Office of Detention and Removal Operations
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
425 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20536

U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

MAR 27 2006

MEMORANDUM FOR: Field Office Directors

FROM: John P. Torres
Acting Director
Office Of Detention And Removal Operations

SUBJECT: Detention and Deportation Officer's Field Manual
Update: Chapter 1

We have revised the Introduction to Detention and Removal Operations Policy and Procedure Manual (DROPPM); formerly the Detention and Deportation Officer's Field Manual, or DDFM). As you know, the DROPPM contains 29 chapters with 54 appendices and more than 2,100 hyperlinks, including but not limited to internal cross-references, other field manuals, regulations, relevant resources and references, contact information, and forms. The DROPPM is available online at (b)(2)High and on I-Link, which has replaced INSerts.

Please remember that the DROPP is the only approved source of DRO policy and procedures. This hyperlinked manual, properly used, can save you and your officers hours of research and legwork (identifying, locating, and downloading forms; researching statutory and regulatory language, etc.)

Chapter 1, Introduction, now includes section 1.1, "Creating and Updating Policy" and section 1.2, "Policy Dissemination." The entire chapter, as updated, is attached.

Chapter 1: Introduction

This manual* is the official "who, what, when, where, why" guide to the Office of Detention and Removal Operations (DRO). Use it for ready access to information critical to the work you and your colleagues perform. A virtual sourcebook, it will guide you to and through policies, procedures, and background documents.

At the click of a mouse, you can pursue any issue as deeply or broadly as you choose. Hyperlinks punctuate every chapter. Use them to review regulatory and statutory language, guidance documents, policy statements, memoranda, handbooks, manuals, legal opinions, postings by other agencies and organizations, and other material at the core of the DRO program.

The contents of Detention and Removal Operations Policy and Procedure Manual (DROPPM) represent official DRO policy. To the extent that any material conflicts with or otherwise differs from previous issuances, this manual will be the controlling document.

The electronic format means we can "publish" a manual as comprehensive as technology permits. With the help of the web, updates occur in real time. This format affords us the flexibility to respond to constructive criticism and comments, developing this living document into the reliable, definitive, user-friendly guide that field officers, analysts, managers, and senior officials will find indispensable.

Chapters vary in length. The goal is to keep them as succinct as possible. If the primary documents are complete and self-explanatory, then a chapter may consist of no more than an explanatory paragraph and a single hyperlink. When issues are complex or confusing, the text will be as extensive as necessary to clarify and add value to the source material (regulations, legislation, handbooks, etc.).

The DROPPM lodges in I-Link, the reference-library program available online and on compact disc. I-LINK organizes material as virtual "books" on a shelf. The DROPPM is cataloged under "Field Manuals." Flip from one field manual to another by means of a hyperlink, with a single click.

I-LINK reflects updates to DROPPM, incorporating new or revised policies or procedures. Procedures and policies issued through cables or memoranda that have not been incorporated into a chapter of DROPPM are no longer in effect.

The program office responsible for the subject matter is responsible for preparing DROPPM updates, in accordance with the procedures described in [redacted].

Chapters of the manual itself are grouped as follows:

---

* referred to previously as the Detention and Deportation Officer's Field Manual

Chapters one and two constitute a basic introduction, with Chapter 2 providing a contextual overview of the Detention and Removal program. Chapter 2 describes the program from its roots in the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice to its integration into the Department of Homeland Security in March 2003.

Subsequent chapters appear in Parts I through IV.

Part I presents the policies and procedures that govern the removal process.

Part II presents detention-related policies and procedures (standards) that apply to detention officers; detainee services, including medical care; and to the facilities housing INS detainees.

Part III provides policy and procedures relating to official property: weapons, vehicles, communications, fingerprinting, uniforms, and records.

Part IV focuses on the administration of the Detention and Removal program.

Please send suggestions for improvements, including omissions, to the "DRO Policy and Procedure Manual" mailbox. Enter "DROPPM" in the subject line of the message.

1.1 Creating and Updating Policy

The DROPPM contains 29 chapters with 54 appendices and more than 2,100 hyperlinks, including but not limited to internal cross-references, other field manuals, regulations, relevant resources and references, etc. The DRPM is available online at

(b)(2)High

(b)(2)High and on I-Link, which replaced INSerts. I-Link CDs are distributed quarterly to more than 5,000 officers and offices across the nation and abroad. Field Office Directors and Deputy Assistant Directors will communicate all changes of policy and procedure to the field in the form of a memorandum announcing a change to the DROPPM. Program offices must complete the following steps when preparing new or updated policy:

- Use the DROPPM Table of Contents to determine where your update belongs.
- Research your subject. Consult subject-matter experts and legal advisors.
- Draft new material in a straightforward, action-by-action format. Use plain English in the active voice: no jargon, no passive verbs. Write as

if you are explaining the policy to a new hire. This means using the second person ("You do this . . . then you . . ."). Do not say, "The officer shall."

- Link to or create the form(s) necessary for the implementation of your new policy.

- If your update raises any legal issues, obtain clearance from the Office of the Principal Legal Advisor (OPLA) before forwarding to Policy Analysis and Development.

- Draft the memorandum announcing the addition or update to the DROPPM. Provide an introductory sentence or two identifying the addition(s), deletion(s), or other revision(s) and the reason for same. End the paragraph. The next paragraph will consist of a bullet citing the affected Chapter, Section, and Heading (bolded), followed by the cut-and-pasted text that will appear in the manual. For multiple updates, follow the same format:

    - [Insert Chapter, Section, Heading]:

    Cut and paste text as it will appear in the DROPPM.

- If the memorandum will exceed one page in length, you may attach the updated section(s) to the memorandum.

- Submit the draft memorandum, with attachment(s), to Policy Analysis and Development. Policy Analysis and Development will review, format and, in consultation with you, edit the update for the field manual.

- The memorandum will become official policy only when signed by the Director, Office of Detention and Removal Operations.

1.2 Policy Dissemination

DRO will issue a broadcast message announcing the change/update to the DROPPM. Each broadcast message will include a link to the DRO memorandum posted on the DRO website: (b)(2)High.

NOTE:

Nothing in this manual may be construed to create any substantive or procedural right or benefit that is legally enforceable by any party against the United States, its agencies or officers, or any other person.

~~LIMITED OFFICIAL USE~~

Portions of this manual are considered sensitive and may not be released to the public. The contents of these sections are exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act. Officers using this manual and the I-LINK system must take appropriate steps to safeguard these restricted materials. Those sections of this manual which are not restricted may be accessed on the ICE Internet web site. Inquiries relating to the release of other materials should be directed to the Headquarters Freedom of Information/Privacy Act Unit, see [redacted] (b)(2)High.

Stipulated removal is exercised by an immigration judge when he/she enters a removal order without a hearing based on an agreement between the alien and the DHS. In some instances, a judge in a criminal case may consider the alien's agreement to be removed when the judge imposes a sentence for the criminal charge.

Reinstatement of removal orders are applied to aliens who illegally reenter the United States after removal. The original removal order is reinstated as of the original date and is not subject to being reopened or reviewed. Reinstatement of the removal order is mandatory if the DHS determines that the alien who reentered unlawfully is, in fact, the same person who was previously removed.

Custody Management

The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 and other immigration laws authorizes and sometimes mandates that DRO detain illegal aliens who are charged with violating immigration law, have entered the United States illegally, or have been ordered to leave the country. These aliens are detained while their immigration proceedings are administered and facilitates their proper and expedient removal from the country when ordered to do so. DRO administers a national detention program that uses funding appropriated specifically for the care of these aliens and includes the transportation, housing, subsistence, medical care, and guard service necessary to provide safe and humane environments to the inmate population and detention staff. The responsibility begins when a detainee is brought into DRO custody and continues until the alien can be released into the community or removed from the United States. The detainee population is generated by multi-component investigative and prosecutorial efforts within the Department of Homeland Security.

DRO detains aliens for administrative purposes, not criminal and punitive, to ensure they comply with the immigration process. In particular, these aliens are detained because they are determined to be a threat to public safety or pose a significant risk of flight if released. Other factors that DRO considers in making detention determinations are similar to those reasons used to justify removal which include health, prior criminal history and the severity of their crimes, history of failure to appear for Court, equities in the United States and evidence of ties to the community, availability of relief from removal and the likelihood of relief being granted, and prior immigration history.

This detained population is inherently unique, requiring specialized knowledge and processes to safely and humanely hold in appropriate facilities and meet all operational demands. The DRO detained population includes illegal economic migrants, aliens who have committed criminal acts, asylum-seekers (required to be detained by law) or potential terrorists. These persons can be male, female, unaccompanied juveniles of either gender, or families. This diverse population necessitates different environments, standards, and management procedures within DRO facilities than that of other federal, state, county, or local correctional facilities. Additionally, detainees have unknown lengths of stay in custody because they are dependant on the speed of immigration court hearings, appeal review or removal processing.

Factors that DHS considers in making detention determinations include prior criminal history, the severity of the crimes for which the alien was convicted, history of failure to appear for Court, equities in the United States and evidence of ties to the community, availability of relief from removal and the likelihood of relief being granted, and prior immigration violation history. DRO detention policy sets forth guidelines for determining priorities in which aliens should be detained. This policy sets forth four major categories of aliens and classifies these individuals as for placement into high priority, medium priority, or lower priority detention.

Category I, mandatory detention;

Category II, includes security and related crimes, other criminals not subject to mandatory detention, aliens deemed to be a danger to the community or a flight risk and aliens smugglers;

Category III, includes inadmissible non-criminal aliens (not placed in expedited removal), aliens who committed fraud or were smuggled into the United States, work site apprehensions; and

Category IV, includes non-criminal border apprehension, other aliens not subject to mandatory detention, aliens placed in expedited removal.

Not every alien taken into DRO custody has to be placed into traditional or hardened detention facilities. Low threat and low risk aliens can be placed into non-traditional settings (halfway houses, intensive supervision) as they complete their immigration proceedings. These non-traditional methods or alternative programs provide a more cost effective solution to hardened detention facilities and free up bed space for those aliens who must be detained.

The alternative to detention program is a comprehensive array of alternative detention settings and methods that, when employed, will provide a more cost effective solution to ensuring that low risk individuals in immigration proceedings comply with their immigration obligations. Releasing these individuals from hardened and secure detention facilities and into controlled alternative environments creates bed space for those aliens who must be detained, and minimizes the management and oversight needed for those aliens in alternative settings. While bed costs in alternative settings equal those in traditional detention the logistics and special requirements needed to manage special populations such as families and non-criminal females are less intensive than managing that same population integrated into a traditional environment. Additionally, moving these unique populations out of traditional facilities frees up bed space exponentially as two rooms needed to house one family will be freed up to bed 2 and 3 times more individual aliens.

Current custody management initiatives include the establishment of halfway houses particularly suited to house families, female asylum seekers and non-criminal females. These dormitory style facilities are secured by staff only and have no fences, bars or

watch towers, providing a less restrictive and more humane atmosphere for individuals who are not releasable. With these facilities in place, the logistical strain for moving, placing, and housing females and families is removed from the mainstream, hardened detention environment. DRO will continue its research into available technology and methods in order to create and provide safe, secure and humane alternatives to detention.

Custody management is a key tool in the immigration enforcement process. Through an array of traditional and non-traditional detention methods, DRO ensures aliens complete their immigration proceedings and are removed when ordered to do so. Experience shows that aliens who are placed into traditional and non-traditional detention environments have high court appearance rates and high removable rates and achieving high removable rates, especially 100%, is DROs overarching goal.

Supporting Functions

Fleet and Transportation Management

DRO relies heavily on an extensive air and ground transportation fleet to complete the domestic transfer of aliens as well as their foreign removal. Transportation assets must also be in place to support the movement of aliens between facilities and courtrooms as required during their immigration proceedings. This transportation program includes the use of commercial and government aircraft (owned and leased via the Justice Prisoner and Alien Transportation System (JPATS), as well as government owned ground transportation conveyances. The DRO vehicle fleet consists of a total of 2049 vehicles (248 buses and 1801 vans, sedans, and trucks).

All detainee transport vehicles are outfitted with appropriate security equipment to ensure the safety of the detainee, staff, and general public. Additionally, the DRO fleet consists of undercover vehicles, primarily sedans and mini-vans, outfitted as such in order to conduct alien absconder/fugitive operations.

During fiscal year 2002, JPATS conducted 897 DHS missions, which included 3,205 takeoffs and landings, utilizing 5,634 flight hours. Meeting this demanding schedule was a challenge considering the age of the aircraft under contract to the JPATS system during FY 2002. Newer, more capable aircraft should improve schedule reliability and capacity as they are acquired in FY 2003.

During FY 2002, the total passenger count was 81,437 for all the JPATS movements, including special missions. This exceeded the 78,000 to 80,000 passenger movements predicted at the beginning of the year. In addition to high security/sensitive missions following September 11th, DRO also continued the ongoing mission of the repatriation of aliens. The original prediction was to repatriate 12,000 aliens and DRO finished with a record year for moving 13,573 individuals to 9 different countries.

