

1 Stephen C. Robbins
6 South 2nd St. Ste. 1002
2 Yakima, WA 98901
(509) 823-4523
3 *stephen@robbinsimmigration.com*

4 Attorney for Petitioner

5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

8 Sila YILDIRIM

9 Petitioner,

10 v.

11 Cammilla WAMSLEY, Seattle Field Office
12 Director, Enforcement and Removal Operations,
United States Immigration and Customs
13 Enforcement (ICE); Bruce SCOTT, Warden,
Northwest ICE Processing Center; Kristi
14 NOEM, Secretary, United States Department of
Homeland Security; Pamela BONDI, United
15 States Attorney General; UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
16 SECURITY;

17 Respondents.

Case No. 2:25-cv-2696

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C.
§ 2241**

AGENCY FILE NO: 

INTRODUCTION

1. This case challenges the unlawful re-detention of Ms. Sila Yildirim (Ms. Yildirim) a 20-year-old native of Turkey who came to the United States to seek asylum in October of 2024.

2. Ms. Yildirim was detained at the border for about two weeks before being released with an ankle monitor and regular check-in requirements. She was placed in removal proceedings where she applied for asylum.

3. Despite fully complying with all alternatives to detention Ms. Yildirim was re-detained by Immigration and Customs Enforcement on December 11, 2025.

4. Before re-detaining her, Respondents did not provide Ms. Yildirim with any written notice explaining the basis for detention, nor was a warrant or other evidence provided to counsel. The Respondents did not provide a hearing before a neutral decisionmaker where ICE was required to justify the basis for re-detention or explain why Ms. Yildirim is a flight risk or danger to the community.

5. As this Court has recently held in multiple cases, due process demands a hearing *prior* to the government's decision to terminate a person's liberty. *See E.A. T.-B. v. Wamsley*, --- F. Supp. 3d --- No. C25-1192-KKE, 2025 WL 2402130, at *2-6 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 19, 2025); *Ramirez Tesara v. Wamsley*, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, No. 2:25-CV-01723-MJP-TLF, 2025 WL 2637663, at *2-4 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 12, 2025); *Ledesma Gonzalez v. Bostock*, No. 2:25-CV-01404-JNW-GJL, 2025 WL 2841574, at *7-9 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 7, 2025); *Kumar v. Wamsley*, No. 2:25-CV-01772-JHC-BAT, 2025 WL 2677089, at *2-4 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 17, 2025); Report & Recommendation, *Lopez Reyes v. Wamsley*, No. 2:25-cv-01868-JLR-MLP (W.D. Wash. Oct. 15, 2025), Dkt. 13. Many other courts have recently held the same.

6. By failing to provide such a hearing, Respondents have violated Ms. Yildirim's constitutional right to due process.

7. Accordingly, this Court should grant the instant petition for a writ of habeas corpus and order her immediate release. *See E.A. T.-B.* 2025 WL 2402130, at *6 (ordering immediate release because “a post-deprivation hearing cannot serve as an adequate procedural safeguard because it is after the fact and cannot prevent an erroneous deprivation of liberty”); *Ramirez Tesara*, at *4 (similar); *Kumar*, 2025 WL 2677089, at *3–4 (similar); *Ledesma Gonzalez*, 2025 WL 2841574, at *9 (similar).

JURISDICTION

8. This action arises under the Constitution of the United States and the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 8 U.S.C. § 1101 et seq.

9. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), and Article I, § 9, cl. 2 of the United States Constitution (Suspension Clause).

10. This Court may grant relief under the habeas corpus statutes, 28 U.S.C. § 2241 et seq., the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 et seq., and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

VENUE

11. Venue is proper because Ms. Yildirim is in Respondents’ custody at the NWIPC in Tacoma, Washington. Pursuant to *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493–500 (1973), venue lies in the judicial district in which Ms. Yildirim currently is in custody.

12. Venue is also properly in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because Respondents are employees, officers, and agencies of the United States, and because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in the Western District of Washington.

REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

13. The Court must grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus or issue an order to show cause (OSC) to the Respondents “forthwith,” unless Petitioner is not entitled to relief. 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If an OSC 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.*

14. Habeas corpus is “perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law . . . 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). “The application for the writ usurps the attention and displaces the calendar of the judge or justice who entertains it and receives prompt action from him within the four corners of the application.” *Yong v. I.N.S.*, 208 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted); *see also Van Buskirk v. Wilkinson*, 216 F.2d 735, 737–38 (9th Cir. 1954) (habeas corpus is “a speedy remedy, entitled by statute to special, preferential consideration to insure expeditious hearing and determination”).

PARTIES

15. Ms. Yildirim is a 29-year old native of Turkey. She is detained in Tacoma, Washington.

16. Respondent Cammilla Wamsley is the Field Office Director for ICE's Seattle Field Office. The Seattle Field Office is responsible for local custody decisions relating to noncitizens charged with being removable from the United States. The Seattle Field Office's area of responsibility includes Alaska, Oregon, and Washington. Respondent Wamsley is a legal custodian of Petitioner and is sued in her official capacity.

17. Respondent Bruce Scott is employed by the private corporation The GEO Group, Inc., as Warden of the NWIPC, where Petitioner is detained. He has immediate physical custody of Petitioner. He is sued in his official capacity.

1 18. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security
2 (DHS). She is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the Immigration and
3 Nationality Act (INA), and oversees ICE, which is responsible for Petitioner's detention. Ms. Noem
4 has ultimate custodial authority over Petitioner and is sued in her official capacity.

5 19. Respondent Pamela Bondi is the Attorney General of the United States, and as such
6 has authority over the Department of Justice. She is sued in her official capacity.

7 20. Respondent U.S. Department of Homeland Security is the federal agency that has
8 authority over the actions of ICE.

9 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

10 21. Ms. Yildirim is a 20-year-old native of Turkey. She came to the U.S. in October of
11 2024 to seek asylum.

12 22. Ms. Yildirim was detained at the border for about two weeks before being released
13 with an ankle monitor and regular check-in requirements. She was placed in removal proceedings
14 where she applied for asylum.

15 23. After her arrival Ms. Yildirim married her partner, Emirhan Aslan, a fellow asylum
16 seeker from Turkey. They lived together in the Seattle area. Emirhan attended all of Ms. Yildirim's
17 appointments with ICE as she was very nervous about being detained.

18 24. Despite fully complying with all alternatives to detention Ms. Yildirim was re-
19 detained by Immigration and Customs Enforcement on December 11, 2025 along with her
20 husband.¹ Officers accused her spouse of missing a check-in appointment, a claim that he denies.

21 25. Ms. Yildirim and her husband have no criminal history nor have they otherwise been
22 accused of presenting any kind of danger or risk to their communities.

23 _____
¹ Mr. Aslan is filing his own habeas petition concurrently with this one. *See*, Case No. 2:25-cv-2698.

1 26. Prior to Ms. Yildirim's re-arrest, she did not receive written notice of the reason for
2 her re-detention.

3 27. Prior to her re-arrest, ICE did not assess whether Ms. Yildirim presented a flight risk
4 or danger to the community, or whether her re-arrest was justified for some other reason.

5 28. Prior to Ms. Yildirim's re-detention, she never received a hearing before a neutral
6 decisionmaker to determine if her re-detention is justified.

7 LEGAL FRAMEWORK

8 Due Process Principles

9 29. Due process requires that if DHS seeks to re-arrest a person like Ms. Yildirim—who
10 has lived in the United States without incident since his release from immigration custody in
11 September of 2023, the government must afford a hearing before a neutral decisionmaker to
12 determine whether any re-detention is justified, and whether the person is a flight risk or danger to
13 the community.

