

1 Steven K. Ridgill (SBN 338535)  
2 LAW OFFICE OF JUDITH L. WOOD  
3 201 S. Santa Fe Avenue, Suite 101  
4 Los Angeles, CA 90012  
5 Tel : (213) 680-7801  
6 Email : Steven@judy-wood.com  
7 *Attorney for Petitioner, ROLAND TUMASOV*

**DETAINED**

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 ROLAND TUMASOV, an individual,

Case No.: '25CV2704 AGS JLB

11 Petitioner,

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS  
CORPUS (28 U.S.C. § 2241)**

12 v.

***[WITHHOLDING OF REMOVAL  
GRANTED]***


14 DOE 1, Director of San Diego Field  
15 Office, U.S. Immigration and Customs  
16 Enforcement; TODD M. LYONS, Acting  
17 Director, U.S. Immigration and Customs  
18 Enforcement; KRISTI NOEM, Secretary,  
19 U.S. Department of Homeland Security;  
20 PAMELA BONDI, U.S. Attorney  
21 General; and DOE 2, Warden of Otay  
22 Mesa Detention Center,

Agency file no.:



23 Respondents.

1 **TO THE HONORABLE COURT AND TO THE PARTIES AND THEIR**  
2 **COUNSEL OF RECORD:**

3 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Petitioner ROLAND TUMASOV  
4 (“Petitioner”), A-Number , by and through his attorneys hereby  
5 petitions the Court for a Writ of Habeas Corpus, pursuant to Art. I, § 9, cl. 2 of the  
6 United States Constitution; 28 U.S.C. § 2241; 28 U.S.C. § 1331; and 28 U.S.C. §  
7 1651; and 28 U.S.C. §§2201, 2202, and for a directive to Respondents to  
8 immediately release Mr. Tumasov from his prolonged detention or, alternatively,  
9 immediately provide a bond hearing within ten (10) days of issuance of the Court’s  
10 writ.  
11  
12  
13

14 **INTRODUCTION**

15 1. Petitioner Roland Tumasov hereby petitions under 28 U.S.C. § 2241  
16 for a writ of habeas corpus seeking release from his 372-day confinement at  
17 Respondent’s Otay Mesa Detention Center in San Diego, California, because there  
18 is "no significant likelihood of [his] removal in the reasonably foreseeable future,"  
19 Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678, 701 (2001), the detention has been greatly  
20 prolonged, Mr. Tumasov has now been granted withholding of removal, and he has  
21 been recently diagnosed as suffering from Major Depressive Disorder, Generalized  
22 Anxiety Disorder, and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder. These last conditions  
23 constitute substantial and material changed circumstances justifying relief.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1           2.     Respondents have detained Mr. Tumasov since October 3, 2024, that  
2 is for 372 days, and yet the continued detention of Mr. Tumasov serves no purpose  
3 and should be ended immediately on legal and humanitarian grounds.  
4

5                                   **CUSTODY**

6           3.     Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents. He is imprisoned  
7 at Otay Mesa Detention Center, an immigration detention facility owned and  
8 operated by Respondents 7488 Calzada de la Fuente, San Diego, CA 92154.  
9  
10    Petitioner is under the direct control of Respondents and their agents..  
11

12                                   **JURISDICTION**

13           4.     12.    This Court has jurisdiction to entertain this habeas petition  
14 under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 2241, 2242, and 2255; the Due Process Clause of the  
15 Fifth Amendment, U.S. Const. amend. V; and the Suspension Clause, art I, § 9.  
16

17                                   **VENUE**

18           5.     Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and  
19 2242 because Petitioner is detained in this District, his immediate physical  
20 custodian (the Warden of OMDC) is located here, and a substantial part of the  
21 events giving rise to the claims occurred here. *See Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S.  
22 426, 434 (2004).  
23  
24

25                                   **PARTIES**

26           6.     Petitioner, Roland Tumasov, is a noncitizen currently detained by  
27  
28



1 Respondents at Otay Mesa Detention Center in San Diego, California. He has been  
2 in Respondent's custody since October 3, 2024.

