

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

Hasiba Samadi A# [REDACTED]

Petitioner-Plaintiff,

v.

Kristi Noem, in her official capacity as Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Todd M. Lyons, in his official capacity as Acting Director, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Melissa B. Harper, in her official capacity as Field Office Director, New Orleans Field Office, Enforcement and Removal Operations, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; and Warden of Richwood Correctional Center, in their official capacity as the immediate custodian of Petitioner.

Civil Action No.: _____

Respondents-Defendants.

MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2241 AND EMERGENCY MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Petitioner: Hasiba Samadi

Alien Registration No: [REDACTED]

Pro Se Petitioner-Detained

Detention Center: Richwood Correctional Center

Address: 180 Pine Bayou Cir, Monroe, LA 71202, United States

Introduction

1. **Petitioner Hasiba Samadi respectfully petitions this Court for a writ of habeas corpus to challenge her indefinite detention by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and concurrently moves for emergency injunctive relief (Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction) to secure her immediate release.** Petitioner entered the United States on **December 15, 2024**, and has been detained from that date up to the present – now totaling almost **11 months** of continuous custody. Petitioner was granted **withholding of removal on May 9, 2025** – a protection that prevents her deportation to her home country – yet she remains detained with no end in sight. Despite *prevailing* in her immigration case, Petitioner has now been held in ICE custody for over six months after winning relief and total almost 11 months of being detained with ICE. This prolonged detention, even though Petitioner is not under any active deportation order to her home country, forms the basis of this habeas corpus petition.
2. **Petitioner's immigration case concluded in her favor on May 9, 2025, when an Immigration Judge granted her withholding of removal.** This form of relief was granted because Petitioner faces a serious risk of persecution if returned to her native country which is Afghanistan. As a result of the withholding grant, the U.S. government is legally barred from deporting Petitioner to that country. In practical terms, Petitioner is *not* under an enforceable deportation order to her home country – her removal order has been indefinitely “withheld.” No other nation has been identified as a safe third country willing to accept her. Thus, while Petitioner remains technically subject to a removal order, it cannot be executed in any foreseeable manner.

3. **Petitioner has now been detained well beyond the legally permissible period.** After the immigration judge granted withholding of removal on May 9, 2025, ICE was immediately barred from removing Petitioner to her country of origin. From that point forward, the Government had 90 days to effectuate removal to a safe third country under 8 U.S.C. § 1231. Once that 90-day removal period expired in August 2025 without any safe country agreeing to accept Petitioner, detention lost any lawful purpose and became unconstitutional under *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001). Even before the six-month presumption, courts have held that detention must end where removal is not realistically foreseeable in the near future, and here, the Government has failed to produce evidence of any safe country willing to accept Petitioner despite repeated inquiries. Now, more than six months have passed since the withholding decision, and the situation has not changed—no safe country has agreed to accept her. Continuing to detain Petitioner under these circumstances is violation of due process, as her removal is not reasonably foreseeable in the near future and detention has become purely punitive.
4. Although ICE claims it conducted a 90-day custody review, Petitioner has never had a real chance to challenge her continued detention. She has not been brought before a neutral decision-maker to decide if her confinement is justified. Instead, ICE issued the same type of boilerplate paper it gives to many detainees, calling her a “flight risk” and claiming there is “foreseeable removal,” without showing any actual evidence or considering her true situation. Simply putting a label on someone as a “flight risk” is not proof and cannot justify keeping a person locked up for months. Petitioner has no criminal record, has a sponsor and release plan, and cannot even legally be deported because she has been granted withholding of removal and petitioner is not flight risk. Keeping her in detention based

only on unsupported claims violates basic fairness and due process. Every additional day of unjustified detention is causing serious harm to her health and well-being, which is why immediate court intervention through habeas corpus and emergency relief **Temporary Restraining Order and preliminary injunctive relief is necessary.**

5. Even if ICE identify a potential third country that is not safe and she does not have ties to that country, Petitioner will still have the legal right to seek protection and to challenge removal to that country under U.S. law. Such proceedings are part of the lawful process and would take additional time to resolve. Therefore, removal cannot be considered **“foreseeable” in the near future.**

6. **Under clear Supreme Court precedent, ICE cannot detain a noncitizen indefinitely when removal is not reasonably foreseeable. In *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001), the Court held that after approximately six months of post-order detention, if the government cannot show a significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future, the detainee must be released. Petitioner’s case fits squarely within this rule: she has been detained well beyond six months, and ICE has no safe country willing or able to receive her. Courts have repeatedly acknowledged that even before six months have elapsed, habeas relief may be warranted where the Government cannot show a significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future. Indeed, in *Clark v. Martinez*, 543 U.S. 371 (2005), the Supreme Court confirmed that the *Zadvydas* limitation applies to *all* noncitizens held under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6), without exception. Continued detention at this stage “no longer bears a reasonable relation” to its intended purpose. Petitioner is being held without a realistic prospect of removal, which violates**

both the statute and the **Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause**. As a guide to courts, the Court in *Zadvydas* established a presumption that detention after a final order of removal was permissible for the six months or less if it is clear that the person can not be removed. Detention after a final order may be unlawful even when six months have not passed, particularly if it is clear that the United States will not be able to affect a noncitizen's removal.

7. **Petitioner's continued civil detention also violates the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause.** Civil immigration detention is not allowed to punish the detainee. Once it becomes clear that deportation cannot be accomplished, keeping Petitioner in custody becomes arbitrary and punitive, in breach of due process. Petitioner is not a danger to anyone and not a flight risk: she has no criminal record, has obeyed all rules, and has a sponsor ready to provide housing and support. Detaining a person like Petitioner *without any end in sight* or any legitimate rationale is fundamentally inconsistent with our Constitution's guarantees of liberty and due process.
8. **Petitioner's health has deteriorated severely during her unnecessary detention.** Petitioner is suffering from multiple urgent medical conditions that have become life-threatening during her prolonged detention. Petitioner has neurological problems, sometimes her hands shaking uncontrollably, which sometimes makes it difficult for petitioner to hold objects. Petitioner experiences cardiac and chest pain caused by continuous anxiety. Petitioner also suffer from digestive problems caused by previous H. pylori problem, which makes it impossible for her to take my prescribed medications, and food provided in detention is also inedible and lacks the nutrition needed for proper treatment makes it impossible for petitioner to take my prescribed medications. In addition,

Petitioner have mental health problems including Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), which give her severe nightmares, ongoing insomnia (the inability to sleep), and a constant fear that someone will harm petitioner. These conditions are not being properly treated by ICE, and each day, her health is deteriorating further, creating a true medical emergency.