14 30. "Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other
15 forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty protected by the Due Process Clause."
16 *Zadydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001). As this Court recently recognized, this is the "the most
17 elemental of liberty interests." *E.A. T.-B.*, 2025 WL 2402130, at *3 (citation modified); *see also*
18 *Ramirez Tesara*, 2025 WL 2637663, at *3 (stating that the petitioner had "an exceptionally strong
19 interest in freedom from physical confinement").

20 31. Consistent with this principle, individuals released on parole or other forms of
21 conditional release have a liberty interest in their "continued liberty." *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S.
22 471, 482 (1972).

23 32. Such liberty is protected by the Fifth Amendment because, "although indeterminate,
[it] includes many of the core values of unqualified liberty," such as the ability to be gainfully

1 employed and live with family, “and its termination inflicts a ‘grievous loss’ on the [released
2 individual] and often on others.” *Id.*

3 33. To protect against arbitrary re-detention and to ensure the right to liberty, due
4 process requires “adequate procedural protections” that test whether the government’s asserted
5 justification for a noncitizen’s physical confinement “outweighs the individual’s constitutionally
6 protected interest in avoiding physical restraint.” *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690 (citation modified).

7 34. Due process thus guarantees notice and an individualized hearing before a neutral
8 decisionmaker to assess danger or flight risk before the revocation of an individual’s release. *Goldberg*
9 *v. Kelly*, 397 U.S. 254, 267 (1970) (“The fundamental requisite of due process of law is the
10 opportunity to be heard . . . at a meaningful time in a meaningful manner.” (citation modified)); *see*
11 *also, e.g., Morrissey*, 408 U.S. at 485 (requiring “preliminary hearing to determine whether there is
12 probable cause or reasonable ground to believe that the arrested parolee has committed . . . a
13 violation of parole conditions” and that such determination be made “by someone not directly
14 involved in the case” (citation modified)).

15 35. Several courts, including this one, have recognized that these principles apply with
16 respect to the re-detention of the many noncitizens that DHS has arbitrarily begun taking back into
17 custody, often after such persons have been released for months and years.

18 36. For example, in *E.A. T.-B.*, this Court applied the *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319
19 (1976), framework to hold that even in a case where the government asserted that mandatory
20 detention initially applied, a person’s re-detention could not occur absent a hearing. The Court did
21 the same in *Ramirez Tesara, Kumar*, and *Ledesma Gonzalez*. *See Ramirez Tesara*, 2025 WL 2637663, at
22 *2–3; *Kumar*, 2025 WL 2677089, at *2–3; *Ledesma Gonzalez*, 2025 WL 2841574, at *7–8.

23 37. In applying the three *Mathews* factors, the *E.A. T.-B.* court held that the petitioner
had “undoubtedly [been] deprive[d] . . . of an established interest in his liberty,” 2025 WL 2402130,

1 at *3, which, as noted, “is the most elemental of liberty interests,” *id.* (citation modified). The Court
2 further explained that even if detention was mandatory, the risk of erroneous deprivation of liberty
3 without a hearing was high because a hearing serves to ensure that the purposes of detention—the
4 prevention of danger and flight risk—are properly served. *Id.* at *4–5. Finally, the Court explained
5 that “the Government’s interest in re-detaining non-citizens previously released without a hearing is
6 low: although it would have required the expenditure of finite resources (money and time) to
7 provide Petitioner notice and hearing on [ISAP] violations before arresting and re-detaining him,
8 those costs are far outweighed by the risk of erroneous deprivation of the liberty interest at issue.”
9 *Id.* at *5. As a result, this Court ordered the petitioner’s immediate release. *Id.* at *6.

10 38. This Court applied a similar analysis in *Ramirez Tesara*. There, the Court reasoned
11 that the petitioner had a “weighty” interest in his liberty and was entitled to the “full protections of
12 the due process clause.” 2025 WL 2637663, at *3. When examining the value of additional
13 safeguards, the Court also noted that despite the government’s allegations of ISAP violations, “the
14 fact ‘that the Government may believe it has a valid reason to detain Petitioner does not eliminate its
15 obligation to effectuate the detention in a manner that comports with due process.’” *Id.* at *4
16 (quoting *E.A. T.-B.*, 2025 WL 2402130, at *4). Finally, the Court reasoned that any government
17 interest in re-detention without a hearing was “minimal.” *Id.* Accordingly, there too, the Court
18 ordered the petitioner’s immediate release. *Id.* at *5.

