

1 ERIC GRANT  
United States Attorney  
2 HADDY ABOUZEID  
Assistant United States Attorney  
3 501 I Street, Suite 10-100  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
4 Telephone: (916) 554-2700

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
6 United States of America

7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 D.J.R.G,

11 Petitioner,

12 v.

13 CHRISTOPHER CHESNUT, ET AL.,

14 Respondents.  
15

CASE NO. 1:25-CV-01747-DC-EFB

RESPONDENTS'S RESPONSE TO ORDER TO  
SHOW CAUSE

16  
17 On December 11, 2025, the Court issued an order granting the motion for a preliminary  
18 injunction. ECF No. 12. The Order 1) directed Respondents to release Petitioner from custody; 2)  
19 directed Respondents to not impose any additional restriction on the Petitioner, such as electronic  
20 monitoring, unless that is determined to be necessary at a future pre-deprivation/custody hearing; and  
21 3) enjoined Respondents from re-detaining Petitioner without first providing at least 7 days' notice to  
22 Petitioner and holding a pre-deprivation bond hearing before a neutral arbiter pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §  
23 1226(a) and its implementing regulations. ECF No. 12.

24 The first of the three categories has been resolved. ICE officials released Petitioner from  
25 custody on December 11, 2025. Respondents will comply with the bond hearing requirement as  
26 mandated by the Court's prior order should they seek to re-detain Petitioner while the Preliminary  
27 Injunction is in place.  
28

1 Respondents respectfully acknowledge that this response is filed two days after the January 12,  
2 2026 deadline set by the Court's December 23, 2025 Order. *See* ECF No. 13. Due to an inadvertent  
3 calendaring oversight, the Order was not initially noted. Upon routine case review, Respondents  
4 promptly identified the Order and filed this response to comply with the Court's directive.  
5 Respondents apologize for the brief delay and submit that no prejudice results, particularly where the  
6 Court has already granted preliminary injunctive relief and Petitioner has been released from custody.  
7 The brief delay does not affect Petitioner's ability to respond, as the Court provided fourteen days to  
8 reply following service of Respondent's answer, and Petitioner retains the full period to do so. *See*  
9 ECF No. 13 at 2.

10 Pursuant to the Court's Order directing Respondents to show cause why the writ should not be  
11 granted by filing an answer/return, Respondents submit this Return addressing the merits of the  
12 Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus. Respondents deny that Petitioner is entitled to habeas relief. In  
13 support, Respondents incorporate by reference the relevant factual background and legal arguments set  
14 forth in their Opposition to Motion for Restraining Order, ECF No. 11, to the extent those arguments  
15 address the merits of the claims raised in the Petition. No intervening facts or controlling authority  
16 have arisen that would alter Respondents' merits analysis. Accordingly, the Petition should be denied.

17 Dated: January 14, 2026

ERIC GRANT  
United States Attorney

18  
19  
20 By: /s/ HADDY ABOUZEID  
HADDY ABOUZEID  
Assistant United States Attorney  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28