9. One day, because of Petitioner's dental problem, the permanent stabilization wire from her previous orthodontic treatment came out, causing her extreme pain and difficulty eating. Since it was an emergency, ICE finally sent her to the hospital. At the hospital, the doctor only cut the wire, and it should be properly reconnected or replaced to prevent further dental damage. Without this treatment, her teeth will continue to shift, causing worsening pain, difficulty chewing, and long-term harm. When Petitioner requested ICE to provide follow-up dental care, she was told, "We do not have dental services here." This left Petitioner's dental treatment incomplete and her pain unresolved, showing another example of ICE's failure to provide necessary medical and dental care. Petitioner's condition is worsening daily, creating an imminent risk of irreparable harm and making continued detention unsafe, unconstitutional, and potentially life-threatening. Immediate judicial intervention is therefore urgently required.

10. For all the above reasons, Petitioner respectfully asks this Court to order her immediate release under reasonable conditions of supervision. Longstanding government policy has been to favor release of individuals who, like Petitioner, have been granted protection from removal. Indeed, since at least 2000, ICE's official policy has been to promptly release noncitizens granted withholding of removal, absent exceptional circumstances. Departing from this policy and detaining Petitioner indefinitely is unjustified and unlawful. Every additional day of Petitioner's detention is a day of freedom

unjustly taken from her. She urges this Court to restore her liberty as the law, the Constitution, and basic principles of justice require. In light of the urgent and ongoing harm described, Petitioner additionally requests that the Court issue a **Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) and/or Preliminary Injunction** to ensure her immediate release while this petition is under review, so that she does not suffer further irreversible damage to her health and rights.

Statement of Facts

- 1. Petitioner's Background and Grant of Withholding:** Petitioner was born on  2002; Petitioner is a native of Afghanistan who came to the United States seeking refuge from persecution. Petitioner entered the United States on 15 Dec 2024, and she is being detained since that time. After being placed in removal proceedings, she applied for asylum due to a well-founded fear of harm in her home country. On May 9, 2025, an Immigration Judge granted Petitioner withholding of removal, recognizing that she would face persecution if returned to Afghanistan. This grant of protection means the U.S. government cannot deport Petitioner to Afghanistan. Although a final order of removal technically remains in place, it is indefinitely *withheld* – effectively barring her removal to Afghanistan. Petitioner did not file an appeal with the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”). There is no other safe country designated in the removal order, though ICE theoretically could seek a safe third country. To date, however, no alternative safe country has been found to accept Petitioner.
- 2. Post-Order Detention and Duration:** Despite prevailing in her immigration case and securing protection from deportation, Petitioner has remained in ICE detention since the

day she won relief. She has now been detained continuously for over six months following the grant of withholding. In total, Petitioner has been detained in ICE custody for nearly 11 months since first entering the United States on December 15, 2024. Petitioner is held at the Richwood Correctional Center in Louisiana, within the Western District of Louisiana. The statutory 90-day "removal period" (see 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(1)) expired long ago. Nevertheless, ICE did not release Petitioner after that period. Instead, ICE has kept her in civil detention well beyond the time reasonably necessary to accomplish removal, even though she has already been recognized as a person who *should not* be deported to her homeland. As the Supreme Court explained in *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 701 (2001), detention is permissible only for the period reasonably necessary to secure removal. Where, as here, there is no foreseeable prospect of removal to any country, continued detention is unauthorized and unconstitutional. See also *Clark v. Martinez*, 543 U.S. 371, 378 (2005) (extending *Zadvydas* to all § 1231(a)(6) cases).

3. **No Safe Third Country for Removal:** There has been no progress toward removing Petitioner to any other safe country. Because of the withholding of removal, ICE cannot lawfully send her back to Afghanistan, and no safe third country has agreed to accept her. More than 6 months has passed since the grant of withholding of removal with no travel documents, no repatriation agreement, and no removal arrangements in sight. ICE has not identified any country where Petitioner has citizenship or ties that would consent to her admission. In short, Petitioner's removal is not reasonably foreseeable – a crucial fact underlying this petition. Even if ICE were to identify a potential third country that is not safe, Petitioner would still have the legal right to seek protection and to

challenge removal to that country under U.S. law. Such proceedings are part of the lawful process and would take additional time to resolve. Therefore, removal cannot be considered "foreseeable" in the near future.

4. Statistics bear out how unlikely a third-country removal is in situations like this: the government's own data show that less than 3% of individuals granted withholding or CAT protection are ever removed to an alternate country. It is exceedingly rare for another nation to accept a U.S. deportee who has no lawful status or connection there. In Petitioner's case, all available information indicates that no country is willing to receive her now or in the foreseeable future.
5. **Petitioner's Conduct and Character:** Petitioner has no criminal record whatsoever. She has never been charged with, let alone convicted of any crime. Throughout her time in the ICE custody, Petitioner has been fully compliant and cooperative with all requirements. She attended all immigration court hearings and obeyed every rule in detention. Petitioner poses no danger to the community. In fact, she has demonstrated admirable patience and respect for the law by pursuing her legal relief through the courts. Petitioner also has strong incentives to continue complying with authorities: having fought for and won protection, she simply seeks the chance to live safely under supervision in the United States. Nothing in Petitioner's background suggests she would be a threat or would violate conditions if released.
6. **Release Plan and Community Support:** Petitioner has a stable and vetted plan for release. A close relative (her cousin) has agreed to sponsor Petitioner and provide

housing for her. This sponsor is prepared to ensure Petitioner has transportation to any required ICE check-ins and can support Petitioner's basic needs upon release. Petitioner has already compiled a comprehensive release packet for ICE, including the address where she would live, letters of support from family and community members.

