ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney
KELLY A. REIS
Assistant U.S. Attorney
California Bar No. 334496
Office of the U.S. Attorney
880 Front Street, Room 6293
San Diego, CA 92101-8893
Telephone: (619) 546-8767
Facsimile: (619) 546-7751
Email: kelly.reis@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Respondents

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

OSMEL BENITO REYES-ALBENAS,

Petitioner,

v.

KRISTI NOEM, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security; *et al.*,

Respondents.

Case No.: 25-cv-3184-TWR-BJW

RESPONDENTS' RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO PETITIONER'S HABEAS PETITION AND APPLICATION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

I. Introduction

Petitioner Osmel Benito Reyes-Albenas has filed a habeas petition and a motion for temporary restraining order. ECF Nos. 1, 3. On November 21, 2025, the Court issued an order to show cause as to why the petition should not be granted. ECF No. 5. For purposes of judicial efficiency, given the petition and motion for temporary restraining order assert the same claims and seek the same relief, Respondents respectfully respond to both the petition and motion herein. For the reasons set forth below, the Court should deny Petitioner's request for interim relief and dismiss the petition.

II. Factual and Procedural Background

Petitioner is a citizen and national of Cuba. *See* Declaration of Osmel Benito Reyes-Albenas ¶ 1, ECF No. 1-2 at 2; Ex. 1 at 4.[1] In February 2020, Petitioner entered the United States by boat near Key Largo, Florida, while not in possession of a valid entry document. Ex. 1 at 2. Petitioner was determined to be inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(7)(i)(I) and placed in expedited removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1). *Id.* Petitioner was subsequently issued a Notice to Appear, which commenced removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a, section 240 of the INA. *See* Declaration of David Townsend ("Townsend Decl.") ¶ 5.

On May 28, 2020, Petitioner appeared for an individual hearing before an immigration judge. *See* Ex. 2. The immigration judge found Petitioner removable under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(7)(i)(I), ordered Petitioner removed from the United States, denied his asylum application, and granted his application for withholding of removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(3).[2] *Id.*

---

[1] The attached exhibits are true copies, with redactions of private information, of documents obtained from ICE counsel.

[2] 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(3) provides, with certain exceptions, that "the Attorney General may not remove an alien to a country if the Attorney General decides that the alien's life or freedom would be threatened in that country because of the alien's race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion." 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(3)(A).

Around June 3, 2020, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) released Petitioner from immigration custody on an Order of Supervision. *See* Ex. 3. On August 13, 2025, ICE re-detained Petitioner for purposes of executing his removal order. *See* Ex. 4. At that time, Petitioner was served a Form I-200, Warrant for Arrest of Alien. *See id.*

Since his re-detention, ICE has worked diligently to effectuate his removal. *See* Townsend Decl. ¶¶ 7–11. On August 22, 2025, ERO contacted its Removal and International Operations division for assistance in identifying a third country suitable for Petitioner's removal. *Id.* ¶ 7. On September 5, Petitioner requested that ERO remove him to Mexico. *Id.* ¶ 8. ICE drove Petitioner to the Mexico border to effectuate his third country resettlement, but Petitioner refused to comply with the removal process. *Id.* ¶ 9. Petitioner was thereafter returned to ICE custody. *See id.* ERO's request to the Removal and International Operations division to identify a third country for Petitioner's resettlement remains pending. *Id.* ¶ 10.

III. Argument

A. Claims and requests barred by 8 U.S.C. § 1252.

Petitioner bears the burden of establishing that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over his claims. *See Ass'n of Am. Med. Coll. v. United States*, 217 F.3d 770, 778–79 (9th Cir. 2000); *Finley v. United States*, 490 U.S. 545, 547–48 (1989). To the extent Petitioner's claims arise from—or seek to enjoin—the decision to execute his removal order, they are jurisdictionally barred under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g). Courts lack jurisdiction over any claim or cause of action arising from any decision to commence or adjudicate removal proceedings or execute removal orders. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) ("Except as provided in this section and *notwithstanding any other provision of law* (statutory or nonstatutory), *including section 2241 of Title 28, or any other habeas corpus provision*, and sections 1361 and 1651 of such title, no court shall have jurisdiction to hear any cause or claim by or on behalf of any alien arising from the decision or action by the Attorney General to commence proceedings, adjudicate cases,

