

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
WAYCROSS DIVISION**

PIZARRO QUINECHE, Eder Simon, )  
 )  
 Petitioner, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 Warden, Folkston ICE Processing Center Michael Loeb )  
 In their Official capacity George Sterling )  
 Field Office Director of the Atlanta Field Office, )  
 U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; Todd )  
 Lyons, in his official capacity as acting Director of )  
 U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; )  
 Kristi Noem in her official capacity as Secretary )  
 of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security; )  
 Pamela Bondi in her official capacity as )  
 Attorney General of the United States; and Daren K., )  
 Margolin Acting Director for Executive Office for )  
 Immigration Review )  
 )  
 Respondents. )

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
HABEAS CORPUS**

**ORAL ARGUMENT  
REQUESTED**

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2241**

**INTRODUCTION**

1. Petitioner Eder Simon Pizarro Quineche is a native and citizen of Peru who was detained by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”). Petitioner entered the United States in August of 2022 without inspection. The Petitioner’s wife, stepchild, and child reside in the United States. He has no criminal history in the United States. Mr. Pizarro Quineche is being held without the possibility of bond at the Folkston ICE Processing Center based on the Department of Homeland Security’s reinterpretation of the statutes and regulations regarding bond eligibility.

2. Under INA § 235(b)(2)(A) and 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) an individual who is apprehended on arrival to the United States is an “applicant for admission” who is “seeking admission” and is therefore subject to Mandatory detention. Historically this has not applied to individuals such as Mr. Pizarro Quineche who entered the United States without inspection. Such individuals are typically eligible for bond under INA § 236(a) and 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) which allows for conditional release on bond and specifically applies to those like Mr. Pizarro Quineche who were charged as inadmissible for having entered the United States without inspection. The new interpretation of the statutory framework is contrary to precedent which holds that individuals like Mr. Pizarro Quineche qualify for a bond before an Immigration Judge. Further, Mr. Pizarro Quineche’s prolonged detention violates his rights under the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution.

3. Mr. Pizarro Quineche respectfully requests that this Court grant him a Writ of Habeas Corpus ordering his release from custody on bond. Mr. Pizarro Quineche also seeks declaratory relief that establishes that he is subject to detention under § 1226(a) and that he is therefore eligible for a bond and release from detention.

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4. Mr. Pizarro Quineche is currently in the physical custody of Respondents in the Folkston ICE Processing Center.

5. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (Habeas Corpus), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (Federal Question), 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act), 28 U.S.C. § § 2201-02 (Declaratory relief), 5 U.S.C. § 702 of the APA; and art. I sec. 9, cl. 2 of the United States Constitution (Suspension Clause), as Mr. Pizarro Quineche is presently in custody under or by color of the authority of the United States and challenges his custody as in violation of the Constitution, law,

or treaties of the United States.

6. The federal district courts have jurisdiction under Section 2241 to hear habeas claims by individuals challenging the lawfulness of their detention by ICE. *See, e.g., Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2011); *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510 (2003). The United States Supreme Court has upheld the federal courts' jurisdiction to review such claims in *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 292-96 (2018).

7. Venue is proper in the Southern District of Georgia, Waycross Division pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § § 1391 and 2241(d) because Petitioner is detained within the District at the Folkston ICE Processing Center in Folkston, Georgia.

#### **REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243**

8. The Court must grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus or issue an order to show cause (OSC) to the respondents “forthwith,” unless the petitioner is not entitled to relief. 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If an order to show cause is issued, the Court must require respondents to file a return “within *three days* unless for good cause additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is allowed.” *Id.* (emphasis added).

#### **PARTIES**

9. Petitioner Eder Pizarro Quineche is a native and citizen of Peru unlawfully detained at the Folkston ICE Processing Center in Folkston, Georgia.

10. The Warden of the Folkston ICE Processing Center controls the detention center where Petitioner is currently detained under the authority of ICE. As such, they have direct control over Petitioner and are his immediate physical custodian. They are sued in their official capacity.

