

1 WILLIAM BAKER, SBN 157 906
Moreno & Associates Law Firm, APC
2 2082 Otay Lakes Road, Ste. 102
Chula Vista, CA 91913
3 619-422-4885
william.baker@morenoandassociates.com


4
5 Attorney for petitioner
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 Southern District of California
9

10 JUANA BEBSABE FLORES LARA,) Case Number: '25CV3565 RSH DEB
11 Petitioner,) **VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF**
12 v.) **HABEAS CORPUS**
13 CHRISTOPHER J. LaROSE, Senior Warden)
14 Otay Mesa Detention Center; PAMELA BONDI,) Oral Argument Requested
15 United States Attorney General; KRISTI NOEM,)
16 Secretary of the Department of Homeland)
17 Security; PATRICK DIVVER, ICE San Diego)
18 Field Office Director, in their official capacities,)
Respondents.)

19
20 Petitioner alleges:

21 **INTRODUCTION**

22 1. Petitioner JUANA BEBSABE FLORES LARA  a citizen of
23 Honduras, is subjected to unlawful detention by Respondents at the Otay Mesa Detention Center.
24 For many years, petitioner has been subject to a final order of removal. In March 2025, respondents
25 detained petitioner during her periodic check in with the Los Angeles ERO office and sent her to the
26 Otay Mesa Detention Center. Petitioner has now been detained for over nine months. Despite her
27 prolonged detention, respondents have not placed petitioner on a supervised release. Petitioner
28 seeks an order compelling respondents to release her from detention.

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

JURISDICTION

2. This action arises under the Constitution of the United States; the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”), 8 U.S.C. § 1101, *et seq.*; and the Administrative Procedures Act (“APA”), 5 U.S.C. § 500, *et seq.*

3. This court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus; 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question); 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act); 5 U.S.C. § 701 *et seq.* (APA); and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202 (Declaratory Judgment Act).

4. The court may grant relief under the habeas corpus statutes, the Declaratory Judgment Act, and the All-Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

VENUE

5. Venue is proper because Petitioner is detained at the Otay Mesa Detention Facility, in San Diego, California, which is within the jurisdiction of this District.

6. Venue is also proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 USC §1391(e) because at least one federal respondent is in this District; and a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims in this action took place in this District. No real property is involved.

REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

7. The Court must grant the habeas corpus petition or issue an order to show cause (OSC) to the respondents “forthwith,” unless the petitioner is not entitled to relief. 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If an order to show cause is issued, the Court must require respondents to file a return “within three days unless for good cause additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is allowed.” *Id.*

8. Courts have long recognized the significance of the habeas statute in protecting individuals from unlawful detention. The Great Writ has been referred to as “perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law of England, affording as it does a swift and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or confinement.” *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963) (emphasis added).

PARTIES

9. Petitioner JUANA BEBSABE FLORES LARA (“Petitioner”) is a 52-year-old citizen of Honduras. She is detained by the Respondents at the Otay Mesa Detention Center.

1 10. Respondent CHRISTOPHER J. LaROSE is sued in his official capacity as the Senior
2 Warden of the (Otay Mesa Detention Center). Defendant LaRose has custody of petitioner.

3 11. Respondent PAMELA BONDI is being sued in her official capacity as the Attorney
4 General of the United States. She is the official generally charged with supervisory authority over
5 all operations of the Department of Justice. In this capacity, she is responsible for the administration
6 of the immigration laws pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1103 and oversees the Executive Office for
7 Immigration Review (“EOIR”), a component of the DOJ, which includes the immigration courts
8 and the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA” or “Board”). She is empowered to oversee the
9 adjudication of removal and bond hearings and by regulation has delegated that power to the
10 nation’s Immigration Judges and the BIA.

11 12. Respondent KRISTI NOEM is being sued in her official capacity as the Secretary of
12 the United States Department of Homeland Security. She is the executive officer who has been
13 given authority to manage and control U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”). As
14 such, she is the ultimate legal custodian of petitioner.

