

1 SYLVIA L. ESPARZA, ESQ. NV #8444
2 Law Office of Sylvia L. Esparza
3 3340 Pepper Lane, Suite 105
4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89120
5 (702) 853-0233
6 Fax (702) 853-0234
7 Sylvia@sylviaesparzalaw.com
8 Counsel for Petitioner,
9 SAMUEL SANCHEZ APARICIO

7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
8 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA (LAS VEGAS)**

8 * * *

9 SAMUEL SANCHEZ APARICIO

10 Petitioner,

11 vs.

12 KRISTI NOEM, Secretary of the
13 United States Department of Homeland
14 Security;

15 PAMELA BONDI, Attorney General of
16 the United States;

17 THOMAS E. FEELEY, Field Office
18 Director of Salt Lake City Field Office,
19 U.S. Immigration and Customs
20 Enforcement;

21 REGGIE RADER, Henderson Police
22 Chief; and

23 MARIA BELLOW, Corrections Captain.

24 Respondents.

CASE NO. 2:25-cv-01919-GMN-DJA
Agency No. 

**OPPOSITION TO REQUEST FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME TO FEDERAL
RESPONDENT'S EMERGENCY
MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO
RESPOND TO PETITIONER'S
EMERGENCY MOTION FOR
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER
(ECF No. 11)**

25 Respondents have requested an extension of time to respond to Petitioner's Emergency
26 Motion for Temporary Restraining Order, which is due today, October 17, 2025. Respondents
27 are claiming they have had insufficient time to respond due to government furloughs and
28

1 unable to obtain documents from DHS and ICE. However, as set forth below, Respondents
2 have failed to demonstrate good cause, as required under Fed. R. Civ. P. (6)(b)(1)(A) and Local
3 Rule IA 6-1(a) of this Court.
4

5 Fed. R. Civ. P. (6)(b)(1)(A) permits this Court to extend time limits only upon a
6 showing of "good cause." Similarly, Local Rule IA-6-1(a) requires a demonstration of good
7 cause for any extension of time. Respondents have failed to meet this standard for the following
8 reasons: 1) Respondents have had sufficient time to respond 2) the legal issues are familiar to
9 the Respondent and 3) Petitioner continues to suffer irreparable harm.
10

11 Contrary to Respondents' assertion that they have had only two days to prepare a
12 response, Respondents have actually had a full week since receiving in-person delivery of the
13 TRO on October 9, 2025 (ECF No. 7 – Certificate of Service). This constitutes ample time to
14 prepare a response, even accounting for any government furloughs. Secondly, the legal
15 arguments at issue in this case have been extensively briefed in similar cases nationwide,
16 including several cases in this Court. Respondents are therefore already familiar with the
17 relevant legal issues and arguments, further undermining their claim of needing additional
18 time. Perhaps more important, Petitioner remains detained. Every day that Petitioner remains
19 in detention constitutes an ongoing and irreparable harm. The purpose of a TRO is to provide
20 immediate relief in situations where irreparable harm is occurring. Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b).
21 Extending the TRO would prolong this harm without justification.
22
23

24 Given the urgent nature of TRO proceedings, extensions should be granted only in
25 exceptional circumstances where good cause is clearly demonstrated. Respondents have failed
26 to meet this high standard.
27
28

1 For the foregoing reasons, Respondents have failed to demonstrate good cause for an
2 extension of time to respond to the TRO. They have had sufficient time to prepare a response,
3 are familiar with the legal issues, and any extension would cause continued irreparable harm
4 to Petitioner who remains in detention.
5

6 Dated: October 17, 2025

7 /S/ Sylvia L. Esparza
8 Sylvia L. Esparza, Esq.
9 Attorney for Petitioner
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28