11. Respondent George Sterling is the acting Director of ICE's Atlanta Field Office which has jurisdiction over ICE detention facilities including the Folkston ICE Processing Center

and thus is Petitioner's immediate custodian. He is sued in his official capacity.


12. Respondent Todd Lyons is the acting Director of ICE. He is responsible for the admission of ICE and the implementation of enforcement of the Immigration laws, including immigrant detention. As such Mr. Lyons is a legal custodian of the Petitioner. He is sued in his official capacity.

13. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of DHS which is responsible for the administration of ICE, a subunit of DHS, and the implementation and enforcement of the Immigration laws. As such, Ms. Noem is the ultimate legal custodian of the Petitioner. She is sued in her official capacity.

14. Respondent Pamela Bondi is the Attorney General of the United States and head of the Department of Justice which encompasses the Board of Immigration Appeals ("BIA") and the Immigration Courts. Ms. Bondi shares responsibility for implementation and enforcement of the Immigration laws with Respondents Lyons and Noem. Ms. Bondi is a legal custodian of Petitioner. She is sued in her official capacity.

15. Respondent Daren K. Margolin is the Acting Director of EOIR and has ultimate responsibility for overseeing the operation of the Immigration Courts and the BIA including bond hearings. He is sued in her official capacity.

#### **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

16. Petitioner was born in Lima, Peru on  and he entered the United States on one occasion in August of 2022 without inspection fleeing from persecution in Peru along with his wife and children. Once in the United States the Petitioner filed an I-589 application for Asylum and Withholding of Removal. The Respondent has never been arrested or convicted of any crimes in the United States. Just months ago, the Petitioner would have an easy case to be released on

bond. However, due to the Respondents' new interpretation of the relevant statutes and regulations, Mr. Pizarro Quineche is being forcibly and illegally separated from his family and community.

17. Petitioner had an Individual hearing on his I-589 Application and subsequently appealed the Immigration Judge's decision. The Board of Immigration Appeals dismissed the Respondent's appeal not on the merits but due to the Petitioner through his attorney filing his appeal out of time. The Petitioner has since filed a Motion with the Court to Reopen his proceedings.

18. Mr. Pizarro Quineche remains detained and away from his family and community and is being forced to litigate his right to be released on bond in federal court.

#### **LEGAL FRAMEWORK**

19. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) individuals are generally entitled to discretionary bond determinations when detained. 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19(a), 1236.1(d). Certain noncitizens who are arrested, charged with, or convicted of certain crimes are subject to mandatory detention until removal proceedings are concluded. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c).

20. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) certain noncitizens subject to expedited removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) are subject to mandatory detention as are recent arrivals "seeking admission" under INA § 1225(b)(2).

21. Following enactment of these statutes EOIR drafted new regulations stating that people who entered the country without inspection were not considered detained under § 1225 but were instead detained under § 1226(a). See *Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum Procedures*, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997) ("Despite being applicants for admission aliens who are present without having been admitted or paroled.... will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination.").

Thus from 1997 till a few months ago noncitizens like the Petitioner were eligible for bond upon detention.

22. Now, Respondents have adopted a new interpretation of the statute requiring detention for all noncitizens like Mr. Pizarro Quineche. The Petitioner is not the first to challenge this cruel and illegal reading of the statutes governing detention. In fact, research suggests that every district court to have addressed this issue has agreed with his position finding that the Respondents' reading of the INA is likely unlawful and that § 1226(a) not § 1225(b) applies to noncitizens who are not apprehended upon arrival to the United States. *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, No. 3:25-CV-0520-TMC, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2025 WL 1193850 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 24, 2025); *Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV11571-JEK, 2025 WL 1869299, at \*8 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025) (same) *Diaz Martinez v. Hyde*, No. CV 25-11613-BEM, --- F. Supp. 3d --- 2025 WL 2084238, at \*9 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025) (same); *Otero Escalante v. Bondi*, 2025 WL 2212104 (D. Minn. July 31, 2025).

