

United States District Court
Western District of Texas
El Paso Division

Lung Van Do
Petitioner,

v.

Warden, Camp East Montana and Field Office
Director, El Paso Field Office, ICE-ERO, *et al*
Respondents.

No. 3:25-CV-00634-LS

**Federal¹ Respondents' Response in Opposition to
Petitioner's Writ of Habeas Corpus**

Respondents timely submit this response per this Court's Order dated December 11, 2025, directing service and ordering a response. *See* ECF No. 4. In his petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, Petitioner, through counsel, seeks release from civil immigration detention, claiming that his detention has become unreasonably prolonged, contrary to statute the Due Process Clause, and *Accard²i*. *See* ECF No. 1. Petitioner's claims lack merit, and this petition should be denied.

Despite his argument that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future and thus no basis for his continued detention, Petitioner is subject to a final

¹ The named warden in this action is not a federal employee. The Department of Justice does not represent him in this action. The Federal Respondents are lawfully detaining Petitioner on a mandatory basis and have direct authority under Title 8 over custody decisions in his case.

² Petitioner did not pay the filing fee for non-habeas claims. *See Ndudzi v. Castro*, No. SA-20-CV-0492-JKP, 2020 WL 3317107 at *2 (W.D. Tex. June 18, 2020) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a)). "When a filing contains both habeas and non-habeas claims, 'the district court should separate the claims and decide the [non-habeas] claims' separately from the habeas ones given the differences between the two types of claims. *Id* (collecting cases and further noting the "vast procedural differences between the two types of actions"). Given the differences, the Court should either sever the non-habeas claims or dismiss them altogether without prejudice if severance is not warranted. *Id.* at *3.

order removal dated November 25, 2009, which mandates his detention. Ex. A (ERO Declaration) ¶ 15; 1231(a)(6); *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 701 (2001). Petitioner argues his continued detention is baseless and violates his substantive and procedural rights to Due Process ECF No. 1 at 8-10. These arguments are insufficient reason to believe that removal is unlikely in the foreseeable future, which means the burden of proof does not shift to ICE to show the likelihood of removal. *See Andrade v. Gonzales*, 459 F.3d 538, 543–44 (5th Cir. 2006); *Gonzalez v. Gills*, No. 20-60547, 2022 WL 1056099 at 1 (5th Cir. Apr. 8, 2022). Even if the burden has so shifted, Respondents can show that removal to Vietnam, in fact, likely in the reasonably foreseeable future. For these reasons, the Court should deny this habeas petition.

I. Facts and Procedural History

Petitioner is a native and citizen of Vietnam. Exh. A (ERO Declaration) ¶ 5. At an unknown place and date, Petitioner was paroled into the United States as a refugee. *Id.* On December 1, 1975, Petitioner adjusted status to that of a legal permanent resident. *Id.* at ¶ 6. After adjusting status, Petitioner was convicted of a number of criminal offenses to include theft, burglar and possession of child pornography. *Id.* at ¶¶ 7-12. On October 15, 2009, Petitioner was issued a Notice to appear. *Id.* at ¶ 13. On November 25, 2009, Petitioner was ordered removed to Vietnam. *Id.* at 15. On February 23, 2010, Petitioner was released on an order of supervision. *Id.* at ¶ 16. On November 12, 2025, Petitioner was arrested by ICE and issued a Notice of Revocation of Release based on the determination made by ICE that Petitioner could now be removed to Vietnam. *Id.* at 17. On December 3, 2025, ICE interviewed Petitioner and completed requisite paperwork for a travel document. *Id.* at 18. On December 9, 2025, ICE submitted request for Petitioner’s travel document to Vietnam, and it remains pending. *Id.* at 20. Said request take , on average, 30 days to complete. *Id.*

II. Detention Is Lawful Under 8 U.S.C. §1231(a)(6).

The authority to detain aliens after the entry of a final order of removal is set forth in 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a). That statute affords ICE a 90-day mandatory detention period within which to remove the alien from the United States following the entry of the final order. 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(2). The 90-day removal period begins on the latest of three dates: the date (1) the order becomes “administratively final,” (2) a court issues a final order in a stay of removal, or (3) the alien is released from non-immigration custody. 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(1)(B).