DRO will continue efforts to re-capitalize its ground fleet and institutionalize a comprehensive fleet management and replacement program. DRO will also evaluate

CASE NAME / YEAR	CUSTODY FACTORS CONSIDERED	(FLIGHT /DANGER)	KEY LEGAL HOLDINGS	OVERCOMING FLIGHT RISK OR DANGER
Matter of Iurii DOBROTVORSKII 2025 29 I&N Dec. 211 (BIA 2025)	R recently entered the U.S. (a) short length of residence) (b) only eligible for speculative humanitarian relief (c) lacked a fixed address (d) no work history (e) no record of court appearances (f) sponsor gave inconsistent documentation showing three different addresses in NJ and FL (g) No affidavit from the sponsor on a willingness to support him or ensure his appearance (h) no family ties or property in the U.S.	Flight risk; ordered detained without bond (vacated $10,000 bond).	1. A valid, reliable, and credible sponsor is relevant to flight risk as it relates to having a fixed address and community ties. 2. IJs can consider all relevant evidence regardless of which party filed it. 3. Findings of likely appearance must be based on reasonable inferences, not speculation. **Factors to avoid flight risk determination:** 1. A fixed address in the U.S. 2. Significant length of residence. 3. Family ties that may lead to permanent residence. 4. Lawful manner of entry. 5. Stable employment history. 6. A reliable sponsor with a verified address and a signed affidavit of support.	(1) A detailed affidavit from a sponsor explaining their relationship to the respondent and a clear commitment to ensure court appearances; (2) Consistent proof of the sponsor's fixed address (e.g., utility bills and leases that match); (3) Evidence of the respondent's participation in safe and orderly entry programs (like CBP One) as an inference of future compliance; (4) Documentation of any possible family ties or community equity; (5) Proof of a stable environment where the respondent will live, specifically clarifying which address is the primary residence.
Matter of Gairat AKHMEDOV 2025 29 I&N Dec. 166 (BIA 2025)	R entered unlawfully in January 2022 (a) 3 years in U.S. (b) Significant discrepancies regarding his residence. He claimed to live in MI with his brother-in-law but had a history of ties to NY. (c) Failed to file timely change of address notices (EOIR-33), (d) only updating his address after being encountered by immigration officers in 2025. (e) His address of record remained in NY for over a year while he claimed to be in MI. (d) Unknown relief from removal.	Flight risk; ordered detained without bond (vacated $15,000 bond).	The totality of circumstances, specifically inconsistent address evidence and failure to comply with statutory address reporting requirements, relief from removal unknown or weak, demonstrates flight risk. **Factors to avoid risk:** 1. Strict compliance with address update (reporting moves within 5 days). 2. Maintaining a fixed, verifiable address. 3. Demonstrating strong family or community ties. 4. Showing a high likelihood of success on the merits of a relief claim.	(1) Proof of timely filed Form EOIR-33/IC for every move to show transparency; (2) Evidence explaining any address discrepancies, such as mail received at the current residence; (3) Affidavits from family members (like a brother-in-law) confirming the respondent's residence and their supervision; (4) Evidence of a pending, strong claim for relief to show motivation to attend hearings; (5) Documentation of property or equity in the U.S. that would be forfeited if the respondent fled;

Matter of C-M-M- 2025 29 I&N Dec. 141 (BIA 2025)	R in the U.S. since 2001. Flight risk because (a) had four removal orders and reentered illegally four times. (b) had two illegal reentry convictions (c) had twice lied to officers by claiming U.S. citizenship. Despite having family, community ties, and a sponsor, her repeated disregard for immigration laws and speculative and (d) very limited relief eligibility (Withholding-only) outweighed those ties.	Flight risk and Danger to Community; ordered detained without bond (vacated $15,000 bond).	Extensive history of immigration violations, including multiple illegal reentries and removals, attests to being a significant flight risk that no bond can mitigate. **Factors needed to avoid flight risk:** 1. A history of compliance with immigration procedures. 2. Truthfulness with immigration officers. 3. A non-speculative path to legal relief. 4. Minimal or no history of prior removals.	(1) Evidence of enrollment and participation in court-ordered programs (e.g., DV treatment) to show rehabilitation; (2) Provide a detailed "release plan" from reputable organizations; (3) Show that the respondent has taken responsibility for past actions to predict future compliance; (4) Provide evidence that the current application for relief has a high probability of success, which increases the incentive to appear.
Matter of R-A-V-P- 2020 27 I&N Dec. 803 (BIA 2020)	R entered unlawfully in February 2019 and was detained immediately. Flight risk because (a) he was a recent arrival, (b) had EWI, (c) no family ties, (d) no work history, (e) no community ties in the U.S. (f) had no prior lawful status (g) no probable path to legal status (h)Sponsor didn't show evidence of immigration status, depth of their relationship, or ability to financially support.	Flight risk; bond denied.	Burden of proof is on the R to show they are not a flight risk. Meaningful ties to the U.S. and a probable path to lawful status are critical to mitigating flight risk. **Factors to avoid flight risk:** 1. Family ties in the U.S. (especially immediate family). 2. Work history in the U.S. 3. Community ties. 4. A record of appearance in court. 5. A probable path to future lawful status.	(1) Independent evidence of a sponsor's lawful immigration status; (2) Proof of the sponsor's financial ability to support the respondent; (3) Detailed affidavits explaining how the sponsor knows the respondent to establish a meaningful connection; (4) Any available evidence of a "probable path" to status, such as an approved visa petition (Form I-130); (5) Documentation of residential stability, such as a long-term lease or utility bills.
Matter of SINIAUSKAS 2018 27 I&N Dec. 207 (BIA 2018)	R entered in 2000 (17 years in U.S.). He was married to an LPR and had a U.S. citizen daughter. He owned a business and had community involvement. Despite these ties, he was detained due to four DUI incidents (three convictions in 2006-2007 and a 2017 arrest). **The court ruled that family ties mitigated flight risk** but did not mitigate his "dangerousness" to the community due to the inherent danger of DUIs.	Danger to the community; ordered detained without bond (vacated $25,000 bond).	Driving under the influence is a significant adverse consideration for danger. Family and community ties do not generally mitigate an alien's dangerousness. **Factors to avoid danger determination:** 1. Evidence of genuine rehabilitation. 2. A clean criminal record or significant time since the last offense without recidivism. 3. Proof that past conduct was an isolated incident, not a pattern.	To counteract a danger finding related to alcohol: (1) Certificates of completion for Alcoholics Anonymous or professional substance abuse treatment; (2) Testimony from a medical professional regarding the respondent's sobriety; (3) Evidence of a significant "clean" period between offenses; (4) Character references from church or charitable organizations to show community standing; (5) Evidence that the respondent no longer has access to a vehicle or has an ignition interlock device installed.

Matter of GUERRA 2006 24 I. & N. Dec. 37 (BIA 2006)	R entered in 2000. Married to a U.S. citizen. He was considered a danger and flight risk because he was criminally charged (though not convicted) in a major drug trafficking scheme involving 6kg of cocaine. The seriousness of the alleged crime and the potential for a long sentence provided a high incentive to flee.	Danger to the community and Flight risk; bond denied.	Immigration Judges have wide discretion to consider any probative evidence, including criminal charges without convictions. Drug trafficking is a major negative factor for both danger and flight risk. **Factors to avoid danger determination:** 1. Fixed address and length of residence. 2. Family ties. 3. Employment history. 4. Record of court appearances. 5. Minimal or no criminal record.	(1) Evidence of the respondent's record of appearance in criminal court (e.g., out on a high criminal bond without fleeing); (2) Work records to show community integration; (3) Proof of a pending I-130 petition to show a legal path to stay; (4) Evidence to undermine the reliability of the criminal complaint if no conviction exists; (5) Documentation of the respondent's role as a primary provider or caregiver for his family; (6) fixed address, family ties, and length of residency in the U.S.
Matter of ADENIJI 1999 22 I&N Dec.1102 (BIA 1999)	R had a history of immigration **deceit** (misrepresenting facts for a 1984 visa) and a 1983 deportation order. He had a 1996 conviction for conspiracy to commit bank fraud. He had a wife (asylee) and two U.S. citizen children, but his history of **deceitful** behavior and criminal record made him a flight risk if he were to lose his merits case.	Potential flight risk and danger to property; remanded.	Under 8 C.F.R. § 236.1(c)(8), an alien must show that release would not pose a danger to society and not a flight risk. **Factors to avoid danger:** 1. Proof that the crime was not "particularly serious." 2. Evidence of rehabilitation. 3. **Strong family ties (spouse/children).** 4. Success in the merits case (e.g., grant of withholding).	(1) Explicitly move to incorporate evidence from the removal/merits hearing into the bond record; (2) Provide a summary of testimony from the merits hearing showing the respondent's character; (3) Present evidence of the respondent's role as a father and husband; (4) Suggest a moderate monetary bond instead of own recognizance to ensure appearance; (5) Provide evidence that the specific crime did not involve physical violence.

UNPUBLISHED BIA BOND DECISION EXHIBIT

The unpublished bond decisions collected in the following Exhibit illustrate how the BIA applies *Matter of Guerra* and related precedent in day-to-day § 236(a) custody cases and underscore that minor traffic or DUI conduct, recent entry, or generalized concerns about relief do not, standing alone, justify categorical "no bond" findings where respondents have ties and sponsors.

In *R-T-M-*, AXXX XXX 273 (BIA May 17, 2019), the Board reversed a no-bond order that relied "in large part" on four convictions for driving without a license and the "prospect of relief," holding that those convictions, without any moving violations, did not show danger and that the prospect of relief, while relevant, could not by itself establish an unmitigable risk of flight; the case was remanded for the IJ to set an appropriate bond.

In *R-C-K-C-*, AXXX XXX 113 (BIA Mar. 11, 2019), the Board sustained the appeal where the IJ had found flight risk and denied bond but made no danger finding, emphasizing the presence of a cousin-sponsor who provided an affidavit offering housing, basic necessities, and assistance with court appearances, and remanded for the IJ to set bond (over a dissent that treated sponsor inconsistencies as "derogatory indicia of flight risk").

In *G-C-S-*, AXXX XXX 032 (BIA Apr. 30, 2019), the Board rejected a no-bond denial based solely on a single DUI arrest in the respondent's 14 years in the United States, where the record showed no conviction or injury and substantial equities—three U.S. citizen children, long residence, steady employment, tax payment, and a pending cancellation application—holding that he had met his burden to show he was not a danger and that any flight risk could be mitigated by bond, and remanding for the IJ to set a reasonable bond.

In *H-G-W-*, AXXX XXX 614 (BIA Dec. 19, 2019), the Board disagreed with the IJ's conclusion that the respondent was a flight risk "such that no bond is warranted" (again with no danger finding) and ordered release under a $10,000 bond, confirming that some bond—rather than categorical detention—is appropriate in the absence of an extreme, unmanageable risk.

Finally, in *M-T-G-*, AXXX XXX 648 (BIA July 31, 2017), the IJ's Rodriguez bond memorandum denied redetermination and ordered no bond based on four alcohol-related driving offenses, "limited" relief following a removal order, and a conclusion that the respondent had "failed to meet his burden" to show lack of danger and flight risk, illustrating how IJs have sometimes misallocated the burden of proof to the detainee and relied on multiple DUIs and perceived weakness of relief to justify prolonged detention without bond. Together, these decisions demonstrate that where respondents have fixed addresses, family and community ties, sponsors, and pending, colorable relief, the Board expects individualized analysis and generally requires that some bond be set rather than upholding "no bond" outcomes based on minor offenses or abstract, "speculative" assessments of relief.

U.S. Department of Justice

Executive Office for Immigration Review

Board of Immigration Appeals
Office of the Clerk

5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 2000
Falls Church, Virginia 22041

Kelley, Laura F.
Law Offices of Laura F Kelley, PA
8180 NW 36th Street
Suite 220
Doral, FL 33166

DHS/ICE Office of Chief Counsel - BTC
3900 N. Powerline Road
Pompano Beach, FL 33073

Name: T[redacted]-M[redacted], R[redacted]

A 2[redacted]-273

Date of this notice: 5/17/2019

Enclosed is a copy of the Board's decision and order in the above-referenced case.

Sincerely,

Donna Carr

Donna Carr
Chief Clerk

Enclosure

Panel Members:
Mann, Ana
Liebmann, Beth S.
Morris, Daniel

Userteam: Docket

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

For more unpublished decisions, visit
www.irac.net/unpublished/index

U.S. Department of Justice
Executive Office for Immigration Review

Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

File: A[redacted]-273 – Pompano Beach, FL Date: MAY 17 2019

In re: R[redacted] T[redacted]-M[redacted]

IN BOND PROCEEDINGS

APPEAL

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Laura F. Kelley, Esquire

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Shaheewa T. Jarrett Gelin
Assistant Chief Counsel

APPLICATION: Change in custody status

The respondent appeals from the Immigration Judge's December 7, 2018, order denying his request for a change in custody status. A December 19, 2018, bond memorandum sets forth the basis for that order. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has filed a motion for summary affirmance. The respondent's appeal will be sustained and the record will be remanded for further custody proceedings.

We review the findings of fact, including the determination of credibility, made by the Immigration Judge under the "clearly erroneous" standard. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(d)(3)(i). We review all other issues, including issues of law, discretion, or judgment, under a de novo standard. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(d)(3)(ii).

An alien in a custody determination hearing conducted pursuant to section 236(a) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), has the burden of establishing that he does not present a threat to persons or property. *See Matter of Siniauskas*, 27 I&N Dec. 207 (BIA 2018). Further, the alien bears the burden to establish that he or she does not present a flight risk if released on bond. *See Matter of Guerra*, 24 I&N Dec. 37, 38 (BIA 2006).

We will sustain the respondent's appeal of the Immigration Judge's determination that he did not meet his burden to establish that he does not present a danger to the community. The Immigration Judge noted the respondent's testimony that he has been present in the United States since 2010 (IJ at 2). The Immigration Judge denied bond in large part based on four convictions that the respondent incurred from 2014 to 2018 for driving without a license (IJ at 1-2). We appreciate the Immigration Judge's concerns about the respondent's conduct, however we disagree that these acts by themselves indicate that the respondent presents a danger to the community (IJ at 1). While the record reflects that the respondent received traffic warnings when he was stopped by police, it does not appear that he has been convicted of any moving violations.

