



Procedure 65, for entry of a temporary restraining order to prevent his removal by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) from the United States during the pendency of his petition for writ of habeas corpus. Petitioner is currently in ICE custody at the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) Joe Corley Processing Center, located at 500 Hilbig Road, Conroe, Texas 77301, and seeks emergency relief to obtain his release and prevent his unlawful removal to El Salvador. In support thereof, Petitioner states the following:

## II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner is a 22 year old male native and citizen of El Salvador. *See attached*, Exhibit A: Petitioner’s Identification. On June 24, 2019, Petitioner entered the United States at or near Rio Grande City, TX. *See attached*, Exhibit B: Notice to Appear. On June 4, 2025, Petitioner was entered into removal proceedings before the South Gessner Immigration Court. *See attached*, Exhibit B: *supra*.

On December 1, 2025, Petitioner filed an Application for Asylum and Withholding of Removal under CAT in Immigration Court. *See attached*, Exhibit C: Form I-589. On December 6, 2025, Petitioner was detained by ICE officers during an ICE check in. Subsequently, he was transferred to Joe Corley Processing CTR and his removal proceedings were transferred to Conroe Immigration Court *See attached*, Exhibit D: Form I-830.

Petitioner has exhausted his administrative remedies. The Immigration Judge does not have the jurisdiction or authority to grant bond under *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*. The government has not been able to articulate any meaningful reason why Petitioner should continue to remain in detention pending the outcome of his removal proceedings. Petitioner, through Counsel, now

submits the present Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus to this Honorable Court, and respectfully requests the Court to order Respondents to effect his immediate release.

### III. LEGAL STANDARD

The standard for granting a temporary restraining order ("TRO") in the Fifth Circuit requires the petitioner to demonstrate:

- (1) a substantial likelihood of success on the merits;
- (2) a substantial threat of irreparable injury if the injunction is not granted;
- (3) that the threatened injury outweighs any harm the injunction may cause the government; and
- (4) that the injunction will not disserve the public interest.

*Mississippi Power & Light Co. v. United Gas Pipe Line Co.*, 760 F.2d 618, 621 (5th Cir. 1985).

In the immigration habeas context, a TRO serves to preserve this Court's jurisdiction and prevent continued unlawful restraint of liberty in violation of the Constitution and federal law. See *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).

### IV. ARGUMENT

#### A. Petitioner Faces Immediate and Irreparable Harm from Continued Detention

Petitioner has been detained by ICE since December 6, 2025, with no final order of removal having ever been issued against him in a removal proceeding, though he is subject to no form of mandatory detention. Petitioner has no criminal history and poses no risk to the community. He has demonstrated no conduct indicating that he is a threat to the United States or otherwise eligible for deportation.

Petitioner's request for bond is moot due to the Immigration Judge not having jurisdiction to set bond. *Matter of Yajure Haturado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). As a result, Petitioner has no administrative avenue for release and remains indefinitely detained without judicial review—an ongoing deprivation of his most fundamental liberty interest.

Continued confinement of a noncitizen without lawful authority constitutes irreparable harm. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690; *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 529–30 (2003). Each additional day of unlawful detention deepens the constitutional injury and cannot be remedied by monetary damages. See *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281 (2018). Petitioner's prolonged confinement also exacerbates his medical conditions, further establishing immediate and irreparable harm absent this Court's intervention.

#### **B. Petitioner is Substantially Likely to Succeed on the Merits**

Petitioner's detention is unlawful under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 because no final order of removal exists, and ICE has failed to justify his continued confinement. Under *Zadvydas*, detention authority under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a) arises only after a removal order becomes final. In Petitioner's case, no final order of removal has been issued against him, and his removal proceedings are still pending before the Immigration Court. Accordingly, the government lacks statutory authority to detain him under § 1231(a).

The Fifth Circuit has recognized that immigration detention must be narrowly tailored and subject to constitutional limits. *Zadvydas v. Underdown*, 185 F.3d 279 (5th Cir. 1999), rev'd on other grounds, 533 U.S. 678 (2001). Absent a final removal order or individualized finding of necessity, detention becomes arbitrary and violates substantive due process. See *Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 302 (1993).

Petitioner poses no flight risk or danger to the community—he has no criminal record, has complied with all ICE reporting requirements, and possesses valid work authorization. ICE’s failure to articulate any legitimate reason for his detention demonstrates that it is punitive, not regulatory, and therefore unconstitutional. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690–91.

For these reasons, Petitioner is substantially likely to prevail on the merits of his habeas corpus petition and is entitled to immediate release.

### **C. The Balance of Harms Favors Petitioner**

The harm to Petitioner from continued unlawful detention—loss of liberty in a facility meant for criminal aliens, deterioration of health, and ongoing constitutional injury—vastly outweighs any administrative burden on the government in effecting her release under appropriate conditions. The government retains full authority to supervise Petitioner through reporting or monitoring conditions, rendering detention unnecessary to ensure appearance.

Where, as here, the government cannot articulate a lawful basis for custody, continued detention serves no legitimate purpose and inflicts disproportionate harm.