3 7. Respondent DOE 1 is the Field Office Director responsible for the San  
4 Diego, California Field Office of ICE with administrative jurisdiction over  
5 Petitioner's immigration case. He is a legal custodian of Petitioner and is named in  
6 his official capacity. Respondent DOE 1 is sued under said fictitious name given  
7 the unavailability of public information regarding his or her identity. On  
8 information and belief, DOE 1 is believed to be agent or employee of the other  
9 Respondents. Upon discovery of the identity of Respondent DOE 1, Petitioner will  
10 seek leave to amend this Petition to provide the correct name.

14 8. Respondent Todd M. Lyons is the Acting Director of U.S.  
15 Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). He is a legal custodian of Petitioner  
16 and is named in his official capacity.

18 9. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of the United States  
19 Department of Homeland Security (DHS). She is a legal custodian of Petitioner and  
20 is named in her official capacity.

22 10. Respondent Pamela Jo Bondi is the Attorney General of the United  
23 States Department of Justice. She is a legal custodian of Petitioner and is named in  
24 her official capacity.

26 11. Respondent DOE 2 is the Warden of Otay Mesa Detention Center in  
27  
28

1 San Diego, California, where Petitioner is currently detained. He is a legal  
2 custodian of Petitioner and is named in his official capacity. Respondent DOE 2 is  
3 sued under said fictitious name given the unavailability of public information  
4 regarding his or her identity. On information and belief, DOE 2 is believed to be  
5 agent or employee of the other Respondents. Upon discovery of the identity of  
6 Respondent DOE 2, Petitioner will seek leave to amend this Petition to provide the  
7 correct name.  
8  
9

## 10 STATEMENT OF FACTS

### 11 Background

12  
13 12. Mr. Tumasov was born in Armenia on [REDACTED] (R.  
14 Tumasov Passport bio page, **Exhibit 1.**) In Armenia, Mr. Tumasov was beaten,  
15 threatened, and threatened with death at the hands of his employer and his  
16 employer's bodyguards. Mr. Tumasov's employers also threatened to physically  
17 harm his parents if he ceased working for them. Mr. Tumasov's employer was  
18 politically connected, and when Mr. Tumasov went to the police to complain, the  
19 police verbally abused him and refused to help him, advising that Mr. Tumasov's  
20 employer was too influential.  
21  
22

23 13. On or around October 3, 2024, Mr. Tumasov attempted to present  
24 himself for admission at the San Ysidro, California, port of entry and he was taken  
25 into ICE custody. (NTA, **Exhibit 2.**)  
26  
27  
28

14. On October 24, 2024, Mr. Tumasov underwent a credible fear interview with an asylum officer. The asylum officer found Mr. Tumasov to be credible and gave him a positive finding. (NTA, Exhibit 2.)

15. Mr. Tumasov remained in Respondent's custody and was given permanent housing at Otay Mesa Detention Center, at 7488 Calzada de la Fuente, San Diego, CA 92154. (NTA, Exhibit 2.)

16. On February 28, 2025, Mr. Tumasov was married his childhood sweetheart, Ms. Ruzanna Nikoghosyan, a U.S. Citizen living in Southern California. (Marriage Certificate, **Exhibit 3**; R. Nikoghosyan Passport bio page, **Exhibit 4**.)

### Irreparable Injury

17. On April 10, 2025, Ms. Nikoghosyan filed with USCIS a Form I-130 Petition for Alien Relative for her husband. (USCIS Receipt, **Exhibit 5**.) Ms. Nikoghosyan has twice requested an expedite of her petition but she has yet to receive an affirmative response.

18. On September 26, 2025, an Immigration Judge granting the relief of Withholding of Removal to Mr. Tumasov pursuant to INA § 241(b)(3). (Withholding Order, **Exhibit 6**.) Asylum was denied for the sole reason that the Securing the Border asylum bar was found to apply to Mr. Tumasov.

19. With the grant of Withholding of Removal Respondents are now



1 legally prohibited from doing so, and no arrangements have been made by  
2 Respondents to remove Mr. Tumasov to a third-party country.