Not all removals can be accomplished in 90 days, and certain aliens may be detained beyond the 90-day removal period. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 701. Under §1231, the removal period can be extended in a least three circumstances. *See Glushchenko v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, 566 F.Supp.3d 693, 703 (W.D. Tex. 2021). Extension is warranted, for example, if the alien presents a flight risk or other risk to the community. *Id.*; *see also* 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(1)(C); (a)(6). An alien may be held in confinement until there is “no significant likelihood of removal in a reasonably foreseeable future.” *Zadvydas*, at 533 U.S. at 680.

a. There Is No Good Reason to Believe That Removal is Unlikely in the Reasonably Foreseeable Future.

Petitioner cannot show “good reason” to believe that removal to Vietnam is unlikely in the reasonably foreseeable future. In *Zadvydas*, the U.S. Supreme Court held that § 1231(a)(6) “read in light of the Constitution’s demands, limits an alien’s post-removal-period detention to a period reasonably necessary to bring about that alien’s removal from the United States” but “does not permit indefinite detention.” 533 U.S. at 689. “[O]nce removal is no longer reasonably foreseeable, continued detention is no longer authorized by the statute.” *Id.* at 699. The Court designated six months as a presumptively reasonable period of post-order detention but made clear that the

presumption “does not mean that every alien not removed must be released after six months.” *Id.* at 701.

Once the alien establishes that he has been in post-order custody for more than six months at the time the habeas petition is filed, the alien must provide a “good reason” to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future. *See Andrade v. Gonzales*, 459 F.3d 538, 543–44 (5th Cir. 2006); *Gonzalez v. Gills*, No. 20–60547, 2022 WL 1056099 at *1 (5th Cir. Apr. 8, 2022). Unless the alien establishes the requisite “good reason,” the burden will not shift to the government to prove otherwise. *Id.*

The “reasonably foreseeable future” is not a static concept; it is fluid and country-specific, depending in large part on country conditions and diplomatic relations. *Ali v. Johnson*, No. 3:21–CV–00050-M, 2021 WL 4897659 at *3 (N.D. Tex. Sept. 24, 2021). Additionally, a lack of visible progress in the removal process does not satisfy the petitioner’s burden of showing that there is no significant likelihood of removal. *Id.* at *2 (collecting cases); *see also Idowu v. Ridge*, No. 3:03–CV–1293-R, 2003 WL 21805198, at *4 (N.D. Tex. Aug. 4, 2003). Conclusory allegations are also insufficient to meet the alien’s burden of proof. *Nagib v. Gonzales*, No. 3:06–CV–0294-G, 2006 WL 1499682, at *3 (N.D. Tex. May 31, 2006) (citing *Gonzalez v. Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement*, No. 1:03–CV–178-C, 2004 WL 839654 (N.D. Tex. Apr. 20, 2004)). One court explained:

To carry his burden, [the] petitioner must present something beyond speculation and conjecture. To shift the burden to the government, [the] petitioner must demonstrate that “the circumstances of his status” or the existence of “particular individual barriers to his repatriation” to his country of origin are such that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future.

Idowu, 2003 WL 21805198, at *4 (citation omitted).

Petitioner's removal order has been final since November 5, 2009. Exh. A (ERO Declaration) at ¶ 15; *see* 8 C.F.R. § 241.1; 1241.1(a). Petitioner, nonetheless, urges this Court to order that his continued detention pending removal is contrary to his substantive and procedural rights to Due Process, because of a lack of travel documents. ECF No. 8-10. Beyond these conclusory allegations, Petitioner fails to allege any reason, much less a "good reason," to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the foreseeable future. These are also wholly insufficient under *Zadvydas*. *See Nogales v. Dept. of Homeland Sec.*, No. 21-10236, 2022 WL 851738 at *1 (5th Cir. Mar. 22, 2022) (citing *Rice v. Gonzalez*, 985 F.3d 1069, 1070 (5th Cir. 2021)); *Akbar v. Barr*, SA-20-CV-01132-FB, 2021 WL 1345530 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 5, 2021); *see also Andrade*, 459 F.3d at 543–44; *Boroky v. Holder*, No. 3:14-CV-2040-L-BK, 2014 WL 6809180, at *3 (N.D. Tex. Dec. 3, 2014).

Petitioner cannot meet his burden to establish no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future. *See Thanh v. Johnson*, No. EP-15-CV-403-PRM, 2016 WL 5171779, at *4 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 11, 2016) (denying habeas relief where government was taking affirmative steps to obtain Vietnamese travel documents). The burden of proof, therefore, does not shift to Respondents to prove that removal is likely.