Additionally, as it appears that the respondent was present in criminal court to address the charges, we do not conclude that these offenses indicate that the respondent presents a flight risk

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

such that no amount of bond will ensure his presence at future removal proceedings. While the prospect of relief from removal is a relevant factor in a bond determination (IJ at 2), we disagree that this factor alone establishes that the respondent presents a flight risk that may not be ameliorated by an appropriate bond.

For the foregoing reasons, we will sustain the respondent's appeal of the Immigration Judge's determination that the respondent presents a danger to the community. The record will be remanded for the Immigration Judge to determine an appropriate bond to ensure the respondent's continued presence throughout removal proceedings.

ORDER: The respondent's appeal is sustained and the record is remanded to the Immigration Judge for further proceedings consistent with the foregoing opinion.

FOR THE BOARD

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

U.S. Department of Justice

Executive Office for Immigration Review

Board of Immigration Appeals
Office of the Clerk

5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 2000
Falls Church, Virginia 22041

Okeke, Ifeanyi Victor
Victor Ifeanyi Okeke, LLC
2470 Windy Hill Road
Suite 249
Marietta, GA 30067

DHS/ICE Office of Chief Counsel - JNA
PO Box 410
Trout, LA 71371

Name: W[redacted], H[redacted] G[redacted] **A [redacted]-614**

Date of this notice: 12/19/2019

Enclosed is a copy of the Board's decision and order in the above-referenced case.

Sincerely,

Donna Carr

Donna Carr
Chief Clerk

Enclosure

Panel Members:
Couch, Stuart V.
Mann, Ana
Kelly, Edward F.

Userteam: Docket

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

For more unpublished decisions, visit
www.irac.net/unpublished/index

U.S. Department of Justice
Executive Office for Immigration Review

Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

File: A[redacted]-614 – Jena, LA

Date: DEC 19 2019

In re: H[redacted] G[redacted] W[redacted]

IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS

APPEAL

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Ifeanyi Victor Okeke, Esquire

APPLICATION: Change in custody status

The respondent has appealed the Immigration Judge's August 5, 2019, bond order. As detailed in the September 10, 2019, bond memorandum, the Immigration Judge found that the respondent is a flight risk such that no bond is warranted. The appeal will be sustained.

We review the findings of fact, including the determination of credibility, made by the Immigration Judge under the "clearly erroneous" standard. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(d)(3)(i). We review all other issues, including issues of law, discretion, or judgment, under a de novo standard. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(d)(3)(ii).

In the present matter, the respondent's custody determination is governed by the provisions of section 236(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). An alien in a custody determination under this section must establish that he or she does not present a danger to persons or property, is not a threat to the national security, and does not pose a risk of flight. *See Matter of Guerra*, 24 I&N Dec. 37 (BIA 2006); *Matter of Adeniji*, 22 I&N Dec. 1102 (BIA 1999); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(c)(8); *Matter of D-J-*, 23 I&N Dec. 572, 576 (A.G. 2003).

On appeal, the respondent argues that the Immigration Judge erred in finding that the respondent did not meet his burden of establishing that he is not a flight risk. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has not filed an opposition to the respondent's appeal. The respondent claims on appeal that he and his wife have a fixed address, that he entered the United States lawfully, that he is not a recent entrant, that he and his wife will apply for asylum, that he is employed, that he has property and community ties, and that he turned himself in and did not flee from the DHS (Respondent's Br. at 4-6; Exh. 1). The respondent has submitted evidence showing that his wife, whose circumstances he claims were similar to his, was granted bond in the amount of $10,000 (Exh E). The respondent has also submitted several letters of support from family and friends (Exh. D). The respondent has submitted a lease showing he has a fixed address (Exh. C). We acknowledge the Immigration Judge's reasoning. However, in the instant case, we do not conclude that the respondent is a flight risk such that no bond is warranted. We thus will sustain the appeal and set a bond of $10,000 for the respondent. We note that the Immigration Judge did not make a finding that the respondent is a danger to the community.

Accordingly, the following orders will be entered.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

A[redacted]-614

FURTHER ORDER: The respondent shall be released from custody under the posting of a bond in the amount of $10,000.

FOR THE BOARD

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

U.S. Department of Justice

Executive Office for Immigration Review

Board of Immigration Appeals
Office of the Clerk

5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 2000
Falls Church, Virginia 22041

Ashraf, Shahzada
Shahzada Ashraf Esq.
19350 Sherman Way Unit 230
Reseda, CA 91335

DHS/ICE Office of the Chief Counsel - OTM
880 Front St., Ste. 2246
San Diego, CA 92101

Name: K[redacted]-C[redacted], R[redacted] C[redacted] **A[redacted]-113**

Date of this notice: 3/11/2019

Enclosed is a copy of the Board's decision and order in the above-referenced case.

Sincerely,

Donna Carr

Donna Carr
Chief Clerk

Enclosure

Panel Members:
Greer, Anne J.
Cole, Patricia A.
Donovan, Teresa L.

Humadyl
Userteam: Docket

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

For more unpublished decisions, visit
www.irac.net/unpublished/index

U.S. Department of Justice
Executive Office for Immigration Review

Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

File: A[redacted]-113 – San Diego, CA Date: MAR 11 2019

In re: R[redacted] C[redacted] [redacted]-C[redacted]

IN BOND PROCEEDINGS

APPEAL

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Shahzada Ashraf, Esquire

APPLICATION: Change in custody status

The respondent has appealed the Immigration Judge's July 12, 2018, bond order. As detailed in the August 20, 2018, bond memorandum, the Immigration Judge found that the respondent is a flight risk such that no bond is warranted. The appeal will be sustained, and the record will be remanded to the Immigration Judge for further proceedings.

We review the findings of fact, including the determination of credibility, made by the Immigration Judge under a clearly erroneous standard. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(d)(3)(i). We review all other issues, including issues of law, discretion, or judgment, under a de novo standard. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(d)(3)(ii).

In the present matter, the respondent's custody determination is governed by the provisions of section 236(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). An alien in a custody determination under this section must establish that he or she does not present a danger to persons or property, is not a threat to the national security, and does not pose a risk of flight. *See Matter of Guerra*, 24 I&N Dec. 37 (BIA 2006); *Matter of Adeniji*, 22 I&N Dec. 1102 (BIA 1999); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(c)(8); *Matter of D-J-*, 23 I&N Dec. 572, 576 (A.G. 2003).

On appeal, the respondent argues that the Immigration Judge erred in finding that the respondent did not meet his burden of establishing that he is not a flight risk. We acknowledge the Immigration Judge's reasoning. However, in the instant case, we do not conclude that the respondent is a flight risk such that no bond is warranted. We note that the Immigration Judge did not make a finding that the respondent is a danger to the community (IJ at 1-2). Moreover, the respondent has a cousin who has submitted an affidavit indicating that the respondent can live with him, that he will provide basic necessities and that he will assist the respondent in appearing in court (IJ at 2; Exh. B-3 at 9).

Under these circumstances, we will sustain the appeal and remand the record for the Immigration Judge to set a bond for the respondent. On remand, both parties may submit additional evidence.

Accordingly, the following orders will be entered.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

FURTHER ORDER: The record is remanded to the Immigration Judge for further proceedings consistent with the foregoing opinion and for the entry of a new decision.

FOR THE BOARD

Board Member Patricia A. Cole respectfully dissents. I do not find an abuse of discretion by the Immigration Judge in determining the respondent to be a flight risk and that no bond is warranted. The Immigration Judge weighed the fact that the respondent was a recent arrival to the United States, had disregard for the United States immigration laws, and presented conflicting information as to whether he had family or friends in the United States. The Majority apparently finds the Immigration Judge erred in not finding the existence of a "cousin" to sponsor the respondent, while ignoring the Immigration Judge's finding that the respondent's presentation of conflicting information regarding a "sponsor" to be "derogatory indicia of flight risk" (IJ at 2). I would dismiss this appeal.

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

U.S. Department of Justice

Executive Office for Immigration Review

Board of Immigration Appeals
Office of the Clerk

5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 2000
Falls Church, Virginia 22041

Echevarria, Jennifer Susan
Jacobowitz & Gubits LLP
158 Orange Avenue
P.O. Box 367
Walden, NY 12586

DHS/ICE Office of Chief Counsel - NYD
201 Varick, Rm. 1130
New York, NY 10014

Name: C[redacted] S[redacted], G[redacted]

A [redacted]-032

Date of this notice: 4/30/2019

Enclosed is a copy of the Board's decision and order in the above-referenced case.

Sincerely,

Donna Carr

Donna Carr
Chief Clerk

Enclosure

Panel Members:
Cole, Patricia A.
Greer, Anne J.
Wendtland, Linda S.

Userteam: Docket

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

For more unpublished BIA decisions, visit
www.irac.net/unpublished/index

U.S. Department of Justice
Executive Office for Immigration Review

Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

File: A[redacted]-032 – New York, NY Date: APR 30 2019

In re: G[redacted] C[redacted] S[redacted] a.k.a. [redacted]

IN BOND PROCEEDINGS

APPEAL

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Jennifer S. Echevarria, Esquire

APPLICATION: Redetermination of custody status

The respondent, a native and citizen of Mexico, is currently detained by the Department of Homeland Security during the pendency of removal proceedings. On October 4, 2018, an Immigration Judge denied the respondent's request for a change in custody status based on the conclusion that he did not demonstrate that he is not a danger to the community or that he poses a flight risk capable of being mitigated by bond. The respondent's appeal of this decision will be sustained and the record will be remanded.

This Board reviews the Immigration Judge's factual findings, including credibility findings and predictions as to the likelihood of future events, for clear error. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(d)(3)(i). We review all other issues de novo. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(d)(3)(ii).

An alien in a custody determination under section 236(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), must establish to the satisfaction of the Immigration Judge and this Board that he does not present a danger to persons or property, is not a threat to the national security, and does not pose a risk of flight. *Matter of Adeniji*, 22 I&N Dec. 1102, 1111-12 (BIA 1999). An alien who presents a danger to persons or property should not be released during the pendency of proceedings. *Matter of Drysdale*, 20 I&N Dec. 815, 816-18 (BIA 1994). Only if an alien has established that he would not pose a danger to persons or property should an Immigration Judge decide the amount of bond necessary to ensure the alien's presence at proceedings to remove him from the United States. *Matter of Urena*, 25 I&N Dec. 140, 141 (BIA 2009). In determining whether an alien presents a danger to the community and thus should not be released on bond pending removal proceedings, an Immigration Judge should consider both direct and circumstantial evidence of dangerousness. *Matter of Fatahi*, 26 I&N Dec. 791, 795 (BIA 2016).

The respondent argues that the Immigration Judge erroneously found that he did not demonstrate he is not a danger to the community on the basis of his July 8, 2018, arrest for driving under the influence of alcohol ("DUI") (IJ at 2-3; Exh. B3; Respondent's Br. at 8-10). We agree. Although we acknowledge the Immigration Judge's reasoning, on the record before us, we conclude that the respondent has met his burden. While we do not condone the respondent's recent arrest, it is the sole arrest reflected on his FBI "RAP sheet" despite the fact that the respondent has resided in this country for over 14 years (IJ at 3; Exh. B3). The record also does not show that the

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

respondent has yet been convicted of any criminal offense. Moreover, no evidence in the record indicates that injury to a person or damage to property occurred during the respondent's sole DUI offense (IJ at 2-3; Tr. at 18-22). *Cf. Matter of Siniauskas*, 27 I&N Dec. 207 (BIA 2018) (alien, who had a history of drinking and driving, had numerous DUI convictions, including ones that involved accidents). The respondent further has close family and community ties, and submitted multiple letters of support, including from his employer and church pastor (Exh. B1). For these reasons, we will reverse the Immigration Judge's holding that the respondent has not demonstrated that he is not a danger to the community. *See Matter of Guerra*, 24 I&N Dec. 37, 40 (BIA 2006) (stating that an alien's criminal record, including the extensiveness of criminal activity, the recency of such activity, and the seriousness of the offenses is a factor for determining whether the alien merits release on bond).

Additionally, we agree with the respondent's argument that the Immigration Judge's flight ruling is erroneous (Respondent's Br. at 10). The record supports the Immigration Judge's determination that the respondent has long residence in this country, family ties including three United States citizen children, and a good record of employment and having paid taxes (IJ at 3-4; Exh. B1). *See id.* Furthermore, while the Immigration Judge found that the respondent did not establish prima facie eligibility for any form of relief from removal (IJ at 3), the administrative records of this agency show that he currently has an application for cancellation of removal pending before the Immigration Court. *See Matter of Andrade*, 19 I&N Dec. 488, 490 (BIA 1987) (stating that a respondent who is likely to be granted relief has a greater motivation to appear for removal than one who has less potential to obtain relief). Therefore, we will reverse the Immigration Judge's holding that the respondent has not shown that his flight risk may be mitigated by bond. *See Matter of Guerra*, 24 I&N Dec. at 40.

In light of our determinations, we will remand the record to the Immigration Judge to set a reasonable amount of bond. The parties may submit additional evidence and argument on remand.

Accordingly, the following order is entered.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained and the record is remanded for further proceedings and the entry of a new decision consistent with this opinion.

FOR THE BOARD

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

U.S. Department of Justice

Executive Office for Immigration Review

Board of Immigration Appeals
Office of the Clerk

5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 2000
Falls Church, Virginia 22041

Tanijo, Steve
Orbit Law PLLC
2226 Eastlake Ave E #71
Seattle, WA 98102

DHS/ICE Office of Chief Counsel - TAC
1623 East J Street, Ste. 2
Tacoma, WA 98421

Name: T[redacted]-G[redacted], M[redacted]

A [redacted]-648

Date of this notice: 7/31/2017

Enclosed is a copy of the Board's decision and order in the above-referenced case.

Sincerely,

Cynthia L. Crosby
Deputy Chief Clerk

Enclosure

Panel Members:
Grant, Edward R.