7. If released, Petitioner will have strong community support to ensure a safe and successful transition. Louisiana Advocates for Immigrants in Detention (LA AID) has committed to receive her upon release, provide meals, overnight shelter, necessary supplies, and safe travel arrangements so that she can reunite with her family in New York. This assistance guarantees stability, supervision, and continuity of care outside detention, further demonstrating that release is both safe and appropriate. Petitioner is not a flight risk – to the contrary, she has every reason to stay in good standing. In sum, Petitioner has significant ties and a support network in the U.S, and a clear plan that would allow her to live under supervision without incident.

11. **Deteriorating Health in Detention:** Petitioner is suffering from multiple urgent medical conditions that have become life-threatening that caused by her prolonged detention. Petitioner has neurological problems, sometimes her hands shaking uncontrollably, which sometimes makes it difficult for petitioner to hold objects. Petitioner experiences cardiac and chest pain caused by continuous anxiety. Petitioner also suffer from digestive problems caused by previous H. pylori problem, which makes it impossible for petitioner to take my prescribed medications, and food provided in detention is also inedible and lacks the nutrition needed for proper treatment makes it impossible for her to take her prescribed medications. In addition, Petitioner have mental health problems including Post-Traumatic

Stress Disorder (PTSD), which give her severe nightmares, ongoing insomnia (the inability to sleep), and a constant fear that someone will harm petitioner. These conditions are not being properly treated by ICE, and each day, her health is deteriorating further, creating a true medical emergency. One day, because of Petitioner's dental problem, the permanent stabilization wire from her previous orthodontic treatment came out, causing her extreme pain and difficulty eating. Since it was an emergency, ICE finally sent her to the hospital. At the hospital, the doctor only cut the wire, and it should be properly reconnected or replaced to prevent further dental damage. Without this treatment, her teeth will continue to shift, causing worsening pain, difficulty chewing, and long-term harm. When Petitioner requested ICE to provide follow-up dental care, she was told, "We do not have dental services here." This left Petitioner's dental treatment incomplete and her pain unresolved, showing another example of ICE's failure to provide necessary medical and dental care. Petitioner's condition is worsening daily, creating an imminent risk of irreparable harm and making continued detention unsafe, unconstitutional, and potentially life-threatening. Immediate judicial intervention is therefore urgently required.

8. **Repeated but Ignored Release Requests:** Petitioner by herself and through her attorney – has made multiple requests to ICE for her release. Given that she was granted withholding of removal and has no disqualifying factors, Petitioner requested parole or an order of supervision as permitted by ICE's post-order custody review regulations. These requests have been met with silence or perfunctory denials, nor given any meaningful updates on efforts to remove Petitioner to a third country. As the months have passed, Petitioner remains in limbo – detained without any timeline or plan for her release.

9. **Summary of Petitioner's Situation:** In sum, Petitioner is a person who has won protection from removal but is nonetheless jailed indefinitely. She cannot be sent back to her home country, and no other safe country has agreed to accept her. She has been detained far beyond the presumptively reasonable period established by the Supreme Court, with no indication that actual removal will ever occur. Petitioner is detainee with no criminal history, strong family support, and a safe place to live upon release. Yet she remains behind bars, and her health is worsening by the day. These facts demonstrate that Petitioner's detention has become effectively indefinite and without purpose. Petitioner now turns to this Court for relief, as her continued detention violates both established law and the Constitution.

Jurisdiction and Legal Standard

Jurisdiction: This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this Petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Petitioner is presently in custody under the authority of the United States, and she asserts that her detention violates the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States. A federal district court has jurisdiction under § 2241 to hear habeas corpus claims by immigration detainees who are held within its jurisdiction. Petitioner is detained at a facility within the Western District of Louisiana, so venue is proper in this District. The immediate custodian and the relevant ICE officials are subject to the Court's habeas jurisdiction. There are no statutory bars to this Court's review: Petitioner is not seeking review of her withholding of removal order but rather challenges the legality of her detention. Habeas corpus is the appropriate vehicle for such a challenge, as it provides a forum to address restrictions on liberty imposed without lawful basis.

Legal Framework for Post-Removal Detention: Petitioner's detention is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1231, which establishes the authority and limits for detaining noncitizens. Under § 1231(a), when a noncitizen is ordered removed, the government has a 90-day "removal period" to execute the removal. Detention during those 90 days is mandatory. However, if removal cannot be accomplished within that period, the statute authorizes only continued detention for a period reasonably necessary to effectuate removal – and even then, the detention is subject to periodic administrative review. Critically, the Supreme Court has made clear that § 1231 does not permit indefinite detention. In *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001), the Court, to avoid constitutional problems, read an implicit time limitation into the statute: after approximately six months of post-order detention, if the noncitizen can show that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future. Detention can be unlawful even when six months have not passed, particularly if it is clear that the United States will not be able to affect a noncitizen's removal. If removal is not reasonably foreseeable, detention "no longer bears [a] reasonable relation to the purpose for which the individual was committed" and must end (quoting *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690).

Constitutional Standard: The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment imposes an independent limit on civil immigration detention. Noncitizens are entitled to freedom from bodily restraint unless confinement is justified by a sufficient governmental interest. Civil detention must always be reasonably related to a legitimate governmental purpose and not excessive in relation to that purpose. Once that purpose can no longer be served – for example, if removal is not practically attainable – then continued detention

is *unreasonable and unconstitutional*. The Supreme Court in *Zadvydas* recognized that indefinite detention of a noncitizen “**would raise serious constitutional concerns**” under the Due Process Clause. Thus, due process requires that prolonged detention be closely scrutinized and that a noncitizen be released if confinement becomes **arbitrary or punitive** rather than administrative. In Petitioner’s case, both the **statutory standards** (as interpreted in *Zadvydas*) and the **constitutional standards** have been exceeded and breached.

Standard for TRO and Preliminary Injunction: When evaluating Petitioner’s claims, this Court must also consider the standard for granting **Temporary Restraining Order and preliminary injunctive relief**. To obtain such relief, a petitioner generally must demonstrate: (1) a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of her claims; (2) that she will suffer irreparable harm in the absence of relief; (3) that the balance of equities (hardships) tips in her favor; and (4) that the requested injunction is in the public interest. As detailed below, Petitioner meets **all four** of these criteria in addition to showing clear entitlement to habeas relief.

