable (displays an error "no seats available"). Complaints to the staff have fallen on deaf ears. The government's response offered no substantive defense to Petitioner's claims and instead relied on procedural bars. As a *Pro se* litigant, having the high stakes last opportunity of overturning his convictions, now more than ever Petitioner urgently needs access to proper legal research and writing resources in order to mount a meaningful defensive reply.

25. Petitioner asserts he has not received a single document from DHS, so he is unable to provide the court with anything at this time. He relies from memory to the best of his ability and respectfully urges the court to verify, if necessary, with electronic filing records of EOIR and Federal Court.

Signed this 21st Day of September, 2025

Jeffrey Sila

Jeffrey Sila A# 
Calhoun County Jail
185 E Michigan Ave
Battle Creek, MI 49014