Userteam: Docket

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

For more unpublished BIA decisions, visit
www.irac.net/unpublished/index/

U.S. Department of Justice

Executive Office for Immigration Review

Board of Immigration Appeals
Office of the Clerk

5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 2000
Falls Church, Virginia 22041

T[redacted]-G[redacted], M[redacted]
A[redacted]-648
NORTHWEST DET. CENTER
1623 EAST J STREET, STE. 5
TACOMA, WA 98421

DHS/ICE Office of Chief Counsel - TAC
1623 East J Street, Ste. 2
Tacoma, WA 98421

Name: T[redacted]-G[redacted], M[redacted]

A [redacted]-648

Date of this notice: 7/31/2017

Enclosed is a copy of the Board's decision in the above-referenced case. This copy is being provided to you as a courtesy. Your attorney or representative has been served with this decision pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 1292.5(a). If the attached decision orders that you be removed from the United States or affirms an Immigration Judge's decision ordering that you be removed, any petition for review of the attached decision must be filed with and received by the appropriate court of appeals within 30 days of the date of the decision.

Sincerely,

Cynthia L. Crosby
Deputy Chief Clerk

Enclosure

Panel Members:
Grant, Edward R.

Userteam: [redacted]

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

U.S. Department of Justice
Executive Office for Immigration Review

Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

File: [redacted] 648 – Tacoma, WA

Date: JUL 3 1 2017

In re: M[redacted] T[redacted]-G[redacted]

IN BOND PROCEEDINGS

APPEAL

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Steve Tanijo, Esquire

APPLICATION: Change in custody status

The respondent, a native and citizen of Mexico, appeals from the Immigration Judge's February 15, 2017, custody order denying his request for a change in custody status. The reasons for the Immigration Judge's custody order are set forth in a memorandum prepared by the Immigration Judge on March 2, 2017. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has not filed an appeal brief. The record will be remanded for further proceedings.

We review the findings of fact, including determinations of credibility, made by the Immigration Judge under the "clearly erroneous" standard. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(d)(3)(i). We review all other issues, including whether or not the parties have met the relevant burden of proof, and issues of discretion, under a de novo standard. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(d)(3)(ii).

The respondent requested a custody redetermination hearing pursuant to *Rodriguez v. Robbins*, 804 F.3d 1060 (9th Cir. 2015), *cert. granted sub nom. Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 136 S.Ct. 2489 (2016). On February 15, 2017, the Immigration Judge held a custody hearing and denied bond. The respondent asserts on appeal that the Immigration Judge improperly placed the burden of proof on him, not the DHS, to establish that he is not a danger or a flight risk, and failed to consider all the relevant factors in the case.

Pursuant to *Rodriguez v. Robbins*, 804 F.3d at 1070-71, a bond hearing must be held for relevant class members after six months of detention, and the DHS bears the burden of justifying continued detention by clear and convincing evidence. As the respondent correctly notes on appeal, the Immigration Judge erroneously stated in the bond memorandum that the respondent had not met his burden of proof on danger or flight risk. As noted above, the DHS has the burden of proof in a hearing under *Rodriguez v. Robbins*, 804 F.3d at 1071, not the respondent. Accordingly, the record will be remanded for application of the correct burden of proof and further consideration of the respondent's request for bond.

ORDER: The record is remanded for further proceedings consistent with the foregoing decision.

FOR THE BOARD

Cite as: M-T-G-, AXXX XXX 648 (BIA July 31, 2017)

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW
IMMIGRATION COURT
1623 EAST J STREET, SUITE 3
TACOMA, WA 98421

Orbit Law PLLC
Tanijo, Steve
2226 Eastlake Ave E #71
Seattle, WA 98102

IN THE MATTER OF FILE A [redacted]-648 DATE: Mar 3, 2017
T[redacted]-G[redacted], M[redacted]

__ UNABLE TO FORWARD - NO ADDRESS PROVIDED

__ ATTACHED IS A COPY OF THE DECISION OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE. THIS DECISION IS FINAL UNLESS AN APPEAL IS FILED WITH THE BOARD OF IMMIGRATION APPEALS WITHIN 30 CALENDAR DAYS OF THE DATE OF THE MAILING OF THIS WRITTEN DECISION. SEE THE ENCLOSED FORMS AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROPERLY PREPARING YOUR APPEAL. YOUR NOTICE OF APPEAL, ATTACHED DOCUMENTS, AND FEE OR FEE WAIVER REQUEST MUST BE MAILED TO: BOARD OF IMMIGRATION APPEALS
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 2000
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22041

__ ATTACHED IS A COPY OF THE DECISION OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE AS THE RESULT OF YOUR FAILURE TO APPEAR AT YOUR SCHEDULED DEPORTATION OR REMOVAL HEARING. THIS DECISION IS FINAL UNLESS A MOTION TO REOPEN IS FILED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 242B(c)(3) OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT, 8 U.S.C. SECTION 1252B(c)(3) IN DEPORTATION PROCEEDINGS OR SECTION 240(c)(6), 8 U.S.C. SECTION 1229a(c)(6) IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS. IF YOU FILE A MOTION TO REOPEN, YOUR MOTION MUST BE FILED WITH THIS COURT:

IMMIGRATION COURT
1623 EAST J STREET, SUITE 3
TACOMA, WA 98421

__X__ OTHER: **PLEASE SEE THE ATTACHED BOND MEMORANDUM OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE.**

COURT CLERK
IMMIGRATION COURT FF

CC: WILLIAM P. HOLLERICH, DHS ASSISTANT CHIEF COUNSEL
1623 EAST J STREET, SUITE 2
TACOMA, WA, 98421

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW
NORTHWEST DETENTION CENTER
IMMIGRATION COURT
TACOMA, WASHINGTON

In the Matter of:

M[redacted] T[redacted] G[redacted]

Respondent

File Number A[redacted]-648

In Bond Proceedings

Application: Bond Re-determination

On Behalf of the Respondent

Steve Tanijo
Orbit Law
509 Olive Way, Suite 611
Seattle, Washington 98101

On Behalf of DHS

Charles Neil Floyd, Esq.
Assistant Chief Counsel, DHS
Immigration and Customs Enforcement
1623 East J Street, Suite 2
Tacoma, Washington 98421

Memorandum of the Immigration Judge

The court conducted an initial bond redetermination hearing and found Respondent failed to meet his burden that he is not a danger to the community and a flight risk and issued an order holding him at no bond. Respondent filed an appeal with the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) and that appeal was dismissed on August 2, 2016.

The court conducted a bond redetermination hearing in accordance with *Rodriguez, et al v. Robbins,* 804 F.3d (9th Cir. 2015) based on his prolonged detention on February 15, 2017. He is currently detained in DHS/Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) custody at the Northwest Detention Center in Tacoma, Washington pending removal proceedings. The court found Respondent failed to meet his burden that he is not a danger to the community and a flight

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

risk and issued an order holding him at no bond.

Respondent is a native and citizen of Mexico. He is currently married to a United States citizen wife and has a 10 year old United States citizen son. The respondent has suffered 4 DUI convictions throughout the many years he has lived in the United States without status. The Respondent was arrested twice more, in 2005 and 2006, for drunk driving related conduct however neither of those resulted in a conviction. The Respondent filed an application for relief on form I-589 in February 2014 and had a merits hearing on January 9, 2017 where all of his applications were denied and was ordered removed as he provided no evidence nor did he testify in support of his applications for relief. Respondent filed an appeal of that decision with the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) and that appeal is currently pending. The Court would like to note for the record that the Respondent has a pending application for a U visa currently.

Under the regulations, the respondent carries the burden of demonstrating: (1) he is not a danger to the community; and (2) he is not a flight risk. 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(c)(8); *see also Matter of Urena*, 25 I&N Dec. 140 (BIA 2009). Relying on *Carlson v. Landon*, 342 U.S. 524 (1952) (holding that denial of bail to an alien will be overruled only where it is shown to be "without a reasonable foundation"). The BIA stated there is no limitation on the discretionary factors that an Immigration Judge may consider when ruling on custody and bond issues. *See Matter of Guerra*, 24 I&N Dec. 37, 40 (BIA 2006). An Immigration Judge may consider various factors when setting bond such as: the respondent's immigration history, criminal record, family ties in the United States, employment history, and length of time in the United States. *Id.* at 39; *see also Matter of Andrade*, 19 I&N Dec. 488, 489-90 (BIA 1987) (listing factors, including whether the alien has potential relief from removal, for consideration in a bond hearing). If the court

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

determines that the respondent is not a danger to the community, the court should then assess the respondent's potential risk of flight. *Id.*

Based on the totality of evidence of record, the court finds that Respondent failed to meet his burden that he is not a danger to the community and a flight risk such that no bond is necessary to secure his future appearance at immigration proceedings. In making this determination, the court considered all of the evidence of record including but not limited to: (1) the Respondent's length of residence in the United States; (2) the Respondent's family and community ties in the United States; (3) the Respondent's potential available relief from removal; (4) the Respondent's employment history; (5) the Respondent's criminal history and (5) the Respondent's immigration history.

The court notes that the Respondent has had four alcohol related driving offenses. *See Bagay v. United States*, 553 U.S. 137, 141 (2008) ("drunk driving is an extremely dangerous crime"); *Marmolejo-Campos*, 558 F.3d 903, 913 (9th Cir. 2009)("the dangers of drunk driving are well established"). The court recognizes that Respondent has resided in the United States for some time. However, Respondent has limited relief available from removal. Respondent was ordered removed on January 9, 2017 and his appeal to the BIA is still pending. Individuals that have a greater likelihood of being granted relief have a greater motivation to appear for a hearing rather than an individual who has less potential of being granted relief. *Matter of Andrade*, 19 I&N Dec. 488, 489-90 (BIA 1987).

The court has little confidence that Respondent will appear for a future immigration proceeding. Weighing all the factors, no bond is appropriate in this matter.

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

ORDER

The Respondent's motion for a custody re-determination is denied. Respondent shall be held without bond.

Dated: March 2, 2017

Appeal: Reserved by the Respondent

Victoria Argumedo
Immigration Judge

Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

FACTUAL INFORMATION ON PETITIONERS' DEFECTIVE BOND HEARINGS

IJs NOT FOLLOWING BIA PRECEDENT NOR DUE PROCESS

NAVA ORDUNO v. Streeval, et. al., 4:26-cv-00073-CDL-ALS

On this record, Mr. Nava Orduno arrived to the U.S. without inspection in about 2000 (over 25 years ago) when he was only 11 years old, previously granted Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and has six U.S. citizen children. He was initially denied bond due to being a "flight risk" despite length of time in the U.S. and having so many children and no significant criminal history. He filed an EOIR 42-B application for cancellation of removal and was GRANTED (!) the cancellation of removal, after he was able to prove his good moral character and that his removal will cause extreme and unusual hardship to his U.S. citizen children. However, because DHS reserved appeal, his attorney filed for a new bond hearing based on the EOIR-42B grant constituting a material change in circumstances. DHS argued he is still a flight risk. And the Immigration Court lacks jurisdiction. IJ Fuller said that the habeas order gave Petitioner only a singular, 1, bond hearing, which he already had that and was denied on flight risk.

Under , 24 I. & N. Dec. 37, 40 (BIA 2006), ( ) the Board directs IJs to make an individualized custody determination based on factors including fixed address, length of residence, family ties (especially those that may lead to lawful status), employment history, compliance history, criminal record, and potential avenues of relief. Every one of those factors weighs heavily in favor of release for Nava Orduno: he has a long, stable residence; six U.S.-citizen children dependent on him; a clean criminal record; steady employment and work authorization; and pending, substantiated application for cancellation of removal (which has since been granted). On these facts, there is no evidence that he is a danger to the community, and the only reasonable conclusion is that any risk of flight can be mitigated through a reasonable bond or non-monetary conditions such as supervision.

Nava Orduno's case is the functional opposite of 29 I&N Dec. 211 (BIA 2025) ( ), the leading precedential example when a no-bond order is justified. There, the respondent had only very recent entry, no fixed address, no reliable sponsor, no meaningful family or property ties in the United States, no record of court appearances, and at most speculative humanitarian relief, and the IJ denied bond yet the BIA reversed and granted a $10,000 bond even in that case. By contrast, Nava Orduno presents the positive equities that and recognize as central to a favorable custody determination—lengthy residence, deep U.S.-citizen family ties, a stable address and work history, no criminal record, and pending, non-speculative relief. Treating him as an unmitigable flight risk or denying bond outright would therefore be inconsistent with the BIA's own framework in and with no one being able to obtain bond. Even in the BIA vacated the IJ's no bond and granted a $10,000 (high) bond, therefore he should have been released on a low bond close to $1,500.

V.C.H. v. Streeval - 4:26-cv-00271-CDL-AGH

On this record, V.C.H. is a textbook low–flight-risk, non-dangerous respondent who should not be denied release under INA § 1226(a). She has lived in the United States for approximately twenty years, continuously since 2006; resides at a fixed address in Berkeley County, South Carolina; and is the primary caregiver and financial and emotional support for four U.S.-citizen children, two of whom have asthma and one of whom has significant allergies requiring ongoing care. She has no criminal history, was stopped for a minor traffic equipment issue (a brake-light problem), and was ordered released by a state judge before being turned over to ICE. She has a long work history in residential cleaning, valid employment authorization, and substantial family and community ties. She also has strong, non-frivolous avenues of relief—a pending, filed asylum application based on serious family-targeted violence in her home country and a colorable non-LPR cancellation case under INA § 240A(b) (42B)—and has complied with immigration procedures at all relevant times.