23. DHS' and DOJ's interpretation defies the INA as these courts have found as a plain reading of the text of the statute supports the Petitioner's position that he is detained under § 1226(a) and therefore is eligible for bond. The text of § 1226(a) explicitly applies to those charged as inadmissible after entering after inspection. See 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E). Congress enacted this subsection in the Laken Riley Act to exclude from bond eligibility noncitizens who entered without inspection who commit certain offenses so if Congress wanted all nonimmigrants to be ineligible for bond it could have done so. There would be no need for Congress to specify that noncitizens who entered without inspection who also committed certain crimes are ineligible for bond under § 1226(c)(1)(E) if they were inherently ineligible under § 1225(b)(2)(A) for entering without inspection.

24. The Petitioner's approach is consistent with binding precedent in the Eleventh Circuit in *Ortiz-Bouchet v. U.S. Att'y Gen.*, 714 F.3d 1353 (11th Cir. 2013). The Eleventh Circuit in *Ortiz-Bouchet* found that noncitizens were not "applicants for admission" because they were seeking to adjust status while inside the United States as opposed to someone who was applying for entry at the border. This is also consistent with Supreme Court precedent which has held that mandatory detention applies "at the Nation's borders and ports of entry, where the Government must determine whether an alien seeking to enter the country is inadmissible." *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287 (2018).

### **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

#### **COUNT I**

##### **Violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)**

25. Mr. Pizarro Quineche incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

26. The mandatory detention provision of § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to all noncitizens. Despite the plain of reading the statute that has been the predominant interpretation for over 25 years, Respondents have adopted a new reading and applied it to the Petitioner in violation of the INA.

#### **COUNT II**

##### **Violation of the Bond Regulations, 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1, 1236.1, and 1003.19**

27. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as is set forth fully herein.

28. Congress and Respondents have made clear in the past that individuals who have entered without inspection were eligible for bond under § 1226 and its implementing regulations.

29. Despite this, Respondents have continued their policy of unlawfully detaining the Petitioner by misapplying § 1225(b)(2) in violation of the bond regulations, 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1, 1236.1, and 1003.19.

30. Because the Petitioner's detention has been unaccompanied by the procedural protections that such a significant deprivation of liberty requires under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution his continued detention without a bond hearing is unlawful.

### **COUNT III**

#### **Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act Contrary to Law and Arbitrary and Capricious Agency Policy**

31. Under the APA, a "reviewing Court shall...hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be...arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law." 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

32. As discussed mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to all noncitizens residing in the United States. Despite this, Respondents are implementing their new policy applying mandatory detention to all noncitizens like Mr. Pizarro Quineche in contradiction to the INA. Such application is arbitrary, capricious, and not in accordance with law, in violation of the APA. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2).

### **COUNT IV**

#### **Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act Failure to Observe Required Procedures**

33. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.

34. Under the APA, a "reviewing court shall...hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be...without observance of procedure required by law."

5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(D). The APA requires agencies to follow public notice-and-comment rulemaking before promulgating new regulations or amending existing regulations. 5 U.S.C. § 553(b), (c).

35. Respondents failed to comply with the APA by adopting its policy and departing from its regulations without any rulemaking, notice, or opportunity to comment. Respondents failed to publish any new rule, as required by 5 U.S.C. § 533(d).

### **COUNT V**

#### **Violation of the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution**

36. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraph as if set forth fully herein.

37. Under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution, “[n]o person” shall be “deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.”

38. “Freedom from imprisonment from imprisonment---from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint-lies at the heart of the liberty that Clause protects” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001). “The Due Process Clause applies to all ‘persons’ within the United States including aliens, whether their presence here is lawful, unlawful, temporary, or permanent.” *Id.* at 693.