or *execute removal orders* against any alien under this chapter.") (emphasis added); *Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 483 (1999) ("There was good reason for Congress to focus special attention upon, and make special provision for, judicial review of the Attorney General's discrete acts of "commenc[ing] proceedings, adjudicat[ing] cases, [and] execut[ing] removal orders"—which represent the initiation or prosecution of various stages in the deportation process."). In other words, § 1252(g) removes district court jurisdiction over "three discrete actions that the Attorney may take: her 'decision or action' to 'commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders.'" *Reno*, 525 U.S. at 482 (emphasis removed). Petitioner's claims necessarily arise "from the decision or action by the Attorney General to . . . execute removal orders," over which Congress has explicitly foreclosed district court jurisdiction. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g); *see also* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(f)(2) ("Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no court shall enjoin the removal of any alien pursuant to a final order under this section unless the alien shows by clear and convincing evidence that the entry or execution of such order is prohibited as a matter of law."). Accordingly, to the extent Petitioner's claims arise from—or seek to enjoin—the decision to execute his removal order, the Court should deny and dismiss those claims for lack of jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252.

B. Petitioner fails to establish entitlement to interim injunctive relief.

Alternatively, Petitioner's motion should be denied because he has not established that he is entitled to interim injunctive relief. Petitioner cannot establish that he is likely to succeed on the underlying merits, there is no showing of irreparable harm, and the equities do not weigh in his favor.

In general, the showing required for a temporary restraining order is the same as that required for a preliminary injunction. *See Stuhlbarg Int'l Sales Co., Inc. v. John D. Brush & Co., Inc.*, 240 F.3d 832, 839 (9th Cir. 2001). To prevail on a motion for a temporary restraining order, a plaintiff must "establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary

relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest." *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008); *accord Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 426 (2009). Plaintiffs must demonstrate a "substantial case for relief on the merits." *Leiva-Perez v. Holder*, 640 F.3d 962, 967–68 (9th Cir. 2011). When "a plaintiff has failed to show the likelihood of success on the merits, we need not consider the remaining three [*Winter* factors]." *Garcia v. Google, Inc.*, 786 F.3d 733, 740 (9th Cir. 2015).

The final two factors required for preliminary injunctive relief—balancing of the harm to the opposing party and the public interest—merge when the Government is the opposing party. *See Nken*, 556 U.S. at 435. "Few interests can be more compelling than a nation's need to ensure its own security." *Wayte v. United States*, 470 U.S. 598, 611 (1985).

1. Petitioner is unlikely to succeed on the merits.

Likelihood of success on the merits is a threshold issue. *See Garcia*, 786 F.3d at 740. Petitioner cannot establish that he is likely to succeed on the underlying merits of his claims because he is properly detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a), and his continued detention is not unconstitutionally indefinite.

a. Petitioner's detention is lawful, and he has not established that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future.

Petitioner is lawfully detained, as there is a likelihood of removal to a third country. *See* Townsend Decl. ¶¶ 7–10. Since his re-detention, ICE ERO has worked to effectuate Petitioner's removal as expeditiously as possible. *See id.*

When an alien has been found to be unlawfully present in the United States and a final order of removal has been entered, the government ordinarily secures the alien's removal during a subsequent 90-day statutory "removal period." 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(1). The statute provides that the Attorney General "shall detain" the alien during this removal period. 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(2).