3 20. Mr. Tumasov has now been detained for 372 days at Otay Mesa  
4 Detention Center.  
5

6 21. Mr. Tumasov was recently diagnosed by a clinical psychologist with  
7 conditions labeled as (1) Major Depressive Disorder, Recurrent and Severe without  
8 Psychotic Features; (2) Generalized Anxiety Disorder; and (3) Post-Traumatic  
9 Stress Disorder. (CV of Dr. Celina Marciano, **Exhibit 7**; Psychological Evaluation  
10 of R. Tumasov, **Exhibit 8**.)  
11

12 22. Mr. Tumasov's prolonged detention is grievously affecting his mental  
13 health and is causing him undue mental and emotional anguish.  
14

15 **Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies**  
16

17 23. Petitioner is detained with an order of removal and granting of  
18 withholding of removal pursuant to INA § 241(b)(3). Petitioner's right to appeal  
19 has been waived. Moreover, Petitioner has received an order of the Immigration  
20 Judge determining that no jurisdiction exists for the Immigration Judge to review  
21 Respondent's custody determination. (Bond Order, **Exhibit 9**.)  
22

23 24. Accordingly, Petitioner has no other avenue to challenge the legality  
24 or conditions of his continued confinement apart from a petition for habeas corpus  
25 challenging the "fact, duration, or conditions" of immigration detention. *Singh v.*  
26  
27  
28

1 *Holder*, 638 F.3d 1196, 1211–12 (9th Cir. 2011).

2 **LEGAL FRAMEWORK**

3 25. District courts retain jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 to consider  
4 habeas challenges to immigration detention that are sufficiently independent of the  
5 merits of the removal order. *See Singh v. Holder*, 638 F.3d 1196, 1211-1212 (9<sup>th</sup>  
6 Cir. 2011); *cf. Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281 (2018). Furthermore, a writ of  
7 habeas corpus is the proper avenue for prisoners to challenge the fact or duration of  
8 their confinement. *See Preiser v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475, 489 (1973) (a writ of  
9 habeas corpus is the sole available federal remedy when a prisoner challenges “the  
10 fact or duration of his confinement”).  
11  
12  
13

14 26. To succeed on a habeas petition, a petitioner must generally show that  
15 he is “in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United  
16 States . . . .” 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3).  
17

18 27. Under *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690–701 (2001), immigration  
19 detention is limited in duration and purpose; it must bear a reasonable relation to  
20 effectuating removal. Where removal is not reasonably foreseeable, detention  
21 violates due process. Previously the Ninth Circuit had emphasized that prolonged  
22 detention without individualized review raises grave due process concerns.  
23  
24 *Hernandez v. Sessions*, 872 F.3d 976, 991 (9th Cir. 2017). Conditions that expose  
25 detainees to serious harm constitute unconstitutional punishment. *Helling v.*  
26  
27  
28



1 *McKinney*, 509 U.S. 25, 33 (1993).

2 28. Whenever the government detains or incarcerates someone, it has an  
3 affirmative duty to provide conditions of reasonable health and safety. As the  
4 Supreme Court has explained, “when the State takes a person into its custody and  
5 holds him there against his will, the Constitution imposes upon it a corresponding  
6 duty to assume some responsibility for his safety and general well-being.”  
7

8 *DeShaney v. Winnebago County Dept. of Soc. Servs.*, 489 U.S. 189, 199-200  
9 (1989). As a result, the government must provide those in its custody with “food,  
10 clothing, shelter, medical care, and reasonable safety.” *Id.* at 200.  
11

12 29. Conditions that pose an unreasonable risk of future harm violate the  
13 Eighth Amendment’s prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment, even if that  
14 harm has not yet come to pass. The Eighth Amendment requires that “inmates be  
15 furnished with the basic human needs, one of which is ‘reasonable safety.’” *Helling*  
16 *v. McKinney*, 509 U.S. 25, 33 (1993) (quoting *DeShaney*, 489 U.S. at 200).  
17

18 Accordingly, “[i]t would be odd to deny an injunction to inmates who plainly  
19 proved an unsafe, life-threatening condition in their prison on the ground that  
20 nothing yet had happened to them.” *Id.*  
21