39. Respondents’ mandatory detention of the Petitioner without the possibility of release on bond violates his due process rights.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that this Court grant the following relief:

- (1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;

- (2) Order Respondents to show cause why the writ should not be granted within **three days** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2243;
- (3) Grant a writ of Habeas Corpus ordering Respondents to immediately release Petitioner from their custody on bond;
- (4) Expedite consideration of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1657 because it is an action brought under the chapter 153 (Habeas corpus) of Title 28;
- (5) In the event that this Court determines that a genuine dispute of material fact exists regarding Petitioner's entitlement to habeas relief, schedule an evidentiary hearing regarding Petitioner's entitlement to habeas relief, schedule an evidentiary hearing pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2243. *See Singh v. U.S. Att'y Gen.*, 945 F.3d 1310, 1315-16 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2019);
- (6) Enter preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining Respondents from further unlawful detention of Petitioner;
- (7) Declare that Petitioner's detention violates the INA;
- (8) Declare that Petitioner's detention violates the Due Process Clause;
- (9) Declare that Petitioner's detention is arbitrary and capricious and in violation of the Administrative Procedures Act;
- (10) Award Petitioner attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act, 5 U.S.C. § 504 and 28 U.S.C. § 2412 and on any other basis justified under law; and
- (11) Grant any further relief this Court deems just and proper.

*[This space intentionally left blank; signature line on following page].*

Dated: November 25th, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ S. Eli Bennett  
(*Pro hac vice* application  
pending)  
Taylor Lee and Associates  
6855 Jimmy Carter Blvd.  
Suite 2150  
Norcross, GA 30071  
Phone: 770-650-7200  
immigration@htlweb.com  
Counsel for Petitioner

**VERIFICATION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2242**

I represent Petitioner, Eder Pizarro Quineche, and submit this verification on his behalf. I hereby verify that the factual statements made in the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated this 25th day of November, 2025.

*/s/ S. Eli Bennett*  
(*Pro hac vice* application pending)  
Taylor Lee and Associates  
6855 Jimmy Carter Blvd.  
Suite 2150  
Norcross, GA 30071  
Phone: 770-650-7200  
immigration@htlweb.com  
Counsel for Petitioner

# CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

**I. (a) PLAINTIFFS**  
 Eder Pizarro Quineche

**(b)** County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Charlton  
 (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

**(c)** Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)  
 S. Eli Bennett (pro hac vice application pending)

**DEFENDANTS**  
 Michael Loeb, Warden, et. al.

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Charlton  
 (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

**II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION** (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

1 U.S. Government Plaintiff

2 U.S. Government Defendant

3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)

4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

**III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES** (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF
Citizen of This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Citizen of Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Foreign Nation	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6

**IV. NATURE OF SUIT** (Place an "X" in One Box Only) Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	<b>PERSONAL INJURY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	<b>PERSONAL INJURY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 367 Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability <b>PERSONAL PROPERTY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 <b>PROPERTY RIGHTS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark <b>SOCIAL SECURITY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g))	<input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act <input type="checkbox"/> 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) <input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 896 Arbitration <input type="checkbox"/> 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
<b>REAL PROPERTY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	<b>CIVIL RIGHTS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other <input type="checkbox"/> 448 Education	<b>PRISONER PETITIONS</b> <b>Habeas Corpus:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 463 Alien Detainee <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty <b>Other:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition <input type="checkbox"/> 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	<input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Management Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 751 Family and Medical Leave Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act	<b>FEDERAL TAX SUITS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	

**V. ORIGIN** (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

1 Original Proceeding     2 Removed from State Court     3 Remanded from Appellate Court     4 Reinstated or Reopened     5 Transferred from Another District (specify)     6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer     8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

**VI. CAUSE OF ACTION**

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):  
28 U.S.C. 2241

Brief description of cause:  
Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus

**VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:**     CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.    **DEMAND \$** \_\_\_\_\_    CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: **JURY DEMAND:**     Yes     No

**VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY** (See instructions):    JUDGE \_\_\_\_\_    DOCKET NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: 11/24/2025    SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD: S. Eli Bennett (pro hac vice application pending)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # \_\_\_\_\_ AMOUNT \_\_\_\_\_ APPLYING IFP \_\_\_\_\_ JUDGE \_\_\_\_\_ MAG. JUDGE \_\_\_\_\_