All factors here are positive and weighs heavily in favor of release for V.C.H.: she has a long, stable residence; four U.S.-citizen children dependent on her; a clean criminal record; steady employment and work authorization; and pending, substantiated applications for asylum and cancellation. On these facts, there is no evidence that she is a danger to the community, and the only reasonable conclusion is that any risk of flight can be mitigated through a reasonable bond or non-monetary conditions such as supervision.

V.C.H.'s case is the functional opposite of , the leading precedential example when a no-bond order is justified (supra). By contrast, V.C.H. presents the positive equities that and recognize as central to a favorable custody determination—lengthy residence, deep U.S.-citizen family ties, a stable address and work history, no criminal record, and pending, non-speculative relief. Treating her as an unmitigable flight risk or denying bond outright would therefore be inconsistent with the BIA's own framework in and with the kind of record-based analysis that justified a no-bond IJ order in . Even in the BIA vacated the IJ's no bond and granted a $10,000 (high) bond, therefore V.C.H. should have been released on a low bond close to $1,500.

R.R.C. 4:25-cv-525-CDL-CHW

For R.R.C., the record shows a paradigmatic low-flight-risk, non-dangerous § 1226(a) detainee who should not have been denied bond. He has lived in the United States for several years, is married to a U.S. citizen, and resides with her at a fixed address. He has no criminal history and multiple concrete avenues of relief pending, including an I-130 filed by his U.S.-citizen wife and a properly filed I-589 asylum application. When he first entered the United States, ICE affirmatively released him on an Order of Release on Recognizance, later placed him on ISAP with an ankle monitor, and—based on years of perfect compliance—removed the monitor and downgraded his supervision level. He consistently complied with all in-person reporting

requirements, and he was only arrested when he appeared, as instructed, for a routine ISAP check-in at the Atlanta ICE office; at no point was he advised of any supervision violation.

On each of these metrics, R.R.C. presents strongly in favor of release: stable residence with a U.S.-citizen spouse, no criminal record, long-term lawful employment and support of his household, a multi-year record of scrupulous compliance with ICE supervision, and pending, non-frivolous applications for asylum and family-based adjustment. Treating such a respondent as an unmitigable "flight risk" is irreconcilable with 's framework, particularly where ICE's own past custody decisions (OREC release, then reduced ISAP) reflect an institutional judgment that he is manageable in the community.

is the Board's leading flight-risk precedent and illustrates the sort of extreme facts that can warrant denial of bond: a very recent entrant with no fixed address, no work history, no reliable sponsor, no family or property ties, no court-appearance history, and at most speculative humanitarian relief. By contrast, R.R.C.'s case is the mirror image of : he has a long U.S. residence, a verified fixed address with his U.S.-citizen wife, a strong supervision-compliance record (including appearing for the very check-in at which he was detained), no criminal history, and multiple concrete, pending forms of relief. Proper application of and the Board's reasoning in therefore supports a finding that any risk of flight is easily mitigated by a reasonable bond or conditions of release, and that denial of bond in his case is inconsistent with binding BIA custody standards. Given was ultimately released by the BIA on a $10,000 bond, R.R.C. should have been released on a low bond around $1,500-$3,000. He is, by any reasonable measure, the opposite of a flight risk in light of his years-long record of compliance; nonetheless, the IJ found him to be a flight risk in direct contradiction to the evidence.

(cf. , AXXX XXX 113 (BIA Mar. 11, 2019) (reversing no-bond order where IJ found flight risk but respondent had a cousin-sponsor willing to house him and assist with appearances).

M.G. - 4:26-cv-00098-CDL-AGH

On this record, M.G. should not have been denied bond under INA § 1226(a). He entered through a port of entry, was released on an Order of Release on Recognizance after passing a credible-fear screening, timely filed his asylum application, has resided at a fixed address, worked with valid authorization as an Amazon driver, and has approximately three years of flawless compliance with OREC and ISAP conditions, including appearing for every scheduled check-in up to and including the in-person check-in at which ICE re-detained him in December 2025. Those facts show a strong pattern of lawful conduct, deepening community ties, and a demonstrated willingness to submit to supervision, all of which weigh heavily against any finding that he is likely to abscond and are precisely the kind of evidence § 1226(a) bond hearings are supposed to credit.

Under , relevant flight-risk factors include whether the respondent has a fixed address, the length of residence in the United States, family and community ties, employment history, record

of appearance in court, criminal record, immigration-violation history, any attempts to flee, and the manner of entry. , 27 I. & N. Dec. 803 (BIA 2020) ( ), likewise affirmed a no-bond denial for a recent unlawful entrant who had no family, employment, or community ties and "no probable path to obtain lawful status." M.G.'s case is the mirror image of and : he has a stable address, lawful employment, years of perfect compliance with ICE supervision, and a live, properly filed asylum application—factors and the Board itself identify as mitigating flight risk—so using "flight risk" to deny him bond is inconsistent with the BIA's own custody framework and most closely analogous to in the sense that his equities line up on the opposite side of every factor the Board relied on there. By DHS releasing M.G., he field a timely asylum application, obtained a stable job and complying for years with the terms of his release and periodic ICE check-ins, he is the antithesis of a flight risk based on years-long behavior, yet the IJ found him a flight risk in direct contradiction to the evidence in the record.

Ricardo Reyes Garcia - ***Garcia v. Streeval***

On this record, Mr. Reyes Garcia should not have been denied bond. He has lived in the United States for between ten and twenty years, has three U.S. citizen children for whom he is the primary provider, has no arrest history other than driving without a license, and has a properly filed, pending EOIR-42B application for non-LPR cancellation of removal that, if ultimately granted, would allow him to obtain work authorization, a driver's license, and a Social Security number during the pendency of proceedings. He appeared through counsel with more than 60 pages of corroborating evidence and an eight-page legal brief, demonstrating both a strong incentive and established ability to comply with court processes. To treat such a respondent as a "flight risk" on the sole ground that his relief is "speculative" ignores the obvious reality that very few people abandon long-term residence, three U.S. citizen children, and a live, colorable path to lawful status.

Under , someone with long residence, a fixed home, three U.S. citizen children, no meaningful criminal history, and a pending, statutorily grounded EOIR-42B application presents the very equities identifies as mitigating flight risk, and nothing in authorizes denial of bond based solely on an IJ's abstract prediction about the ultimate merits of relief. Likewise, in , 19 I. & N. Dec. 488, 490 (BIA 1987) ( ), the Board explained that a greater likelihood of relief tends to increase, not decrease, a noncitizen's motivation to appear. Treating Mr. Garcia's properly filed, supported cancellation application as a negative factor labeled "speculative relief" inverts that reasoning and effectively converts a merits forecast—reserved to the full removal hearing—into a categorical bar to bond.

Mr. Garcia's case is the mirror image of the Board's recent custody precedent in . It is likewise the opposite of , in which the Board affirmed a no-bond decision for a recent unlawful entrant who had no family, employment, or community ties and "no probable path to obtain lawful status." Mr. Garcia, by contrast, has deep family and community roots, a documented

history of law-abiding conduct aside from minor traffic-related licensing issues, and a live, non-frivolous cancellation case that gives him a strong incentive to appear. Under the / / / framework, those are paradigmatic bond-favorable equities, and denying bond by characterizing his relief as "speculative" is inconsistent with how the Board has applied those precedents in materially weaker government-favoring case.

(cf. , AXXX XXX 032 (BIA Apr. 30, 2019) (reversing no-bond denial based on single DUI arrest where respondent had 14-year residence, U.S.-citizen children, employment, tax payment, and pending cancellation, and remanding to set bond),

Iovanny Carmona Cervantes - 4:26-cv-00249-CDL-ALS

On these facts, Iovany Carmona Cervantes is a paradigmatic low–flight-risk, non-dangerous § 1226(a) detainee who should not be denied bond. He is a Mexican national who has resided continuously in the United States since entering without inspection on or about December 31, 2023, has made Columbus, Georgia his home, and has built a family with and actively supported his U.S.-citizen children through steady work, tax compliance, and deep community involvement over a sustained period. He was taken into ICE custody only after being reported by a neighbor, was detained at his home without any citation, arrest, or criminal charge, and has now been held at Stewart Detention Center for over a month despite the absence of any criminal history or evidence that he poses a danger to the community.

Based on the axes, Mr. Carmona Cervantes presents strong positive equities: a stable residence in Columbus, U.S.-citizen children dependent on him, a history of lawful work and tax payment, deep community support, and no criminal record or history of noncompliance. His situation is therefore the inverse of the BIA's recent custody precedent in . Proper application of and the Board's reasoning in thus supports a finding that any risk of flight for Mr. Carmona Cervantes is readily mitigable by a reasonable bond (under $10,000 that the BIA ordered for) or conditions of release, and that outright denial of bond in his case is inconsistent with binding BIA standards for § 1226(a) custody determinations.

Odrice Alisma - 4:26-cv-00226-CDL-AGH

On this record, Petitioner Odrice Alisma should not have been denied bond under INA § 1226(a). Petitioner has lived in Florida since entering on December 31, 2021; resides with close family; has five siblings in the United States (including U.S. citizen and lawful permanent resident siblings) and lawful permanent resident parents; holds a fixed address; was employed at the time ICE detained him; possesses valid employment authorization through 2030; has complied with all immigration-court hearings and ICE/ISAP reporting requirements; was re-detained only when he voluntarily appeared for a routine check-in; has a timely filed asylum application based on a

positive credible-fear determination; and enjoys strong community support, including from his church. These facts show deep family and community ties, a stable residence, lawful employment, and a proven record of compliance with supervision, all of which strongly mitigate any risk of flight or danger.

Petitioner's fixed address, multi-layered U.S. citizen/LPR family network, lawful employment and valid EAD, perfect appearance and reporting history, and pending asylum relief all weigh decisively in favor of release when analyzed under framework. He represent the opposite fact-pattern of , where the IJ denied bond due to very recent entry, no fixed address, no work history or appearance history, an unreliable sponsor with inconsistent addresses and no sworn commitment, no family or property ties in the United States, and at most speculative humanitarian relief, and the BIA still ordered release on a higher bond of $10,000 even in that extreme case. Petitioner has the very equities—stable residence, strong verified family ties, lawful work, years of compliance with ICE, and a live, properly filed asylum application—that and identify as mitigating flight risk. Denying bond on this record, particularly by invoking "flight risk" notwithstanding Petitioner's long-term compliance and pending relief, is therefore inconsistent with the individualized, evidence-based custody analysis required by the regulations and BIA precedent. He is, by any reasonable measure, the opposite of a flight risk in light of his years-long record of compliance; nonetheless, the IJ found him to be a flight risk in direct contradiction to the evidence.

Mileidys Aguiar Hernandez - 4:25-cv-00527-CDL-ALS:

On this record, Petitioner Mileidys Aguiar Hernandez should not have been denied bond under INA § 1226(a). Ms. Aguiar Hernandez is a Cuban national who was paroled into the United States in January 2024 to seek asylum. Her asylum application is pending, as is her application for permanent residence under the Cuban Adjustment Act. Ms. Aguiar Hernandez was detained in immigration court in June 2025 and has remained detained since. She has a stable address and has been consistently reporting with ICE and has attended all her immigration court hearings. She has valid work authorization and stable employment.

Nonetheless, Judge Bianca Brown denied bond based on Ms. Aguiar Hernandez's alleged short time in the United States and because she has no spouse or children with immigration status, neither of which are required for a reasonable bond. She has a clear pathway for permanent immigration status through the Cuban Adjustment Act.

Compared to , while Ms. Aguiar Harnandez has short residence and no relatives with status, she has a clear pathway to permanent residence through Cuban Adjustment, submitted proof of a fixed address, consistently reported to ICE and immigration court (and was detained in court), has stable work history, has a sponsor with a fixed address, and no criminal history.

Francisco Trujillo Villegas - 4:26-cv-00266-CDL-ALS:

On this record, Petitioner Francisco Trujillo Villegas should not have been denied bond under INA § 1226(a). Mr. Trujillo Villegas is a Mexican national who has been present in the US since 1998. He has five children present in the United States, one with DACA and four who are United States citizens. Mr. Trujillo Villegas has no criminal history besides a couple minor traffic violations for which he fulfilled his obligations with the court. Mr. Trujillo Villegas's U.S. citizen children submitted affidavits and pledged to serve as bond sponsors. Mr. Trujillo Villegas also submitted proof of stable address, stable employment, proof of eligibility for cancellation of removal, many letters of support including from teachers and college professors, proof of involvement in his church since 2002, and tax filings since 2006.

Nonetheless, Immigration Judge Bianca Brown denied bond based on alleged "speculative relief" and no proof that his children could pay the bond, which is also not a requirement for a reasonable bond.

Compared to , while Mr. Trujillo Villegas entered the country unlawfully, he is eligible for cancellation of removal, he has resided in the country for over 25 years, he has a fixed address, he has been involved with his community, he has paid taxes since 2006, he is involved at the same church for over 20 years, he has a clear relationship to sponsors who showed proof of address, relationship, and willingness to pay, he has minimal criminal history, he has significant family ties with four United States citizen children, and he has proof of stable employment. A sponsor's ability to pay bond is not a relevant factor. Either the sponsor pays the bond and the client gets released or the person stays detained.

(cf. , AXXX XXX 032 (BIA Apr. 30, 2019) (reversing no-bond denial based on single DUI arrest where respondent had 14-year residence, U.S.-citizen children, employment, tax payment, and pending cancellation, and remanding to set bond).

Andy Jumbo Saltos - 4:26-cv-00163-CDL-AGH

On this record, Petitioner Andy Jumbo Saltos should not have been denied bond under INA § 1226(a). Mr. Jumbo Saltos is an Ecuadorian national who entered the country in 2024. He timely filed for asylum and has only a couple minor traffic offenses for which he fulfilled all his obligations with the court. He has a bond sponsor who is a United States citizen. Mr. Jumbo Saltos files his taxes, was working lawfully at a stable employment, lived at a stable address, attended all his immigration court hearings, and consistently reported to ICE, where he was detained.