The Supreme Court held in *Zadvydas* that when removal is not accomplished during the 90-day removal period, the statute "limits an alien's post-removal-period detention to a period reasonably necessary to bring about the alien's removal from the United States" and does not permit "indefinite detention." *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 689 (2001). The Supreme Court has held that six months constitutes a "presumptively reasonable period of detention." *Id.* at 701. Courts have repeatedly declined to grant habeas relief where the presumptively reasonable six-month period has not yet elapsed. *See Ghamelian v. Baker*, No. SAG-25-02106, 2025 WL 2049981, at *4 (D. Md. July 22, 2025) ("The government is entitled to its six-month presumptive period before Petitioner's continued § 1231(a)(6) detention poses a constitutional issue."); *Guerra-Castro v. Parra*, No. 1:25-cv-22487-GAYLES, 2025 WL 1984300, at *4 (S.D. Fla. July 17, 2025) ("The Court finds that the Petition is premature because Petitioner has not been detained for more than six months. Petitioner has been in detention since May 29, 2025; therefore, his two-month detention is lawful under *Zadvydas*.") (citations omitted).

Even after the period of presumptive reasonableness has run, release is not required under *Zadvydas* unless "there is *no* significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 701 (emphasis added). As the Supreme Court instructed, "the habeas court must ask whether the detention in question exceeds a period reasonably necessary to secure removal. It should measure reasonableness primarily in terms of the statute's basic purpose, namely, *assuring the alien's presence at the moment of removal*." *Id.* at 699 (emphasis added). In so holding, the Supreme Court recognized that detention is presumptively reasonable pending efforts to obtain travel documents, because the noncitizen's assistance is often needed to obtain the travel documents, and because a noncitizen who is subject to an imminent, executable warrant of removal becomes a significant flight risk, especially if he or she is aware that it is imminent.

//

The Supreme Court also instructed that detention could exceed six months: "This 6-month presumption, of course, does not mean that every alien not removed must be released after six months." *Id.* at 701. "After this 6-month period, once the alien provides good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future, the Government must respond with evidence sufficient to rebut that showing." *Id.* The Ninth Circuit has emphasized, "*Zadvydas* places the burden on the alien to show, after a detention period of six months, that there is 'good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future.'" *Pelich v. INS*, 329 F. 3d 1057, 1059 (9th Cir. 2003) (quoting *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 701); *see also Xi v. INS*, 298 F.3d 832, 840 (9th Cir. 2003).

Petitioner is subject to a final, executable order of removal, which means that he has no right to remain in the United States. ICE has long-standing authority to remove noncitizens and resettle them in third countries where removal to the country designated in the final order is "impracticable, inadvisable, or impossible." 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(2)(E)(vii); *see also* 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b) (outlining framework for designation). Accordingly, noncitizens like Petitioner, who have been granted withholding of removal for their country of designation, may be removed and resettled in third countries.

Section 1231(b)(2)(E) provides that the Secretary of Homeland Security shall remove the noncitizen to any of the following countries:

> (i) The country from which the alien was admitted to the United States.
> (ii) The country in which is located the foreign port from which the alien left for the United States or for a foreign territory contiguous to the United States.
> (iii) A country in which the alien resided before the alien entered the country from which the alien entered the United States.
> (iv) The country in which the alien was born.
> (v) The country that had sovereignty over the alien's birthplace when the alien was born.
> (vi) The country in which the alien's birthplace is located when the alien is ordered removed.

> (vii) If impracticable, inadvisable, or impossible to remove the alien to each country described in a previous clause of this subparagraph, another country whose government will accept the alien into that country.

Id. Accordingly, if the Secretary of Homeland Security is unable to remove a noncitizen to a country of designation or an alternative country in subparagraph (D), the Secretary may, in her discretion, remove the noncitizen to any country listed in subparagraphs (E)(i) through (E)(vi).

Here, Petitioner was ordered removed on May 28, 2020, and he was released from custody several days later. He has been in custody for less than four months since his re-detention on August 13, 2025. Thus, Petitioner's six-month presumptively reasonable removal period will not end until approximately February 7, 2026. Courts have repeatedly declined to grant habeas relief where the presumptively reasonable six-month period has not yet elapsed. *See Khalilova v. Smith*, No. 25-CV-2140 JLS (DDL), 2025 WL 3089522 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 5, 2025) (denying similar habeas petition brought on same grounds); *Ghamelian v. Baker*, No. SAG-25-02106, 2025 WL 2049981, at *4 (D. Md. July 22, 2025) ("The government is entitled to its six-month presumptive period before Petitioner's continued § 1231(a)(6) detention poses a constitutional issue."); *Guerra-Castro v. Parra*, No. 25-cv-22487-GAYLES, 2025 WL 1984300, at *4 (S.D. Fla. July 17, 2025) ("The Court finds that the Petition is premature because Petitioner has not been detained for more than six months."); *Ali v. Barlow*, 446 F. Supp. 2d 604, 609-10 (E.D. Va. 2006) (finding habeas petition was unripe for review where *Zadvydas* six-month period had not expired; dismissing petition without prejudice); *Gonzales v. Naranjo*, No. EDCV 12-1392 DSF (FFM), 2012 WL 6111358 (C.D. Cal. 2012) (same); *Waraich v. Ashcroft*, No. CVF051036, 2005 WL 2671406, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 19, 2005) (same).

