

**Cardenas Immigration Law
Veronica Cardenas, ESQ
2 Arnot Street
Ste. 6, Unite 122
Lodi, NJ 07644**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

WASHINGTON MURILLO)	
CASTILLO)	
Petitioner,)	Civil Action No. 25-cv-16728
v.)	
)	
ACTING FOD JONATHAN)	
FLORENTINO, ICE, <i>et. al.</i> ,)	
)	
Respondents.)	
)	

PETITIONER’S MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b), Petitioner Washington Murillo Castillo (“Petitioner”), hereby requests a temporary restraining order (“TRO”) pending adjudication of their Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus and an order to show cause why a preliminary injunction should not issue pending the final disposition of their habeas petition. The habeas petition was filed on October 18, 2025.

As set in the memorandum of law, Petitioner is likely to succeed on the merits of their claim. Petitioner is unlawfully detained under Section 1225(b)(1), despite evidence that he was paroled into the United States.

Petitioner has been unlawfully detained for close to 5 months, away from his wife and children. Mr. Murillo-Castillo’s case is materially similar to this District’s decision in *Rivas Rodriguez v. Rokosky*, where the Court held that the issuance of a parole pursuant to DHS’s discretion under § 1182(d)(5)(A) meant that Respondents could no longer subject him to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1). *Rivas Rodriguez v. Rokosky*, 1:25-cv-17419-CPO, at *3 (D.N.J. Dec. 3, 2025). In holding that *Rodriguez’s* mandatory detention was foreclosed under § 1225(b)(1), the court found that the plain language under § 1225(b)(1)(A)(iii)(II), limiting it to those “who have not been admitted or paroled into the United States,” could not include the petitioner who had been paroled into the country. *Id.*