Nonetheless, Immigration Judge Jerrica Harness denied bond, only citing Mr. Jumbo Saltos's recent entry, "speculative relief," and no family ties.

Compared to , while Mr. Jumbo Saltos was a recent entry and does not have family ties in the United States, he showed eligibility of asylum, had a record of court appearance and immigration check-ins and was actually detained at an immigration check-in. He has stable work history and was working lawfully. He has a bond sponsor who is a United States citizen and wrote an affidavit showing willingness to support him and ensure appearance. Historically such individuals were given minimal bonds, and many such clients until recently were being released on bonds around $3,000 to $4,000.

(cf. , AXXX XXX 113 (BIA Mar. 11, 2019) (reversing no-bond order where IJ found flight risk but respondent had a cousin-sponsor willing to house him and assist with appearances).

Jesus Graterol Jimenez - 4:26-cv-00176-CDL-CHW:

This petitioner is a Venezuelan national who entered the United States around 2022. He timely applied for asylum, had approved TPS, and his wife and two children are in the United States also seeking asylum. He has no criminal history. He was also detained at immigration check-in appointment. He has stable employment with valid work authorization. In support of his bond, he submitted letters of support, proof of a bond sponsor, proof of a stable address, and proof of property ownership. He was previously released on his own recognizance, and he has a history of showing up at every immigration check-in.

Nevertheless, Immigration Judge denied bond based on fight risk, citing his "recent" entry, "tenuous ties," and "speculative relief."

Compared to , while Mr. Graterol Jimenez recently entered the country, he has family ties in the US and is eligible for asylum. He previously had approved TPS, meaning he had lawful presence for most of the time he has been in the United States. He has a record of court appearance and appearance at immigration check-ins, where he was ultimately detained. He has stable work that was with authorization, and he has a U.S. citizen bond sponsor who wrote an affidavit showing willingness to support him and ensure appearance. Historically and until recently, such individuals were normally given a bond around $3,000 to $5,000.

(cf. , AXXX XXX 113 (BIA Mar. 11, 2019) (reversing no-bond order where IJ found flight risk but respondent had a cousin-sponsor willing to house him and assist with appearances).

Juan Suarez Luna - 4:26-cv-00239-CDL-ALS:

This Petitioner is a Mexican national who has been present in the U.S. for 26 years. He has no criminal history besides two minor traffic citations. He has three U.S. citizen children and submitted numerous support letters. He submitted proof of a U.S. citizen bond sponsor and that he had been paying taxes for at least ten years.

Nevertheless, Immigration Judge Bianca Brown. denied bond, finding "speculative relief" and flight risk, noting that Mr. Suarez Luna only paid taxes in 2024 despite 10 years of taxes being in the record. Compared to , Mr. Suarez Luna was in the U.S. for over 25 years, he has strong connections to family with US citizenship, he has strong community support, he has a U.S. citizen bond sponsor, he has minimal criminal history, and he has proof of paying taxes which IJ Brown ignored completely.

(cf. , AXXX XXX 032 (BIA Apr. 30, 2019) (reversing no-bond denial based on single DUI arrest where respondent had 14-year residence, U.S.-citizen children, employment, tax payment, and pending cancellation, and remanding to set bond).

NATIONAL IMMIGRATION PROJECT

Lawyers for the Movement

Portions of this chart were originally created by Aaron Hall, Esq. of Joseph & Hall, P.C. It was updated by National Immigration Project legal intern Maria Juliana Guerrero, LL.M. 2026 at Georgetown University Law School, and reviewed by Supervising Attorney Victoria Neilson. It is current through February 18, 2026. The "case substance" column is generally pasted from the BIA's own summary of the decision so it may not be fully accurate.

Trump 2.0 BIA/AG Precedent Decisions

Case	Date published or designated	Precedent Through	Case substance	Favorable to Noncitizen or DHS?	Attorney-represented?	Notes
BAEZA-GALINDO, 29 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 2025)	1/31/25	BIA Decision	Proximity in time necessary but not sufficient to conclude that two crimes arise from a single scheme of criminal misconduct under section 237(a)(2)(A)(ii) of the INA.	DHS	Yes	
DE JESUS PLATON, 29 I&N Dec. 7 (BIA 2025)	1/31/25	Designated by AG	Evidence of post-conviction relief the respondent submitted in support of his motion to remand does not demonstrate that his conviction was vacated for a procedural or substantive defect in the underlying criminal proceedings and not for reasons of rehabilitation or immigration hardship.	DHS	Yes	
C-A-R-R-, 29 I&N Dec. 13 (BIA 2025)	3/17/25	BIA Decision	IJ not required to consider I-589 on merits if form incomplete, but may not deem I-589 incomplete or abandoned solely because it did not include a declaration.	DHS*	Yes	While this decision has favorable language about not terminating asylum cases for failure to file a declaration, IJs have weaponized it to pretermit asylum applications where any substantive question on the I-589 is not answered in great detail.
DOR, 29 I&N Dec. 20 (BIA 2025)	3/18/25	BIA Decision	Time of conviction is the relevant point for determining whether a respondent's State conviction is for a controlled substance offense, not the time the respondent's removability is adjudicated in immigration proceedings.	DHS	Yes	
ISKANDARANI, 29 I&N Dec. 26 (BIA 2025)	4/8/25	BIA Decision	When an IJ issues an oral decision, the 30-day appeal filing period is calculated from the date the decision is rendered and is unaffected by the subsequent mailing of a memorandum summarizing the oral decision.	DHS	Yes	
O-A-R-G-, 29 I&N Dec. 30 (BIA 2025)	4/16/25	BIA Decision	Where PSG defined by "former" status, IJ must ensure prosecutor's conduct motivated by "former" status, not conduct when member of group.	DHS	Yes	
A-A-R-, 29 I&N Dec. 38 (BIA 2025)(amended)	4/24/25	BIA Decision	Based on the facts and evidence in this case, the applicant, a former MS-13 gang member, has not met his burden to show he will more likely than not be tortured in El Salvador based on the government's state of exception policy.	DHS	Yes	
CHOC-TUT, 29 I&N Dec. 48 (BIA 2025)	5/2/25	Designated by AG	While an IJ may consider a State court's decision as to dangerousness and the amount of bail that was set in criminal proceedings, an IJ does not owe a State court custody order deference in immigration bond proceedings.	DHS	Yes	

Trump 2.0 BIA/AG Precedent Decisions						
Case	**Date published or designated**	**Precedent Through**	**Case substance**	**Favorable to Noncitizen or DHS?**	**Attorney-represented?**	**Notes**
F-B-G-M- & J-E-M-G-, 29 I&N Dec. 52 (BIA 2025)	5/12/25	Designated by AG	Electronic notification of a briefing schedule to an attorney is sufficient even if attorney does not access the document.	DHS	Yes	
M-S-I-, 29 I&N Dec. 61 (BIA 2025)	5/12/25	Designated by AG	The acquiescence standard for protection under the CAT differs from the unable-or-unwilling standard for asylum and withholding of removal; the potential for private actor violence coupled with a speculation that police cannot or will not help is insufficient to prove acquiescence.	DHS	Yes	
Q. LI, 29 I&N Dec. 66 (BIA 2025)	5/15/25	BIA Decision	Applicant for admission detained without a warrant while arriving in the U.S. is detained under section 235(b) and not eligible for bond.	DHS	Yes	
BAIN, 29 I&N Dec. 72 (BIA 2025)	5/23/25	Designated by AG	Recency and repeated nature of the respondent's criminal history and the lack of a showing of rehabilitation means not deserving of grant of cancellation of removal as a matter of discretion.	DHS	No	
BELTRAND-RODRIGUEZ, 29 I&N Dec. 76 (BIA 2025)	5/23/25	Designated by AG	Respondent's release on bond would pose a danger to the community based on his dangerous behavior that subjected a person who was particularly vulnerable because of her age and her familial relationship to the respondent to unlawful sexual conduct.	DHS	Yes	
N-N-B-, 29 I&N Dec. 79 (BIA 2025)	5/23/25	Designated by AG	IJ applied the wrong legal standard for protection under the CAT, determining the respondent "could be" subject to torture instead of that he would "more likely than not" be tortured.	DHS	Yes	
D-E-B-, 29 I&N Dec. 83 (BIA 2025)	5/23/25	Designated by AG	A supplemental filing to a motion to reopen that raises claims that are fundamentally different from those raised in the original motion is treated as a separate motion.	DHS	Yes	
LOPEZ-TICAS, 29 I&N Dec. 90 (BIA 2025)	5/29/25	BIA Decision	Lack of time and place information on the notice to appear does not render untrue or incorrect a respondent's admissions and therefore is not a proper basis for granting a respondent's motion to withdraw pleadings.	DHS	Yes	
B-N-K-, 29 I&N Dec. 96 (BIA 2025)	6/6/25	BIA Decision	Pending application for Temporary Protected Status generally will not warrant a grant of administrative closure.	DHS	Yes	
E-Y-F-G-, 29 I&N Dec. 103 (BIA 2025)	6/6/25	Designated by AG	Grant of withholding of removal that is pending on appeal does not justify release on bond where the factors regarding flight risk weigh strongly against release on bond.	DHS	Yes	
ROQUE-IZADA, 29 I&N Dec. 106 (BIA 2025)	6/20/25	BIA Decision	Termination not warranted to permit a respondent to seek adjustment of status under the Cuban Refugee Adjustment Act before USCIS based on speculation that USCIS will grant the respondent parole under section 212(d)(5)(A).	DHS	Yes	
MAYORGA IPINA, 29 I&N Dec. 110 (BIA 2025)	6/26/25	BIA Decision	Virginia conviction for indecent exposure is a crime involving moral turpitude because the requirement of an "obscene display or exposure" necessarily involves a lewd intent.	DHS	Yes*	Respondent's counsel withdrew from representation after filing the appeal brief

Trump 2.0 BIA/AG Precedent Decisions						
Case	**Date published or designated**	**Precedent Through**	**Case substance**	**Favorable to Noncitizen or DHS?**	**Attorney-represented?**	**Notes**
C-I-R-H- & H-S-V-R-, 29 I&N Dec. 114 (BIA 2025)	6/25/25	Designated by AG	While explicit persecutor statements on the protected ground are not required to establish nexus, there must be some showing of a connection between the persecutors' actions and the protected ground beyond speculation such that the alleged harm is not solely stemming from statistical likelihoods or unfortunate coincidence.	DHS	Yes	
A-A-F-V-, 29 I&N Dec. 118 (BIA 2025)	6/30/25	Designated by AG	Bisexual criminal deportee with visible gang tattoos found not to have established an individualized risk of torture in detention in El Salvador.	DHS	No	
E-Z-, 29 I&N Dec. 123 (BIA 2025)	7/2/25	Designated by AG	IJ's predictive findings on harm to be suffered in Russia on acount of support for Ukraine too speculative to support relief under the CAT.	DHS	Yes	
GONZALEZ JIMENEZ, 29 I&N Dec. 129 (BIA 2025)	7/9/25	BIA Decision	Use of false social security numbers and providing false information on tax returns are negative discretionary factors.	DHS	Yes	
S-S-, 29 I&N Dec. 136 (BIA 2025)	7/8/25	Designated by AG	IJ erred in concluding that the respondent would more likely than not be tortured in Haitian detention where no finding his detention would be long term and where the record did not establish that the harsh conditions specifically intended to torture.	DHS	Yes	
C-M-M-, 29 I&N Dec. 141 (BIA 2025)	7/8/25	Designated by AG	Extensive and lengthy history of immigration law violations demonstrates significant flight risk that cannot be sufficiently mitigated by any monetary bond.	DHS	Yes	
K-E-S-G-, 29 I&N Dec. 145 (BIA 2025)	7/18/25	BIA Decision	PSG defined by sex or by sex and nationality overbroad is insufficiently particular to be cognizable.	DHS	Yes	
FELIX-FIGUEROA, 29 I&N Dec. 157 (BIA 2025)	7/30/25	BIA Decision	IJ must apply realistic probability test where state drug definition broader than federal based on isomers.	DHS	No	
AKHMEDOV, 29 I&N Dec. 166 (BIA 2025)	8/4/25	Designated by AG	Failure to submit change of address notices with court helps justify flight risk finding	DHS	Yes	
GARCIA MARTINEZ, 29 I&N Dec. 169 (BIA 2025)	8/8/25	BIA Decision	Nondetained respondent represented by private counsel presumed to have ability to pay filing fees and fee waiver request reporting adult with zero income is presumptively invalid.	DHS	Yes	
SALAS PENA, 29 I&N Dec. 173 (BIA 2025)	8/13/25	Designated by AG	Bond applicant did not establish that he was not danger to community where pending cocaine trafficking charges	DHS	Yes	
G-C-I, 29 I&N Dec. 176 (BIA 2025)	8/19/25	BIA Decision	Nonresponsive or evasive testimony on corroboration supports adverse credibility determination.	DHS	Yes	
BURI MORA, 29 I&N Dec. 186 (BIA 2025)	8/18/25	Designated by AG	Respondent didn't establish exceptional and extremely unusual hardship based on economic detriment and family separation where the qualifying relatives will remain in the U.S. and treatment for their mental health conditions and developmental delays will not be affected by the respondent's removal. Note that one U.S. citizen child was autistic.	DHS	Yes	