ICE has worked diligently to secure Petitioner's removal to a third country. Shortly after Petitioner was re-detained, ERO contacted its Removal and International Operations division for assistance in identifying a third country suitable for Petitioner's

resettlement. *See* Townsend Decl. ¶ 7. Petitioner requested that ERO remove him to Mexico, but when he was taken to the Mexico border Petitioner refused to comply with the removal process. *Id.* ¶¶ 8–9. Petitioner's attempt at showing that there is no likelihood of removal while he refused to cooperate should thus be given no weight. *See, e.g.*, *Diouf v. Mukasey*, 542 F.3d 1222, 1233 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that the government could continue to detain the petitioner because it successfully completed his travel arrangements and "was not removed at those times solely because of his own refusal to cooperate"). ERO's request to the Removal and International Operations division to identify a third country suitable for Petitioner's resettlement remains pending. Townsend Decl. ¶ 10.

On this record, Petitioner cannot sustain his burden, and it would be premature to conclude otherwise before permitting ICE an opportunity to complete its diligent efforts to effect his removal. Evidence of progress, even slow progress, in negotiating a petitioner's repatriation will satisfy *Zadvydas* until the petitioner's detention grows unreasonably lengthy. *See, e.g.*, *Sereke v. DHS*, Case No. 19-cv-1250-WQH-AGS, ECF No. 5 at *5 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2019) (slip op.) ("The record at this stage in the litigation does not support a finding that there is no significant likelihood of Petitioner's removal in the reasonably foreseeable future."); *Marquez v. Wolf*, Case No. 20-cv-1769-WQH-BLM, 2020 WL 6044080, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 13, 2020) (denying petition because "Respondents have set forth evidence that demonstrates progress and the reasons for the delay in Petitioner's removal").

Lastly, Petitioner's claim that he may not be removed to a third country without adequate notice and an opportunity to be heard is subject to ongoing litigation, with the Supreme Court staying an injunction imposed by a district court ordering the government to provide notice and an opportunity to be heard like that requested here. *See Dep't of Homeland Sec. v. D.V.D.*, 145 S. Ct. 2153 (2025). Given the Supreme Court's reversal of that injunction, Respondents' position is that imposition of a similar injunction would be reversed here.

Based on the foregoing, Petitioner cannot prevail on his *Zadvydas* and third country removal claims.

b. Petitioner's complaints about procedural deficiencies in his re-detention do not establish a basis for habeas relief.

Additionally, Petitioner claims that the agency failed to comply with its regulations revoking Petitioner's Order of Supervision. ECF No. 1 at 7–10. Respondents have no information that Petitioner was provided notice of the reasons for the revocation of his release or interviewed after his return to custody.