22 30. Immigration detention is civil in nature and must not be punitive. The  
23 U.S. Supreme Court has made clear in *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690  
24 (2001), that the government’s power to detain is limited by constitutional  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 principles. When removal is not reasonably foreseeable, detention becomes  
2 constitutionally suspect. The Ninth Circuit has applied this principle to make clear  
3 that civil detainees, like the petitioner here, are entitled to conditions of  
4 confinement that are superior to those of convicted prisoners and to those of  
5 criminal pretrial detainees. *Jones v. Blanas*, 393 F.3d 918, 933-34 (9th Cir. 2004),  
6 cert. denied, 546 U.S. 820 (2005).  
7

8  
9 31. Here, while Respondents were previously holding Mr. Tumasov  
10 pending attempts to remove him to Armenia, Respondents are now legally  
11 prohibited from doing so, and no arrangements have been made by Respondents to  
12 remove Mr. Tumasov to a third-party country. Nevertheless, Respondents have  
13 continued to detain Mr. Tumasov. As of the filing of this amended petition, Mr.  
14 Tumasov has now been detained for 372 days at Otay Mesa Detention Center.  
15

16  
17 32. Mr. Tumasov's prolonged detention is grievously affecting his mental  
18 health and is causing him undue mental and emotional anguish. This is exacerbated  
19 by the fact that Mr. Tumasov was recently diagnosed by a clinical psychologist  
20 with conditions labeled as (1) Major Depressive Disorder, Recurrent and Severe  
21 without Psychotic Features; (2) Generalized Anxiety Disorder; and (3) Post-  
22 Traumatic Stress Disorder.  
23

24  
25 33. Because Mr. Tumasov has now been granted Withholding of Removal,  
26 and because Mr. Tumasov is married to a U.S. Citizen who is petitioning for a  
27  
28

1 family-based visa for him, Mr. Tumasov should be released to await the  
2 adjudication of his petition with his wife.

3 34. In short, for these reasons, Petitioner's continued detention violates the  
4 Due Process Clause of the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment and *Zavydas v. Davis*. Furthermore,  
5 there are clear and weighty humanitarian factors justifying release.  
6

7 35. The instant petition does not merely challenge the conditions of  
8 Petitioner's confinement, but takes the position that no remedy other than  
9 immediate release is sufficient to address the harm that Petitioner continues to  
10 suffer.  
11

12  
13 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

14 WHEREFORE, Petitioner Roland Tumasov respectfully requests that the Court  
15 grant the following relief:  
16

17 1. Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus and directive to Respondents to  
18 immediately release Mr. Tumasov from his prolonged detention and permit him to  
19 reside with his U.S. Citizen wife while he awaits further adjudication of his family-  
20 based petition; or  
21

22 2. In the alternative, direct Respondents to provide Mr. Tumasov with a  
23 bond hearing within ten (10) days of the date of issuance of the Court's Writ;  
24

25 3. Award Petitioner his costs and reasonable attorneys' fees in this action  
26 under the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA"), as amended, 5 U.S.C. § 504 and  
27  
28



1 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and on any other legal and just grounds; and

2 4. Grant any other further relief as the Court may deem just and  
3 appropriate.  
4

5 Respectfully submitted,  
6

7 Dated this 10th day of October, 2025.  
8

9  
10 /s/ [Steven K. Ridgill]  
11 Steven Ridgill, SBN 338535  
12 LAW OFFICE OF JUDITH L. WOOD  
13 201 South Santa Fe Ave., Suite 101  
14 Los Angeles, CA 90012  
(213) 680-7801  
steven@judy-wood.com

15 *Attorney for Petitioner*  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**EXHIBITS**

1. R. Tumasov's passport biographical page ;
2. Notice to Appear, excerpt;
3. Marriage Certificate;
4. R. Nikoghosyan passport biographical page;
5. USCIS Receipt (Form I-130);
6. Order Granting Withholding of Removal;
7. Curriculum Vitae of Dr. C. Marciano;
8. Psychological Evaluation by Dr. C. Marciano; and
9. Immigration Judge Bond Order.

**CERTIFICATION**

This petition cannot be verified by ROLAND TUMASOV because he is in DHS custody. Consequently, the undersigned counsel for Petitioner hereby verifies that the information in this petition is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief based on information provided by the Petitioner.

SWORN under penalty of perjury this date of October 10, 2025, at Los Angeles, California.

*/s/ [Steven K. Ridgill]*

---

Steven K. Ridgill, attorney for  
Petitioner, Asghar Farsi  
Declarant