Arguments

❖ Prolonged Detention Has Become Unconstitutional: Violation of Due Process

1. The Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause is being violated by Petitioner's continued confinement. She has now endured almost eleven months in ICE custody, including over 6 months since being granted withholding of removal on May 9, 2025. Because U.S. law forbids her return to her home country and ICE has failed to secure any alternative safe country of removal, her detention no longer serves its only legitimate purpose and has become arbitrary and punitive. The Constitution does not allow the government to deprive a person of liberty when there is no realistic prospect of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future. Worse still, this prolonged confinement is inflicting grave harm on her physical and mental health: she suffers from neurological problems, digestive complications, PTSD, anxiety, and insomnia, all of which have been aggravated by her detention. A civil detention that serves no lawful goal while actively destroying an individual's health is precisely the kind of unconstitutional, indefinite imprisonment condemned in *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001). For these reasons, her immediate release is required.
2. Petitioner's continued detention violates her rights under the **Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause**. When civil detention stretches on without a reasonable prospect of achieving its goal, it transforms into something punitive and **constitutionally impermissible**. In Petitioner's case, detention is no longer serving the immigration purpose; it has effectively become **punishment for punishment's sake**, which cannot be squared with due process.
3. **No Legitimate Purpose – Detention as Punishment**: Petitioner's detention has now lasted so long, and with so little progress, that it has lost any valid regulatory purpose and has

become **punitive in effect**. Petitioner is not being punished for a crime – she has committed none. Here, keeping Petitioner locked up **does not help effectuate her removal at all**, since no removal is possible at this time. When detention serves no purpose except perhaps to deter others or to oppress the detainee, it crosses the line into **improper punishment**. As one federal court observed: civil detention “may not be punitive” and **cannot continue once it lacks a valid regulatory purpose**. The Department of Homeland Security itself has recognized in the past that detention should not be prolonged when removal is not likely, because to do so raises constitutional red flags. Here, ICE’s justifications have evaporated, leaving only the bare fact of Petitioner’s imprisonment – an imprisonment that feels arbitrary and cruel. Indeed, in *R.I.L.-R v. Johnson*, 80 F. Supp. 3d 164 (D.D.C. 2015), a federal court enjoined a DHS policy of detaining asylum-seekers en masse to deter others from migrating, holding that a **“no-release” detention policy not tied to individual risk factors was impermissible**. By the same logic, continuing to detain Petitioner for almost a year with **no plan and no individualized reason** is not justified by any legitimate government aim – it is **unlawfully punitive**.

4. **Arbitrariness and Indefiniteness: Due process forbids arbitrary incarceration.** The Supreme Court in *Zadvydas* noted that allowing indefinite detention of a person who cannot be deported would raise a serious constitutional problem, as it would mean the executive branch could jail someone forever with no goal or end point. Petitioner’s plight is exactly what due process guards against: **indefinite detention with no foreseeable end**. Every additional day Petitioner spends behind bars is a further deprivation of liberty without justification. Such detention becomes **excessive and arbitrary**, since Petitioner’s liberty is being denied not because of what she has done (she’s done nothing wrong) but simply because of bureaucratic inertia and

policy choices. The Fifth Amendment does not countenance imprisonment that is no longer rationally connected to its original purpose. In Petitioner's case, the original purpose can't be achieved, so there is *no rational connection* between Petitioner's detention and any valid government interest. Continuing to hold her in these circumstances is tantamount to detaining someone for **no reason at all**, which is the definition of arbitrary detention.

5. **Lack of Procedural Protections:** The manner in which Petitioner's detention has been managed raises serious due process concerns. Although ICE has conducted a **90-day custody review** pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 241.4(e), Petitioner has not received any meaningful opportunity to contest her continued detention. She was never afforded a hearing before a neutral decision-maker to assess whether her prolonged confinement is justified. Instead, ICE unilaterally issued a boilerplate decision based on vague and speculative claims of "**flight risk**" and "**foreseeable removal**," without offering any concrete evidence or considering Petitioner's actual circumstances. ICE's determination lacks both factual support and legal foundation. Petitioner has no criminal history, has fully complied with all requirements, and has a stable sponsor and release plan in place. Despite this, ICE continues to detain her without judicial oversight or the basic procedural safeguards required under the Constitution.

6. **Ongoing Harm to Petitioner's Fundamental Liberty Interests:** Freedom from physical detention lies at the heart of the liberty protected by due process. Petitioner has now been separated from her life, family, and community for almost a year, suffering severe mental and physical harm as a result. The **injury to her rights is irreparable and growing**. Courts have consistently recognized that indefinite detention "without [a] sufficiently strong justification" violates due process. Here, there is *no justification at all*—only the government's insistence on

detention for its own sake. Petitioner's case vividly illustrates the very dangers that concerned the Supreme Court in *Zadvydas*: executive detention that becomes permanent and unchecked, effectively nullifying the promise of due process. The Court should not permit ICE to continue what has become an unconstitutional deprivation of liberty. The appropriate remedy for this due process violation is immediate release. No lesser alternative (such as another round of internal review or waiting even longer) can cure the harm, because time is of the essence when someone is unjustly jailed. Every additional day of unjustified incarceration further compounds the injury to Petitioner's rights. The only way to vindicate the Constitution's guarantee in this situation is to end Petitioner's unlawful detention.

❖ **Removal Is Not Reasonably Foreseeable in the near future, So Petitioner's Detention Is Unlawful Under § 1231 and *Zadvydas***

7. Under the framework set forth in *Zadvydas v. Davis*, Petitioner's continued detention is unlawful because her removal is not significantly likely in the reasonably foreseeable future. Petitioner has been in post-order custody for well over six months, which means the burden has shifted to the government to show that her deportation is imminent. The government cannot meet this burden here. ICE has no viable plan to remove her anytime soon. Her home country (Afghanistan) is off-limits due to the grant of withholding. ICE's attempts (if any) to find a safe third country have yielded nothing. There are no travel documents, no host country, and no timeline for removal in place. This is precisely the scenario the Supreme Court addressed in *Zadvydas*: when deportation is not practical within the reasonably foreseeable future, continued detention exceeds the government's authority under 8 U.S.C. § 1231.