But even assuming the agency's compliance with the relevant regulations fell short, Petitioner has not established prejudice nor a constitutional violation. *See Brown v. Holder*, 763 F.3d 1141, 1148–50 (9th Cir. 2014) ("The mere failure of an agency to follow its regulations is not a violation of due process."); *United States v. Tatoyan,* 474 F.3d 1174, 1178 (9th Cir. 2007) (holding that "[c]ompliance with ... internal [customs] agency regulations is not mandated by the Constitution" (internal quotation marks omitted)); *Bd. of Curators of Univ. of Mo. v. Horowitz*, 435 U.S. 78, 92 n.8 (1978) (holding that *Accardi* "enunicate[s] principles of federal administrative law rather than of constitutional law"). At the time of his re-detention, Petitioner knew he was subject to a final order of removal. *See* Declaration of Osmel Benito Reyes-Albenas ¶ 1, ECF No. 1-2 at 2. He also knew, based on his Order of Supervision, that although he was released in 2020, ICE would be continuing to make efforts to execute his removal order. *See* Ex. 3. And as illustrated above, because Respondents had, and continue to have, an evidentiary basis to determine there is a likelihood that Petitioner will be removed to a third country, any challenge that Petitioner would have raised under the regulations would have failed. *See, e.g.*, *United States v. Barraza-Leon*, 575 F.2d 218, 221–22 (9th Cir. 1978) (holding that even assuming that the judge had violated the rule by failing to inquire into the alien's background, any error was harmless because there was no showing that the petitioner was qualified for relief from deportation).

//

Moreover, Petitioner does not have a protected liberty interest in remaining free from detention where ICE has exercised its discretion under a valid removal order and its regulatory authority. *See Moran v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, 2020 WL 6083445, at *9 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2020) (dismissing petitioners' claim that § 241.4(l) was a violation of their procedural due process rights and noting, "[the petitioners] fail to point to any constitutional, statutory, or regulatory authority to support their contention that they have a protected interest in remaining at liberty in the United States while they have valid removal orders"). "While the regulation provides the detainee some opportunity to respond to the reasons for revocation, it provides no other procedural and no meaningful substantive limit on this exercise of discretion as it allows revocation "when, in the opinion of the revoking official ... [t]he purposes of release have been served ... [or] [t]he conduct of the alien, or *any other circumstance*, indicates that release would no longer be appropriate." *Rodriguez v. Hayes*, 578 F.3d 1032, 1044 (9th Cir. 2009), *opinion amended and superseded*, 591 F.3d 1105 (9th Cir. 2010), citing §§ 241.4(l)(2)(i), (iv) (emphasis in original).

Even assuming the lack of notice and interview were not in compliance with federal regulations, that allegation does not entitle Petitioner to release. In *Ahmad v. Whitaker*, for example, the government revoked the petitioner's release but did not provide him an informal interview. *Ahmad v. Whitaker*, 2018 WL 6928540, at *6 (W.D. Wash. Dec. 4, 2018), *rep. & rec. adopted*, 2019 WL 95571 (W.D. Wash. Jan. 3, 2019). The petitioner argued the revocation of his release was unlawful because, he contended, the federal regulations prohibited re-detention without, among other things, an opportunity to be heard. *Id.* In rejecting his claim, the court held that although the regulations called for an informal interview, petitioner could not establish "any actionable injury from this violation of the regulations" because the government had procured a travel document for the petitioner, and his removable was reasonably foreseeable. *Id.* Similarly, in *Doe v. Smith*, the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts held that even if the ICE detainee petitioner had not received a timely

interview following her return to custody, there was "no apparent reason why a violation of the regulation … should result in release." *Doe v. Smith*, 2018 WL 4696748, at *9 (D. Mass. Oct. 1, 2018). The court elaborated, "[I]t is difficult to see an actionable injury stemming from such a violation. Doe is not challenging the underlying justification for the removal order…. Nor is this a situation where a prompt interview might have led to her immediate release—for example, a case of mistaken identity." *Id.*

The same is true here. Whatever procedural deficiencies or delays may have occurred, they do not warrant Petitioner's release, and indeed could be cured by means well short of release. *See Morales Sanchez v. Bondi*, No. 5:25cv02530 AB DTB, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2025) ("While the regulations cited by Petitioner, 8 C.F.R. §§ 241.13(i)(1)–(2) and 241.4, establish procedural safeguards—including the requirements that revocation be based on a condition of release violation or on a significant likelihood of removal, and that the noncitizen receive notice and an informal interview—they do not create independent substantive rights that override the statutory grant of detention authority.") (citing *Jane Doe 1 v. Nielsen*, 357 F. Supp. 3d 972, 1000 (N.D. Cal. 2018) (concluding that agency rules must prescribe substantive law, not merely procedural or policy guidance, to be enforceable)).