15 13. Respondent PATRICK DIVVER is being sued in his official capacity as the Field
16 Office Director for the San Diego Field Office of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), a
17 component of DHS with responsibility over persons in immigration custody at the Otay Mesa
18 Detention Center. Director Divver has custody of petitioner.

19 LEGAL FRAMEWORK

20 14. This petition presents the question of whether respondents may lawfully ignore the
21 order of supervision regulations and detain a noncitizen indefinitely. It also presents the question of
22 whether the Constitution allows indefinite prolonged detention.

23 15. As a threshold matter, the United States Supreme Court has re-affirmed that aliens are
24 entitled to due process of law in deportation proceedings and must be given notice and an opportunity to
25 be heard commensurate with the nature of the case. *Trump v. J. G. G.*, 604 U.S. ___, 145 S. Ct. 1003,
26 1006 (2025).

27 16. “The detention and release of noncitizens that are subject to a final order of removal
28 is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1231. This statute provides that “when an alien is ordered removed, the

1 Attorney General shall remove the alien from the United States within a period of 90 days.” 8
2 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(1)(A). “If the alien does not leave or is not removed within the removal period,
3 the alien, pending removal, shall be subject to supervision under regulations prescribed by the
4 Attorney General.” *Id.* § 1231(a)(3).

5 17. Supervised release and any revocation of such release thereafter is governed by
6 either 8 C.F.R. § 241.4 or 8 C.F.R. § 241.13; *Diaz v. Wofford*, No. 1:25-CV-01079 JLT EPG, 2025
7 WL 2581575, at *4 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 5, 2025).

8 18. Revocation under § 241.4(l) provides two ways for supervised release to be revoked:

9 (1) Violation of conditions of release. Any alien described in paragraph (a) or (b)(1) of
10 this section who has been released under an order of supervision or other conditions of
11 release who violates the conditions of release may be returned to custody. Any such alien
12 who violates the conditions of an order of supervision is subject to the penalties described
13 in section 243(b) of the Act. Upon revocation, the alien will be notified of the reasons for
14 revocation of his or her release or parole. The alien will be afforded an initial informal
15 interview promptly after his or her return to Service custody to afford the alien an
16 opportunity to respond to the reasons for revocation stated in the notification.

17 (2) Determination by the Service. The Executive Associate Commissioner shall have
18 authority, in the exercise of discretion, to revoke release and return to Service custody an
19 alien previously approved for release under the procedures in this section. A district
20 director may also revoke release of an alien when, in the district director’s opinion,
21 revocation is in the public interest and circumstances do not reasonably permit referral of
22 the case to the Executive Associate Commissioner. Release may be revoked in the exercise
23 of discretion when, in the opinion of the revoking official: (i) The purposes of release have
24 been served; (ii) The alien violates any condition of release; (iii) It is appropriate to enforce
25 a removal order or to commence removal proceedings against an alien; or (iv) The conduct
26 of the alien, or any other circumstance, indicates that release would no longer be
27 appropriate. 8 C.F.R. § 241.4(l).

28 19. Revocation under § 241.13 similarly provides that an alien’s supervised release may

1 be revoked after it is granted for two reasons:

2 (i) Revocation of release

3 (1) Violation of conditions of release. Any alien who has been released under an order
4 of supervision under this section who violations any of the conditions of release may be
5 returned to custody and is subject to the penalties described in section 243(b) of the Act.
6 [...]

7 (2) Revocation for removal. The Service may revoke an alien's release under this
8 section and return the alien to custody if, on account of changed circumstances, the Service
9 determines that there is a significant likelihood that the alien may be removed in the
10 reasonably foreseeable future. Thereafter, if the alien is not released from custody
11 following the informal interview provided for in paragraph (h)(3) of this section, the
12 provisions of § 241.4 shall govern the alien's continued detention pending removal. 8
13 C.F.R. § 241.13(4)(i).