8. Petitioner has now been detained well beyond the legally permissible period. After the immigration judge granted withholding of removal on May 9, 2025, ICE was immediately barred from removing Petitioner to her country of origin. From that point forward, the Government had only 90 days to effectuate removal to a third country under 8 U.S.C. § 1231. Once that 90-day removal period expired in August 2025 without any safe country agreeing to accept Petitioner, detention lost any lawful purpose and became unconstitutional under *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001). Even before the six-month presumption, courts have held that detention must end where removal is not realistically foreseeable in the near future, and here, the Government has failed to produce evidence of any country willing to accept Petitioner despite repeated inquiries. Now, more than six months have passed since the withholding decision, and the situation has not changed—no safe country has agreed to accept her. Continuing to detain Petitioner under these circumstances is not only unlawful but also a violation of due process, as her removal is not reasonably foreseeable in the near future and detention has become purely punitive.
9. Courts have rejected conclusory claims by ICE agents which claim, without submitting concrete factual information about scheduled flights or travel documents, that removal is imminent. “[A] theoretical possibility of eventually being removed does not satisfy the government’s burden once the removal period has expired and the petitioner establishes good reason to believe his removal is not significantly likely in the reasonably foreseeable future. **Even if ICE were to identify a potential third country that is not safe, Petitioner would still have the legal right to seek protection and to challenge removal to that country under**

U.S. law. Such proceedings are part of the lawful process and would take additional time to resolve. Therefore, removal cannot be considered “foreseeable” in the near future.

10. Petitioner’s continued detention is marked not only by the absence of any lawful purpose but also by a pattern of coercive and unprofessional conduct by ICE officers and agents. On October 23, 2025, an officer attempted to make Petitioner into signing a “voluntary departure” form, despite her having been granted withholding of removal by an Immigration Judge. When Petitioner refused, explaining that she was legally protected and can not legally be removed to Afghanistan, the employee reacted in a hostile manner—crumpling the document, setting it aside, and stating, “so get out.” This incident reflects the broader environment in which detainees are routinely intimidated, treated as criminals despite no criminal convictions, and deprived of clear communication regarding their status. When detainees ask officers what will happen in their cases, they are told only to “go and ask your deportation officer.” Yet when deportation officers are contacted—whether by detainees directly or by counsel—they frequently do not respond, and when they do, their replies are vague and fail to address the inquiries made. Such conduct demonstrates that Petitioner’s detention is not serving the statutory purpose of facilitating removal, but rather has become indefinite, punitive confinement, which the Supreme Court has made clear is unlawful under *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001).

11. Multiple courts have ordered the release of detainees in situations like Petitioner’s, where removal was not forthcoming. For example, in *Castro Balza v. Barr*, No. 6:20-CV-00866, 2020 WL 6143643 (W.D. La. Sept. 17, 2020) (R&R), adopted, 2020 WL 6064881 (W.D. La. Oct. 14, 2020), a court in this District released an ICE detainee from Venezuela who had been

held beyond six months because **no country would accept him for removal**. Venezuela at that time refused to issue travel documents or receive deportees from the U.S., rendering removal impossible. The court recognized that continued detention under those circumstances served no purpose and was unlawful, and it ordered the detainee freed. Petitioner's case is on all fours with *Castro Balza*: her designated removal country will not accept her (indeed, it's legally barred in light of her protection grant), and **no safe third country is available**. As in *Castro Balza*, this Court should conclude that further detention of Petitioner **has no legitimate purpose and is not authorized by statute**.

12. Furthermore, the Government's own long-standing policies support Petitioner's release when removal is not imminent. Since at least 2000, ICE's official policy (reiterated in multiple directives) has been to **favor the release** of individuals who have been granted withholding of removal or CAT relief, absent exceptional circumstances. This policy exists precisely because holding such individuals is generally unnecessary and raises constitutional concerns. Yet in Petitioner's case, ICE has inexplicably deviated from that policy, continuing to detain her with **no end in sight**. Such a departure is arbitrary. In fact, in recent litigation challenging the detention of withholding-of-removal grantees, advocates noted that ICE's failure to follow its own release policy "*ignores important protections*" against indefinite and arbitrary detention. Courts have the authority to enforce the statutory limitation that detention may last only a reasonable period to secure removal. Here, the **reasonable period has long since passed**, and the rationale for detention has evaporated. Accordingly, under *Zadvydas* and 8 U.S.C. § 1231, Petitioner is entitled to immediate release under appropriate supervision.

13. Notably, the government's inability to remove Petitioner is not a temporary hiccup but a likely long-term (if not permanent) obstacle. Petitioner's situation is emblematic of a broader reality: when a person is granted withholding of removal, it is exceedingly rare for ICE to find a willing safe third country for removal. As mentioned, less than 3% of individuals with withholding/CAT relief are ever removed to a different country. The overwhelming majority (97%+) are not removed to any alternate country. This is because third-country removals face numerous hurdles – countries are often unwilling to accept strangers with no ties, and the individuals have rights to contest removal to new countries as well. In short, if a person cannot be removed to their home country due to fear of persecution (as in Petitioner's case), the realistic outcome is that they will remain in the U.S. ICE's usual practice for decades was to release such people under supervision, precisely because continued detention would be indefinite and futile. Petitioner's ongoing detention defies that historical practice and common sense. Since there is *no significant likelihood of removal* in Petitioner's case, the law says she should not be detained any longer.

14. Finally, Petitioner has met her burden under *Zadvydas* by demonstrating the unlikelihood of removal, shifting the burden to the Government to prove otherwise. However, ICE has not offered yet any evidence or argument that Petitioner's removal is likely in the near future. There have been no updates of progress, no details of negotiations with any country, and no scheduled deportation date. ICE is, in essence, keeping Petitioner detained without a plan. In *Zadvydas*, the Supreme Court warned that once the purpose of detention cannot be fulfilled, continued detention is not authorized. ICE's inaction here speaks volumes: it has no realistic prospect of deporting Petitioner, yet it continues to lock her up. The only lawful course, as the

Supreme Court noted, is to **release the individual under supervision** in such circumstances. Petitioner's detention has become the very definition of "indefinite" and "no longer reasonably related to the purpose of removal," and thus it must end.