Trump 2.0 BIA/AG Precedent Decisions						
Case	**Date published or designated**	**Precedent Through**	**Case substance**	**Favorable to Noncitizen or DHS?**	**Attorney-represented?**	**Notes**
O-Y-A-E-, 29 I&N Dec. 190 (BIA 2025)	8/20/25	Designated by AG	Evidence of human rights abuses in Venezuela and past threats to the respondent do not establish an individualized risk of torture where the last threat occurred years before the respondent left the country and the respondent was otherwise unharmed following the threats.	DHS	Yes	
J-A-F-S-, 29 I&N Dec. 195 (BIA 2025)	8/28/25	BIA Decision	IJ should not continue hearing based on speculative assertion of new eligibility for relief.	DHS	Yes	
R-E-R-M- & J-D-R-M-, 29 I&N Dec. 202 (A.G. 2025)	9/2/25	AG Decision	Matter of L-E-A-, 28 I&N Dec. 304 (A.G. 2021), overruled.	DHS	N/A	
S-S-F-M-, 29 I&N Dec. 207 (A.G. 2025)	9/2/25	AG Decision	Matter of A-B-, 28 I&N Dec. 307 (A.G. 2021), is overruled, and immigration judges and the Board shall adhere to Matter of A-B-, 27 I&N Dec. 316 (A.G. 2018), and Matter of A-B-, 28 I&N Dec. 199 (A.G. 2021), in all pending or future cases. By extension, Matter of A-R-C-G-, 26 I&N Dec. 388 (BIA 2014), and any decision issued in reliance thereupon is also overruled.	DHS	N/A	
DOBROTVORSKII, 29 I&N Dec. 211 (BIA 2025)	9/5/25	BIA Decision	In bond proceedings, the existence of a valid, reliable, and credible sponsor is relevant to the determination of flight risk.	DHS	Yes	
YAJURE HURTADO, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025)	9/5/25	BIA Decision	235(b)(2)(A) dictates that IJs lack authority to hear bond requests or to grant bond to aliens who are present in the United States without admission.	DHS	Yes	
GARCIA-FLORES, 29 I&N Dec. 230 (BIA 2025)	9/8/25	Designated by AG	In assessing discretion, the IJ exceeded authority to consider the circumstances of the respondent's conviction by making an adverse credibility finding regarding the respondent's two child victims and in effect finding the respondent factually innocent of the crime.	DHS	No	
H-A-A-V-, 29 I&N Dec. 233 (BIA 2025)	9/11/25	BIA Decision	If the factual allegations underlying a claim for asylum, WOR, or CAT, viewed in the light most favorable to the respondent, do not establish prima facie eligibility for relief or protection, an Immigration Judge may pretermit the applications without a full evidentiary hearing on the merits of the claim.	DHS	Yes	
Landers, 29 I&N Dec. 240 (BIA 2025)	9/17/25	BIA Decision	Circumstantial evidence of similarities in allegedly pro se filings and suspended counsel's involvement in the mailing of documents to the Immigration Courts and DHS can constitute clear and convincing evidence that counsel practiced law in violation of a disciplinary order of suspension.	DHS	No*	This is a pro se case, but the respondent is an attorney subject to disciplinary proceedings
McDonald, 29 I&N Dec. 249 (BIA 2025)	9/22/25	Designated by AG	The respondent's convictions for endangering the welfare of a child, combined with the respondent's conduct (sexual conduct) as described in the charging document and the victim's statement, demonstrate that the respondent does not warrant a favorable exercise of discretion.	DHS	Yes	

Trump 2.0 BIA/AG Precedent Decisions						
Case	**Date published or designated**	**Precedent Through**	**Case substance**	**Favorable to Noncitizen or DHS?**	**Attorney-represented?**	**Notes**
J-A-, 29 I&N Dec. 253 (BIA 2025)	9/22/25	Designated by AG	Evidence that the Uzbek Govt. is pursuing charges of terrorist activity against the respondent, that he will be detained upon arival, and isolated incidents of toture does not establish that he will more likely than not be tortured where there is insufficient evidence that he will be prosecuted for illegitimate reasons.	DHS	Yes	
FRIAS ULLOA, 29 I&N Dec. 259 (BIA 2025)	9/22/25	Designated by AG	Section 2C:35-5(b)(4) of the New Jersey Statutes Annotatted is divisible by controlled substance, and applying the modified categorical approach, the respondent's record of conviction identifies the relevant substance as fentanyl, a federally controlled substance.	DHS	Yes	
COTRUFO, 29 I&N Dec. 264 (BIA 2025)	9/23/25	Designated by AG	The respondent's recent convictions involving unlawful sexual conduct with a mor, combined with the probation officer's report, show that the respondent is a danger to the community.	DHS	Yes	
L-A-L-T-, 29 I&N Dec. 269 (BIA 2025)	9/26/25	BIA Decision	Matter of E-A-G-, 24 I&N Dec. 591 (BIA 2008), reaffirmed. Perceived or imputed membership in a particular social group will only satisfy the PSG requirements if the underlying group of which the respondent is perceived to be a member is, standing alone, sufficiently cognizible. The respondent's proposed PSG, defined as "perceived Salvadoran gang members" is not cognizibile within the meaning of the INA.	DHS	Yes	
J-H-M-H-, 29 I&N Dec. 278 (BIA 2025)	10/7/25	BIA Decision	In making findings of fact and conclusions of law, Immigration Judges exercise independent judgment and are not required to accept party stipulations. In this case, a joint motion to reconsider the denial of CAT protection.	DHS*	Yes	DHS actually stipulated to relief in this case so, technically the IJ and BIA went against DHS's stated position, but the noncitizen's order of removal was upheld so it is counted in the column that goes against the noncitizen
NEGUSIE, 29 I&N Dec. 285 (A.G. 2025)	10/22/25	AG Decision	Matter of Negusie, 28 I&N Dec. 120 (A.G. 2020), which held that the bar to asylum elegibility for noncitizens who have engaged or assisted in the persecution of another does not contain a duress exception, is now the operative opinion.	DHS	N/A	
J-A-N-M-, 29 I&N Dec. 287 (BIA 2025)	10/23/25	BIA Decision	Discretionary termination of an applicant's withholding-only proceedings is prohibited by 8 C.F.R. §1208.2(c)(3)(i).	DHS	No	
C-I-G-M- & L-V-S-G-, 29 I&N Dec. 291 (BIA 2025)	10/31/25	BIA Decision	If DHS claims that an asylum cooperative agreement bars a respondent from applying for asylum in the United States, the IJ should determine whether the safe third country bar applies prior to and separate from considering a respondent's elegibility for asylum. A respondent subject to the terms of an asylum cooperative agreement has the burden to establish by a preponderance of evidence that he or she will more likely than not be persecuted on account of a protected country or tortured in the relevant third country to avoid application of the safe third country bar for the respondent to be elegibile for asylum in the United States.	DHS	Yes	

Trump 2.0 BIA/AG Precedent Decisions						
Case	**Date published or designated**	**Precedent Through**	**Case substance**	**Favorable to Noncitizen or DHS?**	**Attorney-represented?**	**Notes**
CAHUEC TZALAM, 29 I&N Dec. 300 (BIA 2025)	11/14/25	BIA Decision	The Immigration Judge erred in granting administrative closure to a respondent who failed to submit evidence of his prima facie elegibility for Special Immigrant Juvenile classification and the extended delay in the availability of a visa.	DHS	No	
K-S-H-, 29 I&N Dec. 307 (BIA 2025)	11/17/25	BIA Decision	A single attempt to report an incident of harm by private actors to local police, without further harm from the police themselves or evidence of their widespread collusion with the alleged persecutors, does not establish that the government, as a whole, is unable or unwilling to protect a respondent from persecution.	DHS	Yes	
B-S-H-, 29 I&N Dec. 313 (BIA 2025)	11/19/25	BIA Decision	Under the plain language of section of 8 U.S.C. §1229a(c)(7)(C)(iv)(III) , the extraordinary circumstances or extreme hardship waiver for motions to reopen only applies to temporal limitations for filing a motion to reopen to apply for releif under VAWA and not to the numerical limitation on such motions.	DHS	Yes	
W-F-, 29 I&N Dec. 319 (BIA 2025)	12/8/25	Designated by AG	The IJ erred in granting the respondent deferral of removal under CAT where the record contained anecdotal reports of bribery in Haitiian prisons and generalized violence by gangs against travelers or outsiders.	DHS	Yes	
JIMENEZ-AYALA, 29 I&N Dec. 325 (BIA 2025)	12/8/25	Designated by AG	The respondent's criminal history of drug use and her exposure of her children to drugs outweigh the favorable factors in this case, including her claimed remorse and intention to avoid drug use in the future, and warrant a discretionaty denial of cancellation of removal.	DHS	Yes	
J-C-A-G-, 29 I&N Dec. 331 (BIA 2025)	12/8/25	Designated by AG	The asylum applicant, who cooperated with United States law enforcement against the cartel, did not demonstrate a clear probability of torture where his fear is based on unsubstantiated statements from a coconspirator and generalized evidence of cartel violence.	DHS	Yes	
DUBON MIRANDA, 29 I&N Dec. 335 (BIA 2025)	12/8/25	Designated by AG	Due to respondent's innapropiate behavior with his stepdaughter, his criminal convictions for driving under the influence and disturbing the peace, the respondent has not satisifed his burden demonstrating that he is not a danger to the community in bond proceedings.	DHS	Yes	
KIM, 29 I&N Dec. 339 (BIA 2025)	12/8/25	Designated by AG	The IJ erred in determining that the respondent, who engaged in systemic criminal fraud for decades, warranted a favorable exercise of discretion for purposes of cancellation of removal based on recent expressed remorse and rehabilitative efforts while in prison.	DHS	No	
L-A-G-B-, 29 I&N Dec. 343 (BIA 2025)	12/8/25	Designated by AG	The IJ's predictive factual findings based on a series of suppositions regarding the harm the respondent would likely suffer in Panama do not support a grant of protection under CAT.	DHS	Yes	

Trump 2.0 BIA/AG Precedent Decisions						
Case	**Date published or designated**	**Precedent Through**	**Case substance**	**Favorable to Noncitizen or DHS?**	**Attorney-represented?**	**Notes**
N-P-A-, 29 I&N Dec. 347 (BIA 2025)	12/8/25	Designated by AG	The respondent did not establish a well-founded fear of persecution based on a summons for his political activity and country conditions evidence that political activists are detained and severely harmed where a similar summons did not result in harm to respondent's son, and respondent lived for several years in Moldova without harm.	DHS	Yes	
LEMA MIZHIRUMBAY, 29 I&N Dec. 351 (BIA 2025)	12/8/25	Designated by AG	The respondent's repeated violations of workplace safety regulations are significant adverse factors that weigh against a favorable exercise of discretion for cancellation of removal.	DHS	Yes	
PALMA-OLVERA, 29 I&N Dec. 355 (BIA 2025)	12/8/25	Designated by AG	The IJ erred in determining that the respondent, who had two convictions of driving while intoxicated, had overcome the presumption that he lacked good moral character for cancellation of removal, based on his care for his son and history of employment.	DHS	No	
RODRIGUEZ PENA, 29 I&N Dec. 358 (BIA 2025)	12/8/25	Designated by AG	The IJ erred in concluding that the respondent is not a danger to the community where the respondent threatened to kill someone, reacted negatively to law enforcement intervention, and used an alias to evade arrest.	DHS	No	
L-T-A-, 20 I&N Dec. 362 (BIA 2025)	12/18/25	BIA Decision	For purposes of the firm resettlement bar, evidence that a respondent had a legal right to enter, live, work, and own property indefinitely in the country of proposed resettlement demonstrate that respondent was offered "some other type of permanent resettlement."	DHS	Yes	
TEPEC-GARCIA, 29 I&N Dec. 371 (BIA 2025)	12/19/25	BIA Decision	The IJ does not err in terminating proceedings without prejudice when DHS does not present evidence of removability in advance of the hearing.	Noncitizen	Yes	
GHANBARI, 29 I&N Dec. 376 (BIA 2025)	12/19/25	Designated by AG	The IJ erred in determining that the respondent did not provide material support to a terrorist organization and was not subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C.A. § 1226(c)(1)(D).	DHS	Yes	
E-M-F-S-, 29 I&N Dec. 379 (BIA 2026)	1/9/26	BIA Decision	Death threats alone rarely rise to the level of persecution and only do so if they are objectively credible and issued by a person or persons with the immediate ability to carry them out.	DHS	Yes	
LAPARRA-DELEON, 29 I&N Dec. 389 (BIA 2026)	1/9/26	Designated by AG	Matter of Laparra, 28 I&N Dec. 425 (BIA 2022) is reinstated. It held that service of a statutorily compliant notice of hearing is sufficient written notice to support the entry of an in absentia order of removal even if the respondent was served with a noncompliant notice to appear.	DHS	Yes	
D-G-B-L-, 29 I&N Dec. 392 (BIA 2026)	1/15/26	BIA Decision	The serious nonpolitical crime bar to asylum and withholding of removal does not include a duress exception.	DHS	Yes	