14 20. Sections 241.4(l)(1) and 241.13(3) both explicitly require that "Upon revocation, the
15 alien will be notified of the reasons for revocation of his or her release or parole. The alien will be
16 afforded an initial informal interview promptly after his or her return to Service custody to afford
17 the alien an opportunity to respond to the reasons for revocation stated in the notification." These
18 requirements for notice and an initial informal interview are not explicitly required in § 241.4(l)(2),
19 but courts have held that the same requirements constrain revocation of release under this second
20 provision as well. *See Diaz*, 2025 WL 2581575 (citing various district court cases that have rejected
21 the government's arguments that these provisions do not apply to § 241.4(l)(2)); *Constantinovici v.*
22 *Bondi*, No. 3:25-CV-02405-RBM-AHG, 2025 WL 2898985, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 10, 2025)
23 ("District courts have consistently rejected this argument and held that § 241.4(l)(1)'s procedural
24 requirements apply equally to revocation of a noncitizen's release pursuant to § 241.4(l)(2)."). Thus,
25 as applicable to this provision, the As other courts have found, Respondents' failure to provide an
26 informal interview after the revocation of release constitutes a due process violation. M.S.L., 2025
27 WL 2430267, at *11 (holding that informal interview was not sufficiently "prompt" where it took
28 place twenty-seven days after revocation and collecting cases); *Constantinovici*, 2025 WL 2898985,

1 at *6 (due process violation where “[n]othing in the record indicates that Petitioner was provided
2 with an interview in connection with the revocation of his release or otherwise afforded an
3 opportunity to respond to the reasons for his re-detention”); *Delkash v. Noem*, No. 5:25-CV-01675-
4 HDV-AGR, 2025 WL 2683988, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2025) (same where there was “no
5 evidence that [petitioner] has been afforded an informal or formal interview”); *Phan v. Noem*, No.
6 3:25-CV-02422-RBM-MSB, 2025 WL 2898977, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 10, 2025) (finding same
7 where no interview was conducted).” *Xayakeson v. Noem*, 3-25-cv-2995-JES-BJW, 2025 WL
8 3229102.

9 21. After the 8 U.S.C. § 1231 removal period, the statute “limits an alien’s post-removal-
10 period detention to a period reasonably necessary to bring about that alien’s removal from the
11 United States” and “does not permit indefinite detention.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 679
12 (2001).. A six-month period of post-removal detention constitutes a “presumptively reasonable
13 period of detention.” *Id.* At 701. After this six-month period passes, the petitioner has the burden to
14 “provide[] good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the
15 reasonably foreseeable future.” *Id.* If petitioner satisfies their initial burden, it then shifts to the
16 Government to rebut that showing. *Id.* “[F]or detention to remain reasonable, as the period of prior
17 post-removal confinement grows, what counts as the ‘reasonably foreseeable future’ conversely
18 would have to shrink.” *Id.* “[O]nce removal is no longer reasonably foreseeable, continued
19 detention is no longer authorized by statute.” *Id.* At 699.. In that case, the alien’s release may be
20 conditioned on any of the various forms of conditioned release, including an order of supervised
21 release. *Id.* At 700.

22 22. Moreover, given the time spent at liberty following an initial release from detention
23 upon a determination that petitioner was not a flight risk or danger, as well as the government’s
24 implicit promise that any custody redetermination would be based on those same criteria, petitioner
25 has a protected “interest in remaining at liberty unless [he] no longer meets those criteria.” *Espinoza*
26 *v. Kaiser*, No. 1:25-CV-01101 JLT SKO, 2025 WL 2581185, at *13 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 5, 2025)
27 (quoting *Pinchi v. Noem*, No. 5:25-CV-05632-PCP, 2025 WL 2084921, at *4 (N.D. Cal. July 24,
28 2025).

1 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

2 23. Petitioner came to the United States fleeing violence and death in Honduras. She
3 arrived to the United States in 2014. She is not married. She has three children. Petitioner was
4 employed as a factory worker. She has no criminal record.

5 24. In 2014, petitioner was paroled into the United States pending a credible fear
6 interview. She was released on her own recognizance. She passed her fear interview, and in March
7 2025 the DHS served petitioner with a Notice to Appear commencing a removal proceeding.

8 25. In June 2019, the immigration judge denied all applications and ordered removal to
9 Honduras. Petitioner appealed this decision to the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). In June
10 2022, the BIA denied the appeal.