❖ **Petitioner Poses No Danger or Flight Risk, So Continued Detention Is Unwarranted**
Petitioner's release would pose **no threat to public safety and no risk of flight**. All of the relevant factors that ICE and courts typically consider weigh in favor of releasing Petitioner under supervision, rather than continuing to detain her at taxpayer expense.

15. No Criminal History: Petitioner has **never been convicted of any crime** (nor even charged with one). There is no history of violence, drug offenses, or any conduct that would suggest she is dangerous. Her record is completely clean. This starkly distinguishes Petitioner from those rare cases where prolonged detention might be justified (for example, cases involving individuals with serious violent criminal records or terrorism concerns). Petitioner is a peaceful person who fled violence; she is not someone who poses a danger to anyone.

16. No Danger to the Community: Nothing in Petitioner's background or behavior indicates she would harm the community. She came to the United States seeking protection, Petitioner's goals – to live safely and recover from trauma – are entirely compatible with being a law-abiding, peaceful resident. She has every incentive to be compliant and no inclination toward any behavior that would endanger others. The absence of any public safety risk is a compelling factor favoring release.

17. Strong Community and Family Ties: Petitioner has **family in the United States**, including the cousin who is ready to host her. She has developed connections and friendships during her time here. This support network will help her transition out of custody and ensure she abides

by all conditions. Petitioner's ties to her sponsor and family provide her with stability and a reason to remain engaged with the legal process (rather than flee). These kinds of ties have led courts to conclude that individuals are not flight risks because they have a community to return to. If released, Petitioner will have strong community support to ensure a safe and successful transition. Louisiana Advocates for Immigrants in Detention (LA AID) has committed to receive her upon release, provide meals, overnight shelter, necessary supplies, and safe travel arrangements so that she can reunite with her family in New York. This assistance guarantees stability, supervision, and continuity of care outside detention, further demonstrating that release is both safe and appropriate.

18. **Full Compliance and Cooperation:** Petitioner has proven through her actions that she is reliable and cooperative. She attended every immigration court hearing, and she complied with all ICE requests during her detention. While detained, she has followed all the rules. There is no indication whatsoever of recalcitrance or non-compliance on her part. Her track record demonstrates that, if released, she will continue to obey any conditions set by the Court or ICE.
19. **Release Plan in Place:** As described, Petitioner already has a detailed release plan. Her sponsor will provide a stable residence and help her meet supervision obligations. Petitioner is prepared to check in regularly with ICE, and she understands that remaining in good standing could benefit any future immigration opportunities. Because she has withholding of removal, Petitioner has lawful permission to remain in the U.S. indefinitely (so long as she does not violate the law), which further motivates her to comply with all requirements. In other words, Petitioner *benefits* by following the rules, and she knows it.
20. **Not a Flight Risk:** Given Petitioner's deep stake in the outcome and her lawful status under withholding, she has no reason to abscond. If released, she gains the chance to live free and

continue her recovery; if she were to abscond, she would risk losing the protection she fought for. Petitioner's entire conduct has been about seeking *legal* refuge in the U.S., not disappearing into the shadows. Her intention is to live openly and lawfully under the protection the immigration court granted her, not to evade supervision. With family support and no alternative destination (she has nowhere else to go), it is highly unlikely that Petitioner would fail to appear for any future appointments or proceedings.

21. Federal courts have routinely ordered release in habeas cases involving detainees with similar profiles. For instance, in the **R.I.L.-R** class-action case mentioned earlier, the court enjoined DHS from detaining asylum-seekers who had no criminal history, emphasizing that detention cannot be used as a blanket deterrent when individuals pose no danger or flight risk. In another example, a court considering a prolonged detention habeas petition noted that **ankle monitors, periodic check-ins, or other alternatives** to detention were more than sufficient to ensure appearance for noncriminal detainees, making jail unnecessary and excessive. These cases reflect a common-sense principle: **if someone is not dangerous and not likely to flee, there is no justification to imprison them for an extended period** – especially when deportation is not achievable.

22. Applying that principle here, Petitioner should be released under appropriate supervision. Indefinitely jailing a cooperative, non-dangerous person like Petitioner serves no valid purpose; it simply imposes needless suffering on her and wastes government resources. ICE can impose reasonable conditions (such as regular reporting, GPS monitoring if truly necessary, and continued compliance with the withholding of removal order) to mitigate any

theoretical concerns. Petitioner is agreeable to any such conditions and will honor them. Thus, continued detention is not only unwarranted – it is counter-productive and unjust. The **balance of equities** tips strongly in favor of release: Petitioner regains her liberty and health, the public faces no risk, and the government can better allocate its detention resources to cases of actual risk.

23. **Similar Cases and Fundamental Fairness Support Petitioner's Release**

Petitioner's situation is not unique – a number of individuals across the country who have won relief from removal have faced similar **indefinite detention**, and courts and experts have widely condemned this practice as unlawful.

24. Recently, in 2023, several advocacy organizations (including the ACLU and the National Immigration Project) filed a lawsuit on behalf of noncitizens in Virginia who, like Petitioner, **won withholding of removal or CAT protection but remained detained**. They argued that ICE's actions violated the Constitution, immigration law, and even ICE's own policy of releasing such individuals. In announcing that case, attorneys underscored that *"continuing to hold [our clients] in detention for no good reason"* flouts constitutional limits and ICE's longstanding practice. They noted that ICE has known for months that there is no legal basis to detain these men, and *"[e]very day [ICE] refuse[s] to release them, [ICE is] violating the law and causing ... irreparable harm"*. That assessment applies with equal force to Petitioner's circumstances. There is no legal basis to keep her locked up, and every additional day inflicts irreparable harm on her without benefiting any legitimate interest.

