

ENTERED

December 16, 2025

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BROWNSVILLE DIVISION

RAUL M. C.¹,
Petitioner,

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:25-cv-327

WARDEN FOR THE PORT ISABEL
DETENTION CENTER, *et al.*,
in their official capacities,
Respondents.

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2243
AND REQUIRING SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING**

Before the Court is Petitioner Raul M. C.’s “Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and Request for Order to Show Cause under 28 U.S.C. § 2243” (Dkt. No. 1). Petitioner, a non-citizen born in Colombia, states that “[o]n June 17, 2014, . . . he was designated a *Franco Gonzalez v. Holder* class member.” *Id.* at 8. He claims his continued detention at the Port Isabel Processing Center in Los Fresnos Texas violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 *Id.* at 6, 10, 14.

Petitioner’s allegations raise a genuine question as to whether his continued detention violates federal law and the U.S. Constitution. Because it does not plainly appear that Petitioner is not entitled to the requested relief, the Court must “forthwith award the writ [of habeas corpus] or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted[.]” 28 U.S.C. § 2243.

Accordingly, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2243, Respondents are **ORDERED** to show cause why the writ of habeas corpus should not be granted **no later than 20 days after service upon Respondents** of this § 2241 petition. If Petitioner chooses to file a reply to Respondents’ response to this order, Petitioner must do so **no later than 15 days** after receiving Respondents’ response.

Further, Petitioner represents that when he was designated a *Franco Gonzalez v. Holder*


¹ Due to significant privacy concerns in immigration cases and noting that judicial opinions are not subject to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2, any opinion, order, judgment, or other disposition in this case will refer to the petitioner only by first name and last initial.

class member, he was detained in an ICE facility in Tacoma, Washington. Dkt. No. 1, p. 8. Petitioner's Exhibit 3 includes the *Franco Gonzalez* Summary Class Notice, which states that the notice is for "a class of current and former individuals in immigration detention in Arizona, California, and Washintgon[,]" among other criteria. Dkt. No. 1-3, p. 1.

To assess the impact of the class action certification in *Franco Gonzalez v. Holder* on this case, the Court **ORDERS** the parties to submit supplemental briefing identifying what bearing, if any, that class certification has on Petitioner. Both Respondents and Petitioner shall file the supplemental briefs 20 days after service upon Respondents of this § 2241 petition.

At this time, the Court finds good cause exists to forego setting a hearing until the issues in the case are fully briefed.

Signed on December 16, 2025.


Karen Betancourt
United States Magistrate Judge