11 26. In July 2022, petitioner filed a petition for review with the Ninth Circuit Court of
12 Appeals. In November 2022, the Ninth Circuit dismissed the petition for review.

13 27. On March 3, 2025, petitioner reported as directed to the Los Angeles ERO office.
14 She was detained sent to the Otay Mesa Detention Center. On March 20, 2025, petitioner filed a
15 motion to reopen with the BIA. The motion to reopen is pending.

16 28. Petitioner filed a prolonged detention bond hearing with the Otay Mesa Immigration
17 Court. On December 5, 2025, the immigration judge denied the bond motion, concluding the court
18 lacked jurisdiction because the removal proceeding was concluded.

19 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

20 **COUNT 1**

21 (Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act)

22 29. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 28.

23 30. Section 706 of 5 U.S.C. provides that a reviewing court shall compel agency action
24 unlawfully withheld and hold unlawful and set aside agency action not in accordance with law. 5
25 U.S.C. § 706(1)-(2).

26 31. Petitioner has a regulatory and due process right to have respondents comply with
27 the regulations relating to orders of supervision and prolonged detention.

28 32. The respondents have not considered Order of Supervision despite the fact that they

1 have detained petitioner since March 3, 2025—a period of over eight months.

2 33. Respondents failed to comply with the regulations in that they have not placed
3 petitioner on an order of supervision.

4 34. Respondents have also failed to comply with the regulation by failing to consider an
5 order of supervision or giving petitioner an opportunity to request release from detention.

6 35. Respondents' refusal to comply with the regulations harms her and constitutes final
7 agency action for purposes of the APA.

8 36. There are no other adequate available remedies.

9 37. Respondents' actions constitute an unlawful withholding of an agency action and
10 unlawful agency action in violation of the APA.

11 **COUNT 3**

12 (Violation of the Due Process Clause)

13 38. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 37.

14 39. On March 3, 2025, DHS agents detained petitioner at her check in and sent her to the
15 Otay Mesa Detention Center.

16 40. Petitioner has been the subject of a final order of removal since at least November
17 2022. She has been detained without bond since March 3, 2025.

18 41. The prolonged detention of petitioner where there is no significant likelihood of
19 removal in the reasonably foreseeable future violates the Due Process Clause of the United States
20 Constitution.

21 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

22 WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests this Court to grant the following:

23 (1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;

24 (2) Issue an Order to Show Cause ordering Respondents to show cause why this Petition
25 should not be granted within three days;

26 (3) Declare that Petitioner's must be considered for an Order of Supervision and her
27 prolonged detention violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment and the regulations;

28

1 (4) Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus ordering Respondents to release Petitioner immediately
2 subject to an Order of Supervision;

3 (5) Issue an order prohibiting respondents from revoking the Order of Supervision without
4 complying with the regulations and Due Process of law;

5 (6) Award Petitioner attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act (28
6 U.S.C. § 2412), and any other applicable statute or regulation; and

7 (7) Grant any further relief this Court deems just and proper.

8 DATED: 12 December 2025

9 Respectfully submitted,

10 */s/ William Baker*

11
12 William Baker (157 906)
13 MORENO & ASSOCIATES
14 2082 Otay Lakes Road, Suites 102
15 Chula Vista, California 91913
16 Telephone: (619) 422-4885
17 william.baker@morenoandassociates
18 Attorney for petitioner
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

VERIFICATION

DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that I am the petitioner; I have read the petition or had it read to me in a language I understand, and the information in the petition is true and correct. I understand that a false statement of a material fact may serve as the basis for prosecution for perjury.

VERIFICACIÓN

DECLARACIÓN BAJO PENA DE PERJURIO

Declaro bajo pena de perjurio según las leyes de los Estados Unidos que soy el peticionario; He leído la petición o me la han leído en un idioma que entiendo, y la información de la petición es verdadera y correcta. Entiendo que una declaración falsa de un hecho material puede servir como base para el enjuiciamiento por perjurio.

Juana Flores
Juana Betsabe Flores Lara
Petitioner/Peticionario