25. Additionally, a case very similar to Petitioner's is currently pending in this District: **Pataraiia v. Noem**, 1:25-cv-01188 (W.D. La., filed Aug. 19, 2025). In Pataraiia, the petitioner is a noncitizen who won **withholding of removal** but has been detained for over 10 months afterwards. The petition in that case challenges the government's policy of **indefinitely detaining people who have won relief from deportation**, arguing that it is both arbitrary and unconstitutional. It points out that from at least 2000 until recently, the government consistently released individuals after grants of withholding, and that abruptly reversing this practice in 2025 has led to unlawful **indefinite and arbitrary detention**. Petitioner here is one such victim of this new no-release policy. The arguments being raised in Pataraiia – that there is *"no significant likelihood of ... removal in the reasonably foreseeable future"* and thus detention serves no purpose – are the very same arguments before this Court. Consistency and fairness suggest that Petitioner, like others in her position, should be released as a matter of law and justice.

26. Another prominent example is the case of **Kilmar Abrego Garcia**, a Salvadoran man who had been granted withholding of removal in 2019. Despite his protected status, Abrego Garcia was re-detained in 2025 under a policy shift similar to Petitioner's situation. The government attempted to remove him to various third countries where he had no ties – including Uganda, Eswatini, and Ghana – in an effort to circumvent his inability to be sent to El Salvador. These attempts failed. In fact, Ghana's Foreign Minister publicly stated that Ghana *"will not accept [Abrego Garcia]. He cannot be deported to Ghana."* The Department of Homeland Security ultimately admitted that its notice of removal to Ghana was "premature" and told his attorneys to disregard it. Before that, DHS had similarly floated and then dropped plans to deport him to

Eswatini and Uganda when it became clear those countries would not accept him. Abrego Garcia's case went to federal court on a habeas petition (much like this one) to determine if his continued detention was lawful given the lack of any realistic removal. At an October 2025 hearing, a U.S. District Judge pressed the government on whether there was *any* significant likelihood of removal for Abrego, noting that the evidence showed DHS had taken minimal steps and that multiple countries had already said "no". This high-profile case underscores a fundamental point: when no country is willing to accept a detainee, the rationale for detention collapses, and holding the person becomes an exercise in pure punitive detention.

27. The lessons from these cases and developments are clear. It is widely recognized (by courts, advocates, and even prior government policy) that continued detention of someone who cannot be removed is unjust and unlawful. Other courts facing similar facts have not hesitated to act they have recognized that once removal is not reasonably foreseeable, detention "no longer [is] reasonably related to the purpose of detention" and must end. This Court should reach the same conclusion. To keep Petitioner jailed indefinitely, when she has already been granted protection and poses no threat, is arbitrary, inhumane, and unjust. The Constitution and the laws of the United States do not permit such an outcome. Petitioner's continued detention violates 8 U.S.C. § 1231 as interpreted in *Zadvydas*, and it violates the Due Process Clause. Therefore, this Court should order Petitioner's release.

❖ **Petitioner Easily Meets the Criteria for a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction Requiring Her Immediate Release**

Petitioner's case presents an **extraordinary emergency** justifying immediate injunctive relief. She satisfies all the requirements for a **Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction**. In particular:

28. Likelihood of Success on the Merits: Petitioner is **highly likely to succeed on the merits** of her habeas claim. The facts squarely align with *Zadvydas*, which held that a detainee must be released if removal is not reasonably foreseeable. Here, more than six months have passed since Petitioner's removal was stayed, and ICE has no viable country for removal. Under Supreme Court precedent and multiple on-point district decisions, her continued detention is unauthorized by §1231. The **legal standards of *Zadvydas* are clearly met**, and the government has no evidence to rebut Petitioner's showing that deportation will not occur. In addition, her **Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause** is compelling: detention that has become indefinite and punitive violates fundamental constitutional limits. The government cannot articulate any legitimate rationale for detaining a woman with no criminal record, no removal destination, and severe health issues. Petitioner's arguments are supported by Supreme Court law, by on-point cases in this District, and by ICE's own historical policies. She is, therefore, more than likely to prevail in this habeas action on both statutory and constitutional grounds.

29. Irreparable Harm: Petitioner is suffering **irreparable harm** every day that she remains in detention. No future court victory can recover the time she has lost or fully heal the damage to her health. As detailed above Petitioner is suffering from serious mental and physical health conditions. Petitioner's hands shake uncontrollably, Petitioner experiences chest and heart pain, and Petitioner suffers from persistent intrusive fears and overwhelming anxiety, often believing Petitioner is in imminent danger. Petitioner has recurring nightmares involving

violent and life-threatening situations. Mental health professionals have attributed these symptoms to trauma caused by Petitioner's prolonged detention, consistent with post-traumatic stress disorder. Petitioner also has an untreated emergency dental condition that cannot be addressed while incarcerated. The food provided in detention is extremely poor and often inedible, which, combined with her history of H. pylori infection and resulting digestive sensitivities, makes it impossible for her to safely take the strong medications ICE provides. As a result, her medical conditions remain untreated and continue to worsen. Petitioner's condition is worsening daily, creating an imminent risk of irreparable harm and making continued detention unsafe, unconstitutional, and potentially life-threatening. Immediate judicial intervention is therefore urgently required. Courts routinely deem the loss of liberty and personal well-being as irreparable injuries, especially in the context of unlawful detention. Indeed, advocates in similar cases have noted that "[e]very day" ICE refuses to release individuals like Petitioner, it is "causing ... irreparable harm" by prolonging their suffering and violating their rights. Here, the imminent risk to Petitioner's health – on top of the profound harm of unjustly losing her freedom – clearly establishes irreparable harm. Money damages cannot compensate what she is enduring; the only relief that can address the injury is immediate release.

30. Balance of Equities: The balance of equities tips decisively in Petitioner's favor. On Petitioner's side of the scale is the ongoing deprivation of her liberty and threats to her health and safety – interests of the highest order. Each additional day of detention deepens her trauma and medical problems. On the government's side, by contrast, there is minimal (if any) harm in releasing petitioner under supervision. Petitioner poses no danger and no flight risk, as shown by her spotless record and compliance history. The government's general interest in

enforcing immigration laws is not undermined by releasing someone who *cannot be deported* and who will remain under ICE monitoring. In fact, ICE itself has long recognized that detaining people like Petitioner yields little benefit and instead consumes scarce resources. Releasing Petitioner would allow the government to allocate its detention capacity to cases involving actual removal or genuine threats, rather than expending funds to jail a cooperative person indefinitely. Thus, any theoretical governmental interest in her continued detention is far outweighed by the concrete, grievous harm she is experiencing. Equity and fairness strongly favor preventing Petitioner's needless suffering over maintaining a status quo that even ICE's own policies say is unnecessary. Simply put, **no equitable consideration justifies keeping Petitioner locked up while this case is resolved** – whereas freeing her would spare her irreparable harm with no appreciable downside.