19 39. The *Kumar* and *Ledesma Gonzalez* courts reached the same decision, again holding that
20 all three factors weighed in favor of affording the petitioner a bond hearing. 2025 WL 2677089, at
21 *3–4; 2025 WL 2841574, at *7–9; *see also* Report & Recommendation, *Lopez Reyes*, No. 2:25-cv-
22 01868-JLR-MLP (W.D. Wash. Oct. 15, 2025), Dkt. 13 (same).

23 40. This Court’s decisions in *E.A. T.-B.*, *Ramirez Tesara*, *Kumar*, and *Ledesma Gonzalez* are
consistent with many other district court decisions addressing similar situations. *See, e.g., Valdez v.*

1 *Joyce*, No. 25 CIV. 4627 (GBD), 2025 WL 1707737 (S.D.N.Y. June 18, 2025) (ordering immediate
2 release due to lack of pre-deprivation hearing); *Garro Pinchi v. Noem*, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, No. 5:25-CV-
3 05632-PCP, 2025 WL 2084921 (N.D. Cal. July 24, 2025) (similar); *Maklad v. Murray*, No. 1:25-CV-
4 00946 JLT SAB, 2025 WL 2299376 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 8, 2025) (similar); *Garcia v. Andrews*, No. 1:25-
5 CV-01006 JLT SAB, 2025 WL 2420068 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2025) (similar).

6 41. The same framework and principles apply here and compel Ms. Yildirim's immediate
7 release.

8 **CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
9 **Violation of Fifth Amendment Right to Due Process**
10 **Procedural Due Process**

11 42. Ms. Yildirim restates and realleges all the prior paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

12 43. Due process does not permit the government to re-detain Ms. Yildirim and strip her
13 of her liberty without written notice and a pre-deprivation hearing before a neutral decisionmaker to
14 determine whether re-detention is warranted based on danger or flight risk. *See Morrissey*, 408 U.S. at
15 487–88. Such written notice and a hearing must occur *prior* to any re-detention.

16 44. Respondents revoked Ms. Yildirim's release and deprived her of liberty without
17 providing her written notice and a meaningful opportunity to be heard by a neutral decisionmaker
18 prior to her re-detention.

19 45. Accordingly, Ms. Yildirim's re-detention violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth
20 Amendment.

21 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

22 WHEREFORE, Ms. Yildirim respectfully requests that this Court:

- 23 (1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- (2) Issue an Order to Show Cause ordering Respondents to show cause within three days as
to why this Petition should not be granted as required by 28 U.S.C. § 2243, and ordering

1 that they not transfer Ms. Yildirim out of this district during the pendency of the court's
2 adjudication of this petition;

- 3 (3) Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus ordering Respondents to Yildirim from custody
4 immediately and permanently enjoining his re-detention during the pendency of her
5 removal proceeding absent written notice and a hearing prior to re-detention where
6 Respondents must prove by clear and convincing evidence that she is a flight risk or
7 danger to the community and that no alternatives to detention would mitigate those
8 risks;
- 9 (4) Declare that Ms. Yildirim's re-detention while removal proceedings are ongoing without
10 first providing an individualized determination before a neutral decisionmaker violates
11 the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment;
- 12 (5) Award Ms. Yildirim's attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act,
13 and on any other basis justified under law; and
- 14 (6) Grant any further relief this Court deems just and proper.

15 Dated: December 24, 2025

16 s/ Stephen C. Robbins

17 Stephen Robbins, WSBA No. 53398
18 stephen@robbinsimmigration.com
19
20
21
22
23