

1 JOSHUA A. CLEM
2 Trial Attorney
3 Arkansas Bar No. AR2023202
4 U.S. Department of Justice
5 Civil Division
6 Office of Immigration Litigation
7 P.O. Box 868, Washington, DC 20044
8 Telephone: (202) 253-6762
9 Email: Joshua.Clem2@usdoj.gov
10 Attorney for Respondents

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
12 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13 MAJID MOHAMMAD BEIGI,
14 Petitioner,
15 v.
16 CHRISTOPHER J. LAROSE, et al.,
17 Respondents.

Case No.: 3:25-cv-03913-DMS-MMP

JOINT STATUS REPORT

18
19
20 Pursuant to the Court’s November 26, 2025 Order, Petitioner and Respondents
21 (collectively, “the Parties”), through their respective counsel of record, respectfully
22 submit this joint status report. *See* ECF No. 7. The Parties, by and through counsel, met
23 and conferred via email correspondence on December 10 and 11, 2025, in preparing
24 this report.

25 **I. Bond Proceeding**

26 On December 8, 2025, Petitioner received an individualized custody
27 redetermination hearing pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). Thereafter, the immigration
28 judge denied Petitioner’s request for a change in custody status after finding Petitioner

1 did not meet his burden of demonstrating that he does not pose a danger to the
2 community. *See* Attachment A.

3 **II. Compliance with the Court’s Order**

4 ***Petitioner’s Position:*** Petitioner is preparing and will soon file a motion under
5 Rule 59(e) (to alter or amend a judgment) or Rule 60(b) (for relief from a judgment or
6 order), including asking the Court to reconsider its order denying Petitioner’s request to
7 be immediately released from custody, but granting Petitioner’s request to be provided
8 an individualized bond hearing pursuant to § 1226(a), and reviewing the IJ’s
9 determination that “Petitioner has not met his burden to show he is not a danger to the
10 community.”

11 ***Respondents’ Position:*** Respondents’ have fully complied with the relief ordered
12 by the Court. *See* ECF No. 7 at 5. Petitioner’s individualized custody hearing was
13 conducted pursuant to § 1226(a), and the immigration judge did not deny bond on the
14 basis that Petitioner was subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2). As such,
15 this matter is now moot, and Respondents would oppose Petitioner’s anticipated
16 motion(s) seeking amendment of or relief from this Court’s judgement.

17
18 DATED: December 11, 2025

19 /s/ Bashir Ghazialam with permission
20 BASHIR GHAZIALAM
21 Attorney for Petitioner

22 DATED: December 11, 2025

23 /s/ Joshua A. Clem
24 JOSHUA A. CLEM
25 Trial Attorney
26 Attorney for Respondents
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SIGNATURE CERTIFICATION

Pursuant to Section 2(f)(4) of the Electronic Case Filing Administrative Policies and Procedures of the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, I hereby certify that the content of this document is acceptable to Bashir Ghazialam, counsel for Petitioner, and that I have obtained Mr. Ghazialam’s authorization to affix his electronic signature to this document.

DATED: December 11, 2025

/s/ Joshua A. Clem
JOSHUA A. CLEM
Trial Attorney