31. Public Interest: Granting the requested Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction is also in the public interest. The public has a powerful interest in ensuring that laws are faithfully executed and that government agencies do not exceed their lawful authority. Here, continued detention of Petitioner would flout *Zadvydas* and the limits Congress placed in §1231, effectively sanctioning unlawful executive conduct. Conversely, releasing Petitioner upholds the rule of law as pronounced by the Supreme Court and reaffirmed in multiple cases. The public also has an interest in the humane and just treatment of individuals, especially those who have been found to merit protection under our laws. Petitioner came to the United States seeking safety and was granted relief by an immigration judge; keeping her imprisoned indefinitely despite that status undermines public confidence in the fairness of our system. **There is no societal benefit in jailing a granted protection indefinitely, and there is considerable moral and legal cost in doing so.** Additionally, the public fisc benefits from

avoiding needless detention expenditures. It costs taxpayers hundreds of dollars per day to detain one person. Releasing Petitioner to live with her family member under supervision would conserve public resources while still achieving the regulatory goals of monitoring compliance. In sum, an injunction preventing Petitioner's further unlawful detention aligns with the public interest in justice, compliance with the law, and responsible use of government resources. There is *no* countervailing public interest in favor of keeping her locked up under these circumstances.

32. Because Petitioner meets all of these criteria, this Court should exercise its power to issue a **Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction** ordering her immediate release from custody. The purpose of such emergency relief is to prevent the exact type of irreparable injury that Petitioner is suffering, especially when the legal right to relief is clear. Here, petitioner has shown a clear entitlement to release and a pressing need for Court intervention. Every factor – likelihood of success, irreparable harm, equities, and public interest – supports granting relief now. The Court should not allow the status quo of Petitioner's unlawful detention to continue even a moment longer. Interim relief will ensure that petitioner does not endure further harm while the Court finalizes its consideration of the case. Indeed, given the strength of her merits case, the **Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction** effectively serves to give her the very relief she is likely to obtain after full habeas review. The Court can be confident that protecting Petitioner's rights immediately is consistent with – and in fact required by – the ultimate demands of justice in this case.

Relief Request

33. For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court grant the writ of habeas corpus and order her immediate release from ICE custody. her continued imprisonment violates the Fifth Amendment's guarantee of due process, as it has become indefinite and punitive despite the absence of any legitimate governmental purpose. She poses no danger or flight risk, and she has a suitable sponsor and plan for supervised release. ICE's failure to make progress toward removal or release, coupled with the severe deterioration of Petitioner's health, makes her ongoing detention not only baseless but unconscionable. Petitioner's prolonged detention – now exceeding six months – is unlawful under *Zadvydas v. Davis* and its progeny, because her removal is not reasonably foreseeable. Further,
34. Furthermore, Petitioner meets all criteria for immediate injunctive relief. She is very likely to succeed on the merits of her claims, given the clear statutory and constitutional violations outlined above. She is suffering irreparable harm with each additional day of detention, as evidenced by her worsening mental and physical health and the deprivation of her fundamental liberty interests. The balance of hardships tips decidedly in her favor: continued detention gravely harms Petitioner, while Respondents would face no harm by releasing her under supervision (indeed, release would align with prior ICE policy and conserve government resources). Finally, the public interest favors Petitioner's release, because upholding the rule of law and protecting individual rights are paramount public interests, and there is no public benefit in detaining someone who cannot be removed and poses no threat. For these reasons, immediate injunctive relief is justified and necessary to prevent further harm.
- 35.

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

36. **Order Respondents to release Petitioner immediately under appropriate conditions of supervision (for example, under an Order of Supervision pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(3)).** This supervised release would allow Petitioner to reside with her sponsor, comply with any required monitoring or reporting, and receive necessary medical care, all while ensuring the government's ability to track her whereabouts and status.
37. **Petitioner requests that the Court promptly issue a Temporary Restraining Order and/or Preliminary Injunction directing Respondents to release her forthwith pending final resolution of this Petition.** Such interim relief is warranted to prevent ongoing irreparable harm while the case is adjudicated, and is supported by Petitioner's strong merits case, lack of danger, and the equities and public interest in her favor.
38. **Petitioner requests that the Court promptly hold a hearing or order Respondents to show cause why her continued detention is justified.** At such a hearing, the government should bear the burden of demonstrating that Petitioner poses a risk that cannot be mitigated by release conditions. Absent such a showing, Petitioner should be released. Given the clear law and facts here, Petitioner submits that the proper and just remedy is immediate release, and any further delay only perpetuates the harm.
39. **Petitioner submits this petition and memorandum in good faith, as a pro se litigant seeking the Court's protection of her basic liberty rights.** Every additional day of detention is another day of freedom unjustly taken from her. Petitioner respectfully urges the Court to act swiftly to restore her liberty, consistent with the Constitution, Supreme Court precedent, and the fundamental principles of justice and humanity that our country upholds.

Conclusion

For all the reasons set forth above, Petitioner asks that the Court grant the writ of habeas corpus and order her release **without further delay**. Petitioner also requests immediate release by means of a Temporary Restraining Order or Preliminary Injunction, to prevent any further irreparable harm while this matter is decided. Petitioner trusts that this Court will recognize the extraordinary injustice of her continued detention and will uphold the rule of law by ensuring that she is no longer held in custody unlawfully. Petitioner thanks the Court for its careful consideration of her case, and she remains hopeful that justice will be done.

Respectfully submitted,

Signature: 

(Dated: November 17, 2025)

Petitioner: Hasiba Samadi

A-Number 

Pro Se Petitioner-Detained

Detention Center: Richwood Correctional Center

Address: 180 Pine Bayou Cir, Monroe, LA 71202, United States