

1 ROGER H. PONCE
2 PONCE LAW CORP
3 1424 17TH ST.
4 BAKERSFIELD, CA 93301
5 TEL: (661) 888-2003
6 FAX: (800) 753-9309

7 Attorney for Petitioner
8 SIMRANJIT SINGH

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 SIMRANJIT SINGH,

12 Petitioner,

13 v.

14 WARDEN OF GOLDEN STATE ANNEX
15 DETENTION FACILITY, ET AL,

16 Respondent.

No. 1:25-cv-01739-TLN-CSK

REPLY IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AND
REQUEST FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

(28 U.S.C. § 2241)

17 I. INTRODUCTION

18 Respondents' Opposition and supporting declaration do not resolve the central defect in
19 Petitioner's detention: DHS is continuing to detain Petitioner without a bond hearing, without any
20 post-order custody review, without fear or CAT screening, and without concrete removal efforts,
21 while asserting mandatory detention under INA § 235(b).

22 As Respondents now expressly concede, DHS has conducted no custody determinations
23 or reviews since the Immigration Judge's August 13, 2025 removal order, has undertaken no fear-
24 based screening, and has made no progress toward removal, other than noting an inability to
25 obtain travel documents. This posture confirms that Petitioner's detention is prolonged,
26 unreviewed, and untethered to actual removal, in violation of due process and the governing
27 detention statutes.

1 or evidence of ongoing removal efforts. When Petitioner requested limited records bearing
2 directly on detention authority and post-order custody decisions, Respondents declined to produce
3 them, asserting that the request was “overbroad.”

4 Respondents cannot simultaneously:

- 5 1. Control all detention-related records,
- 6 2. Decline to produce them, and
- 7 3. Ask the Court to accept DHS’s legal conclusions at face value.

8 Where liberty is at stake, bare declarations asserting detention authority are not a
9 substitute for meaningful process.

10 **V. THE ABSENCE OF FEAR OR CAT SCREENING FURTHER UNDERMINES**
11 **DHS’S POSITION**

12 Respondents explicitly state that no CAT or fear-based screening has occurred post-order.
13 This admission is significant. DHS cannot claim categorical detention authority and removal
14 power while declining to conduct procedures designed to ensure that removal is lawful and safe.

15 At minimum, the absence of any such screening reinforces the conclusion that removal is
16 not imminent, further weakening any justification for continued mandatory detention.

17 **VI. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF REMAINS NECESSARY AND APPROPRIATE**

18 The Court previously entered an order prohibiting Petitioner’s removal or transfer to
19 protect its jurisdiction. That relief remains necessary. Respondents’ own admissions confirm that
20 DHS has not stabilized Petitioner’s custody posture, has not clarified detention authority through
21 review, and has not advanced removal.

22 Absent continued injunctive relief, Petitioner remains vulnerable to arbitrary custody
23 decisions without notice or process.

24 **VII. REQUESTED RELIEF**

25 Consistent with *Morales-Flores* and Respondents’ concession, Petitioner respectfully
26 requests that the Court:

- 27 1. Grant the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus;
- 28 2. Order DHS to provide an individualized custody determination, including a bond

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

hearing before an Immigration Judge, or alternatively order Petitioner's release under appropriate conditions;

3. Maintain the existing injunction prohibiting removal or transfer pending resolution; and
4. Grant such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Roger H. Ponce
ROGER H. PONCE
Attorney for Petitioner
Ponce Law Corp
1424 17th Street
Bakersfield, CA 93301
(661) 888-2003
roger@rogerponcelaw.com