Based on the foregoing, Petitioner cannot show entitlement to habeas relief and has thus failed to demonstrate a likelihood of success on the underlying merits.

2. Irreparable harm has not been shown.

To prevail on his request for interim injunctive relief, Petitioner must demonstrate "immediate threatened injury." *Caribbean Marine Services Co., Inc. v. Baldrige*, 844 F.2d 668, 674 (9th Cir. 1988) (citing *Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum Commission v. Nat'l Football League*, 634 F.2d 1197, 1201 (9th Cir. 1980)). Merely showing a "possibility" of irreparable harm is insufficient. *See Winter*, 555 U.S. at 22. And detention alone is not an irreparable injury. *See Reyes v. Wolf*, No. C20-0377JLR, 2021 WL 662659, at *3 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 19, 2021), *aff'd sub nom. Diaz Reyes v. Mayorkas*, No. 21-35142, 2021 WL 3082403 (9th Cir. July 21, 2021). Further, "[i]ssuing a

preliminary injunction based only on a possibility of irreparable harm is inconsistent with [the Supreme Court's] characterization of injunctive relief as an extraordinary remedy that may only be awarded upon a clear showing that the plaintiff is entitled to such relief." *Winter*, 555 U.S. at 22.

Petitioner suggests that being subjected to unjustified detention itself constitutes irreparable injury.[3] But this argument "begs the constitutional questions presented in [his] petition by assuming that [P]etitioner has suffered a constitutional injury." *Cortez v. Nielsen*, 2019 WL 1508458, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 5, 2019). Moreover, Petitioner's "loss of liberty" is "common to all [noncitizens] seeking review of their custody or bond determinations." *See Resendiz v. Holder*, 2012 WL 5451162, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2012). He faces the same alleged irreparable harm as any habeas corpus petitioner in immigration custody, and he has not shown extraordinary circumstances warranting a mandatory preliminary injunction.

Importantly, the purpose of civil detention is facilitating removal, and the government is working to timely remove Petitioner. Here, because Petitioner's alleged harm "is essentially inherent in detention, the Court cannot weigh this strongly in favor of Petitioner." *Lopez Reyes v. Bonnar*, No. 18-CV-07429-SK, 2018 WL 7474861, at *10 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 24, 2018).

3. Balance of equities does not tip in Petitioner's favor.

It is well settled that "the public interest in enforcement of the immigration laws is significant." *Blackie's House of Beef, Inc. v. Castillo*, 659 F.2d 1211, 1221 (D.C. Cir. 1981) (collecting cases); *see Nken*, 556 U.S. at 436 ("There is always a public interest in prompt execution of removal orders: The continued presence of an alien lawfully deemed removable undermines the streamlined removal proceedings [the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act] established, and permits

[3] Detention is different than removal. But a removal is also not an inherently irreparable injury. *See Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 435 (2009).

and prolongs a continuing violation of United States law.") (simplified). And ultimately, "the balance of the relative equities 'may depend to a large extent upon the determination of the [movant's] prospects of success.'" *Tiznado-Reyna v. Kane*, Case No. C 12-1159-PHX-SRB (SPL), 2012 WL 12882387, at * 4 (D. Ariz. Dec. 13, 2012) (quoting *Hilton v. Braunskill*, 481 U.S. 770, 778 (1987)).

Here, as explained above, Petitioner cannot succeed on the merits of his claims and the public interest in the prompt execution of removal orders is significant. The balancing of equities and the public interest thus weigh heavily against granting equitable relief in this case.

IV. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Respondents respectfully request that the Court deny the application for a temporary restraining order and dismiss the habeas petition.[4]

DATED: December 3, 2025

ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney

s/ *Kelly A. Reis*
KELLY A. REIS
Assistant United States Attorney

Attorneys for Respondents

[4] Because the record shows that Petitioner is not entitled to habeas relief, there is no need for an evidentiary hearing in this matter. *See Schriro v. Landrigan*, 550 U.S. 465, 474 (2007) ("[I]f the record refutes the applicant's factual allegations or otherwise precludes habeas relief, a district court is not required to hold an evidentiary hearing.").