Even if the burden did shift to ICE in this analysis, ICE could show that removal is likely in the foreseeable future. ICE Headquarters Removal International Operations has successfully removed over 400 Vietnamese nationals to Vietnam in 2025. Exh. A (ERO Declaration) at ¶19. As recent as November 2, 2025, ICE removed several Vietnamese nationals to Vietnam via charter flight. *Id.*

The 2025 removal numbers continue the upward trend of Vietnamese removal since FY2019. *See* <https://www.ice.gov/doclib/eoy/iceAnnualReportFY2024.pdf> (last accessed

December 31, 2025).

Specific to Petitioner, ICE submitted a travel document request to the government of Vietnam. *See* Exh. A (ERO Declaration) at ¶20.

In other words, until Vietnam refuses to issue a travel document to Petitioner, there is no reason to believe that Vietnam is unlikely to accept him for repatriation. It has just not happened yet.

As such, removal is likely in the reasonably foreseeable future, and his continued detention is lawful. Petitioner's substantive due process claim fails and should be denied.

b. ICE Has Afforded Petitioner Procedural Due Process.

To establish a procedural due process violation, Petitioner must show that he was deprived of liberty without adequate safeguards. *See Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 332 (1976); *Daniels v. Williams*, 474 U.S. 327, 331 (1986). The Fifth Circuit has not provided guidance to lower courts, post-*Arteaga-Martinez*, on the appropriate standard for reviewing a procedural due process claim alleged by an alien detained under § 1231, but the Fourth Circuit, post-*Arteaga-Martinez*, used the *Zadvydas* framework to analyze a post-order-custody alien's due process claims. *See Linares v. Collins*, 1:25-CV-00584-RP-DH, ECF No. 14 at 10–14 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 12, 2025) (discussing *Johnson v. Arteaga-Martinez*, 596 U.S. 573 (2022) and *Castaneda v. Perry*, 95 F.4th 750, 760 (4th Cir. 2024)). To the extent this Court finds that any additional analysis is required beyond the constitutional analysis outlined in *Jennings* and *Thuraiissigiam*, *supra*, this Court may look to *Zadvydas* to review the procedural claim at issue here. *Id.*

Additionally, the Fifth Circuit finds no procedural due process violation where the constitutional minima of due process is otherwise met. *Murphy v. Collins*, 26 F.3d 541, 543 (5th Cir. 1994). Even if the Court were to find a procedural due process violation here, the remedy is substitute process. *Mohammad v. Lynch*, No. EP-16-CV-28-PRM, 2016 WL 8674354, at *6 n.6

(W.D. Tex. May 24, 2016) (finding no merit to petitioner's procedural due process claim where the evidence demonstrated that the review had already occurred, thereby redressing any delay in the provision of the 90-day and 180-day custody reviews). Even in the criminal context, failure to comply with statutory or regulatory time limits does not mandate release of a person who should otherwise be detained. *U.S. v. Montalvo-Murillo*, 495 U.S. 711, 722 (1990).

Petitioner has received the maximum process afforded by Congress under the statutes, to include placement in “full” removal proceedings before an immigration judge. Such process included notice and an opportunity to be heard, including judicial review through the appellate court. Even after that process ran its course, ICE issued Petitioner a Notice of Revocation of Release due to ICE’s determination that Petitioner could now be removed to Vietnam. Exh. A at ¶17. Petitioner’s procedural due process claim, like his substantive one, should be denied.

III. Conclusion

Petitioner’s continued detention is lawful under § 1231(a)(6). Petitioner fails to show good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal to Vietnam in the reasonably foreseeable future. As such, the burden has not shifted to ICE to show the opposite. Even if the burden had shifted, ICE could establish that removal is foreseeable. Additionally, ICE has afforded Petitioner procedural due process through his detention. Petitioner’s continued detention, therefore, is comports with the law and with due process. It is not unreasonably prolonged, nor is it in violation of the INA or the Constitution. Accordingly, the Court should deny this petition.

Respectfully submitted,

Justin R. Simmons
United States Attorney

By: /s/ FidelEsparza III

Fidel Esparza III
Assistant United States Attorney
Texas Bar No. 24073776
601 N.W. Loop 410, Suite 600
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(210) 384-7100 (phone)
(210) 384-7118 (fax)
Fidel.Esparza@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Federal Respondents

Certificate of Service

I certify that on December 31, 2025, I mailed a copy of Response in Opposition to Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus to Petitioner (*pro se*) at the following address:

Lung Van Do
A 
El Paso Camp East Montana
6920 Digital Road
El Paso, TX 79936
PRO SE

/s/ Fidel Esparza III
Fidel Esparza III
Assistant United States Attorney