### **D. The Public Interest Supports Immediate Release**

The public interest is served by ensuring that government detention authority is exercised within constitutional and statutory bounds. Upholding due process and preventing unlawful imprisonment preserves confidence in the rule of law and the integrity of immigration proceedings.

Granting the requested relief promotes judicial economy by ensuring this Court can fully adjudicate the habeas petition without the case becoming moot due to prolonged or arbitrary detention.

## V. CONCLUSION

Because Petitioner has shown (1) a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of his habeas claim; (2) irreparable harm from continued detention; (3) that the balance of equities strongly favors release; and (4) that release under appropriate safeguards serves the public interest, this Court should grant the temporary restraining order and order Petitioner's **immediate release from ICE custody under appropriate safeguards determined by DHS.**

## VI. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Honorable Court **IMMEDIATELY** issue a temporary restraining order:

1. **Directing Respondents to immediately release Petitioner from custody;**
2. Petitioner requests that this Court order the Immigration Judge to conduct a bond hearing within 7 days governed under INA §1226(a) in the alternative, if immediate release is not possible;
3. Restraining and enjoining Respondent, their agents, employees, and successors from removing Petitioner from the United States;
4. Directing Respondent to take all necessary steps to halt any removal preparations;
5. Requiring Respondent to notify all relevant personnel that Petitioner shall not be removed;

6. Set an expedited hearing on Petitioner's motion for preliminary injunction;
7. After hearing, issue a preliminary injunction maintaining the relief requested above during the pendency of this action;
8. Waive or set security in a nominal amount;
9. Award attorney's fees and costs; and
10. Grant such other relief as this Court deems just and proper.

## **VII. SECURITY AND NOTICE**

Petitioner respectfully requests that the Court waive the security requirement under Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(c) due to her indigent status, or alternatively, set security in a nominal amount.

Petitioner has taken reasonably calculated steps to effect service of process on each of the Respondents named herein, and has provided them with copies of the present motion as described in the Certificate of Service, below.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Matthew Mendez  
Matthew Mendez  
Attorney for Petitioner  
State Bar No. 24098092  
6300 Gulfton Street  
Houston, Texas 77081  
Tel. (346) 205-4343  
matt@mendezlawoffice.com

**CERTIFICATE OF EMERGENCY**

I hereby certify that this motion seeks emergency relief due to Petitioner's imminent risk of removal, which would render his habeas corpus petition moot and cause irreparable constitutional harm.

/s/ Matthew Mendez  
Matthew Mendez  
Attorney for Petitioner

December 18, 2025  
Date

**CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE**

I hereby certify that due to the emergency nature of this motion and the imminent threat of removal, I have been unable to confer with opposing counsel regarding this motion.

/s/ Matthew Mendez  
Matthew Mendez  
Attorney for Petitioner

December 18, 2025  
Date

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

On December 18, 2025, Counsel for Plaintiff served a copy of the attached Motion via USPS Certified Mail, in compliance with Rule 4 of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, upon the **Respondent, Randy Tate, in his official capacity as Warden of the Montgomery Processing CTR;** at the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) Montgomery Processing CTR, located at 806 Hilbig Rd, Conroe, TX 77301.

/s/ Matthew Mendez  
Matthew Mendez  
Attorney for Petitioner

December 18, 2025  
Date

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

On December 18, 2025, Counsel for Plaintiff served a copy of the attached Motion via USPS Certified Mail, in compliance with Rule 4 of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, upon the **Respondent, Bret Bradford, in his Official Capacity as Field Office Director, of ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations Houston Field Office,** at (1) Office of the Field Office Director, Enforcement and Removal Operations, Houston Field Office, 126 Northpoint Drive, Houston, Texas 77060.

/s/ Matthew Mendez  
Matthew Mendez  
Attorney for Petitioner

December 18, 2025  
Date

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

On December 18, 2025, Counsel for Plaintiff served a copy of the attached Motion via USPS Mail, in compliance with Rule 4 of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, upon the **Respondent, Raymond Thompson, in his Official Capacity as Co-Associate Warden of the Joe Corley Processing Center**, at (1) Office of the Warden, 500 Hilbig Road, Conroe, Texas 77301.

/s/ Matthew Mendez  
Matthew Mendez  
Attorney for Petitioner

December 18, 2025  
Date

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

On December 18, 2025, Counsel for Plaintiff served a copy of the attached Motion via USPS Certified Mail, in compliance with Rule 4 of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, upon the **Respondent, Kristi Noem, in her Official Capacity as Director of U.S. Department of Homeland Security**, at (1) Office of General Counsel, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 245 Murray Lane, SW, Mail Stop 0485, Washington, D.C. 20530.

/s/ Matthew Mendez  
Matthew Mendez  
Attorney for Petitioner

December 18, 2025  
Date

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

On December 18, 2025, Counsel for Plaintiff served a copy of the attached Motion via email, in compliance with Rule 4 of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, upon the **Respondent, Pam Bondi, in her Official Capacity as Attorney General of the United States**, at USATXS.CivilNotice@usdoj.gov.

/s/ Matthew Mendez  
Matthew Mendez  
Attorney for Petitioner

December 18, 2025  
Date