

1 JON M. SANDS
2 Federal Public Defender
3 KEITH J. HILZENDEGER #023685
4 Assistant Federal Public Defender
5 250 North 7th Avenue, Suite 600
6 Phoenix, Arizona 85007
7 (602) 382-2700 voice
8 keith_hilzendeger@fd.org
9 *Attorneys for Petitioner Eshaghian*

7 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
8 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

9 Nader Eshaghian,

10 Petitioner,

11 vs.

12 Chris Howard, Acting Warden, et al.,

13 Respondents.

No.

Motion for a Preliminary Injunction

14
15 Along with his petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, Mr.
16 Eshaghian is filing this motion for a preliminary injunction and a temporary restraining order . In
17 his petition, he asserts that he cannot be removed to Iran, such that his continued detention by
18 immigration officials violates the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause. He also asserts that
19 his detention is illegal because he has not received notice and an opportunity to seek relief from
20 removal to a country other than Iran. Because he is almost certain to prevail on at least one of
21 these claims, he respectfully asks the Court to order his immediate release from custody while
22 this case is litigated.

23 “A plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on
24 the merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the
25 balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest.” *Planned*
26 *Parenthood Great Northwest v. Labrador*, 122 F.4th 825, 843–44 (9th Cir. 2024) (quoting *Alliance*
27 *for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127, 1131 (9th Cir. 2011)). “Alternatively, a preliminary
28

1 injunction may issue where serious questions going to the merits were raised and the balance of
2 hardships tips sharply in plaintiff's favor if the plaintiff also shows that there is a likelihood of
3 irreparable injury and that the injunction is in the public interest." *Id.* at 844 (quoting *Alliance for*
4 *the Wild Rockies*, 632 F.3d at 1135). Here, Mr. Eshaghian can make all four of these showings.

5 First, he is almost certain to succeed on the merits of his habeas petition. His continued,
6 indefinite detention in immigration custody violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth
7 Amendment because there is no significant likelihood that he can be removed to Iran in the
8 reasonably foreseeable future. He is not a danger to the community. Second, illegal confinement
9 is quintessentially irreparable harm, because "the deprivation of constitutional rights
10 unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury." *Melendres v. Arpaio*, 695 F.3d 990, 1002 (9th Cir.
11 2012). Third, and finally, when the government is a party, as it is here, "the balance of equities
12 and public interest factors merge." *Pimentel-Estrada v. Barr*, 464 F. Supp. 3d 1225, 1237 (W.D.
13 Wash. 2020) (citing *Drakes Bay Oyster Co. v. Jewell*, 747 F.3d 1073, 1092 (9th Cir. 2014)). The
14 risk of harm to Mr. Eshaghian far outweighs the government's interest in illegally detaining him,
15 for it is "always in the public interest to prevent the violation of a party's constitutional rights."
16 *Melendres*, 695 F.3d at 1002.

17 For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Eshaghian respectfully asks the Court to grant a
18 preliminary injunction and order his immediate release from custody.

19 Respectfully submitted:

November 5, 2025.

20 JON M. SANDS
21 Federal Public Defender

22 s/Keith J. Hilzendeger
23 KEITH J. HILZENDEGER
24 Assistant Federal Public Defender
25 *Attorney for Petitioner Eshaghian*
26
27
28