Trump 2.0 BIA/AG Precedent Decisions						
Case	**Date published or designated**	**Precedent Through**	**Case substance**	**Favorable to Noncitizen or DHS?**	**Attorney-represented?**	**Notes**
M-C-C-, 29 I&N Dec. 401 (BIA 2026)	1/9/26	Designated by AG	The respondent willfully misrepresented a material fact by omitting reference to his military service during the Bosnian War on his refugee application because the omission cut off a line of inquiry that predictably would have disclosed facts relevant to his eligibility for refugee status.	DHS	Yes	
S-M-H-, 29 I&N Dec. 412 (BIA 2026)	1/21/26	BIA Decision	The written warnings on the respondent's initial asylum application provided the respondent with statutorily notice of the consequences of filing a frivolous application, irrespective of the absence of oral warnings by an Immigration Judge. Matter of X-M-C-, 25 I&N Dec. 322 (BIA 2010), clarified.	DHS	Yes	
LAURENT CASTRO, 29 I&N Dec. 419 (BIA 2026)	1/23/26	Designated by AG	The IJ erred in continuing removal proceedings rather than entering an in absentia removal order where the respondent did not appear at a hearing, was properly served with notice of the missed hearing, and DHS provided evidence of the respondent's removability.	DHS	No	
E-A-S-O-, 29 I&N Dec. 422 (BIA 2026)	1/30/26	BIA Decision	Matter of N-A-M-, 24 I&N Dec. 336 (BIA 2007), framework is the proper rubric for determining whether a crime is particularly serious and there is no presumption that a single misdemeanor conviction is not for a particularly serious crime. Matter of Juarez, 19 I&N Dec. 664 (BIA 1988), overruled.	DHS	Yes	
G-M-I-, 29 I&N Dec. 431 (BIA 2026)	2/4/26	BIA Decision	The relevance and the reliability of an expert witness' opinions are significantly undercut when those opinions are informed by anecdotal or inaccurate facts or data.	DHS	Yes	
YADAV, 29 I&N Dec. 438 (BIA 2026)	2/5/26	BIA Decision	A respondent's valid marriage to a United States citizen entered into after a removal order does not constitute an exceptional situation warranting sua sponte reopening of removal proceedings.	DHS	Yes	
JIN, 29 I&N Dec. 441 (BIA 2026)	2/13/26	BIA Decision	Based on the petitioner's extensive allegations and evidence of marriage fraud regarding the approved visa petition for the beneficary, the record is returned to USCIS to further consider the visa petition and take action as warranted in this matter.	DHS	Yes	

DECLARATION OF ALIZEH SHEIKH

I, Alizeh Sheikh, state under penalty of perjury under U.S. law that the following information is true and correct to the best of my knowledge:

1. My name is Alizeh Sheikh, and I am an attorney and a 2024-2026 Equal Justice Works Fellow at the Georgia Asylum & Immigration Network (GAIN). I provide direct representation and *pro se* assistance to asylum seekers detained in Georgia. As part of my work, I maintain GAIN's virtual court watch program. Volunteers regularly observe bond hearings for individuals detained at Stewart Detention Center and Folkston ICE Processing Center. Bond hearings take place virtually by default. The volunteers record their observations in a survey, including writing a summary of the arguments for each bond hearing and marking the reasons why bond was granted or denied. Accompanying my declaration is a PDF copy of GAIN's court watch survey, which volunteers usually fill out and submit at the same time as they observe the bond hearings.

2. The GAIN court watch program has been vital to ensuring transparency about immigration court practices and educating the public about immigration court. GAIN regularly provides updates to practitioners to inform how they prepare for bond cases. Our program has been covered by news outlets including NPR and CNN.

3. Volunteers receive basic training on how to complete the survey form, including understanding when a case is denied based on "flight risk," "danger to the community," or lack of "jurisdiction." They complete the survey during or soon after observing each hearing, and their responses auto-populate a central spreadsheet. I periodically review entries for internal consistency. The excerpts of the spreadsheet attached to this declaration are true and correct copies of survey entries, with only volunteer identifying information and any additional comments provided by the volunteer removed. The entries are formatted for ease of review: red and yellow entries are cases where bond was denied on the merits. Yellow entries are cases where bond was denied for flight risk alone. Blue entries are cases where the respondent appeared to have prima facie eligibility for relief despite being denied bond for flight risk. Entries that are struck through are those where no final decision was issued. All of the figures and examples in this declaration are drawn from that spreadsheet, based on contemporaneous or near-contemporaneous volunteer observations. Starting around February 19, we began asking whether a bond case was preceded by a habeas grant.

4. This declaration should in no way be read as reflecting GAIN's or my own opinion on the character of these judges, who face numerous pressures when making their decisions. We are very grateful that all of these judges remain committed to transparency in their decision-making by allowing volunteers to observe hearings and learn how the U.S. immigration court system currently functions. I provide the following information as objectively and accurately as I can. These conclusions are based solely on my review of our court watch data. Any mistakes are my own, and any data analysis of observational data inherently involves a subjective component, which is why I have included the raw data entries.

5. From January 22 until February 27, 2026, volunteers observed thirty-one hearings before Immigration Judge Bianca Brown where a decision was issued. In six of those cases, she found no jurisdiction to grant bond. In twenty-five of those hearings, IJ Brown denied bond on the merits (100% denial rate). Of the twenty-five cases where IJ Brown denied bond, she cited flight risk as a reason for denial in twenty-two of those cases. In nineteen of the cases where IJ Brown denied bond, flight risk was the sole reason for denying bond.

6. For fourteen of the nineteen cases where bond was denied solely for "flight risk," the respondent was prima facie eligible for relief, and bond was nonetheless denied. In several of these cases, IJ Brown justified denial on the basis that relief was "speculative." For example, one respondent who was married to a U.S. citizen and eligible for relief on that basis was nonetheless denied bond, because the relief had yet to be filed and was therefore deemed "speculative." Two respondents who appeared to be brothers and had a permanent resident mother were also found to be flight risks. Another respondent who was married to a U.S. citizen and ran a business in Atlanta was also denied for flight risk, as were two different respondents who each had cancellation of removal cases and multiple U.S. citizen children. Finally, one respondent was paroled into the U.S., had timely filed for asylum, and had attended all required check-ins with ICE, and they were deemed a flight risk, as was an apparently Venezuelan asylum applicant who had obtained Temporary Protected Status (TPS). Another respondent had received a bona fide determination finding for their T-visa application, a form of relief based on being a victim of trafficking, but was nonetheless denied bond. One teenage respondent who allegedly was eligible for Special Immigration Juvenile Status (SIJS) was also denied bond. No bond case was granted by IJ Brown according to our data from this period.

7. From February 1 until February 27, 2026, volunteers observed twenty-three hearings before IJ Jerrica Harness where a decision was issued, and four total were granted. Three of the bond cases were denied for lack of jurisdiction, and sixteen were denied on the merits (80% denial rate). Of the sixteen cases where IJ Harness denied bond, she cited flight risk as a reason for denial in fourteen of those cases. For those fourteen of the sixteen cases where bond was denied, flight risk was the sole reason for the denial, despite prima facie eligibility for relief and, in numerous cases, evidence of long standing residence, family ties, or prior compliance with supervision.

8. For ten of the fourteen cases where bond was denied solely for flight risk, the respondent was prima facie eligible for relief, and bond was nonetheless denied. For example, one of the respondents had filed taxes since 2006 and had a pending cancellation of removal application where the attorney had not yet submitted the relevant evidence. IJ Harness concluded that it was unlikely that the respondent would win her cancellation of removal case and denied bond, stating that relief was "speculative." A respondent who also had a cancellation of removal case was likewise denied. Another respondent had a pending T visa application (based on being a victim of human trafficking), and was denied bond by IJ Harness because his waiting nine years to file the T visa indicated that he had "very speculative" relief. Another respondent had applied for asylum and had valid work

authorization, and she was also denied bond. One respondent, who previously filed for asylum based on his fear of persecution in China due to his Christian religion, submitted statements about his asylum claim, and had attended mandated ICE check-ins, was also denied bond for "very speculative" relief, as was another respondent who had filed an asylum application and had a U.S. citizen sister.

9. From February 1 until February 27, 2026, volunteers observed fifteen hearings before IJ Steven Fuller where a decision was issued, and eight total were granted. Three of the eleven bond cases were denied wholly on the merits, and four were denied at least in part for lack of jurisdiction. Two of the cases with "no jurisdiction" findings were based on mandatory detention due to criminal history where the judge alternatively denied the cases on the merits due to danger to the community. One of the three denials was denied solely for flight risk. In that case, the respondent allegedly had fraud charges and no form of relief had been filed with the court.

10. From February 1 until February 24, 2026, volunteers observed two hearings before IJ James Ward where a decision was issued, and one was granted while the second was denied for lack of jurisdiction. The last bond hearing before IJ Ward was held on February 4. To undersigned's knowledge, IJ Ward no longer works at Stewart Immigration Court.

11. According to our prior court-watch data for August 2025 through January 2026, Immigration Judge Brown denied bond in 13 of 27 cases in which she found that she had jurisdiction (48.1%); by contrast, between January 22 and February 27, 2026, she denied bond in 25 of 25 such cases (100%). Over the same August 2025 through January 2026 period, Immigration Judge Harness denied bond in 10 of 37 cases with jurisdiction (27%), compared to 16 of 20 such cases (80%) from February 1 through February 27, 2026. Immigration Judge Fuller denied bond in 6 of 22 cases with jurisdiction (27.3%) in the earlier period, compared to 3 of 11 cases (27.3%) between January 22 and February 27, 2026. Finally, IJ Ward denied bond in nine out of thirty-seven cases where he found that he had jurisdiction, a 24.3% denial rate.

12. Our August 2025 through January 2026 court-watch data reflect that immigration judges rarely identified 'speculative' or 'very speculative' relief as a stated reason for denying bond, whereas beginning in late January 2026 that terminology appears frequently in the hearing notes and spreadsheets as a primary or sole stated basis for bond denial, including in cases where relief applications had already been filed with the court.

13. In summary, during the February 2026 period, Immigration Judge Brown denied bond in every case in which she reached the merits, and Immigration Judge Harness denied bond in most such cases, with the overwhelming majority of denials grounded solely in "flight risk," often in conjunction with a statement that the respondent's pending relief was "speculative," even where respondents had long residence, U.S. citizen family members, stable employment, or a history of compliance with ICE supervision, as reflected in the attached spreadsheet.

14. Our dataset reflects only those bond hearings that GAIN volunteers were able to observe during the specified periods; it does not capture all bond hearings conducted for those detained at Stewart Detention Center or Folkston ICE Processing Center (which are assigned to immigration judges in Atlanta). Comprehensive data on the total number of bond hearings, grant and denial rates by judge, and the reasons recorded for those outcomes are only maintained by EOIR. We also do not have information on BIA appeals statistics in bond decisions, which are mostly unpublished.

I declare, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States, that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Alizeh Sheikh

03/02/2026

Date

GAIN's Virtual Court Watch Program

We recommend opening two to three tabs on your internet browser with this survey loaded in each of them. Fill out each survey for each bond case to the best of your ability. Then immediately after bond sessions end, review your survey answers and submit.

Please note that this form does **NOT** autosave your responses. If you do not intend to submit your survey immediately after filling it out, please instead take notes in this Word Document template (when you open this link, click "File" then "Download"). Then, copy your responses into this online survey form. This will avoid your survey answers getting lost if your internet browser refreshes.

Before court watch, make sure to:
(1) Watch the online orientation video, and read a written summary of the instructions available here
(2) Sign-up for a timeslot based on the bond hearing calendar, but be flexible about watching another judge
(3) Review this survey ahead of time so you are familiar with it
(4) Once you are ready to do court watch, access the judges' virtual meeting rooms to see bond hearings

Other links: You can see other volunteers' responses to this survey here (note that other volunteers' entries are not necessarily correct), and see a glossary of common terms/abbreviations here

Saving disabled

* Indicates required question

Preliminary questions

Date *

Date

mm/dd/yyyy

Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex) *

- ◯ Stewart
- ◯ Folkston
- ◯ Unknown

Judge Last Name *

- ◯ Brown (Stewart)
- ◯ Fuller (Stewart)
- ◯ Harness (Stewart)
- ◯ Ward (Stewart)
- ◯ Crofts (Folkston)
- ◯ Gallow (Folkston)
- ◯ Hewitt (Folkston)
- ◯ Sydnor (Folkston)

Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it) *

You can identify someone's name by looking up their A number and country of origin on the EOIR Case Status webpage

Your answer

Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned) *

Your answer

Attorney name (if not represented, write “pro se”) (UNK if you didn't catch it) *

Your answer

What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it) *

Your answer

Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation? *

- ◯ Yes or already speaks English
- ◯ No
- ◯ Waives
- ◯ Unknown

If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel? *

- ◯ N/A (has attorney)
- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ Unknown

Summary of arguments

Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision *

EXAMPLES:
#1: DHS: Respondent was transferred this morning, no jurisdiction. "Body is not present." Attorney: Courts regularly decide bond of those not present in the court, i.e., Atlanta court deciding Stewart and Folkston cases. Judge: No jurisdiction.

#2: DHS: Flight risk, he was a visa overstay, and has no relief presented to the court. No work permit or fixed address. Attorney: He has a fixed address as shown in our evidence, and he will file for asylum. His son has DACA. He has a US citizen sponsor. Judge: Flight risk mitigated by bond, grants bond.

Your answer

Jurisdictional questions

Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction? *

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ Did not address
- ◯ Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date

If **NO** to the previous question: Why not? *

- ◯ N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)
- ◯ Mandatory detention due to criminal history
- ◯ Arriving at a port-of-entry or in expedited removal/passed fear interview (Matter of M-S-)
- ◯ Matter of Q. Li (apprehended near border, not just at port-of-entry)
- ◯ Anyone who entered without inspection is an "applicant for admission" under INA 235 (Matter of Yajure Hurtado)
- ◯ Final removal order (often the case if in "withholding-only" proceedings)
- ◯ Other:

Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed? *

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ Unknown

Bond questions

What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options *

- [ ] N/A (because no jurisdiction)
- [ ] None
- [ ] Unknown
- [ ] Assault/battery
- [ ] Cruelty to children
- [ ] Domestic/family violence
- [ ] Driving without a license
- [ ] Drug-related
- [ ] DUI
- [ ] Firearms-related
- [ ] Property damage
- [ ] Sex-related
- [ ] Speeding
- [ ] Theft/robbery
- [ ] Other:

Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community? *

- ◯ N/A (because no jurisdiction)
- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

If **NO** to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options *

- ☐ N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)
- ☐ DHS never alleged danger
- ☐ No criminal history at all, including no arrests
- ☐ No charges
- ☐ Pending charges are minor
- ☐ Pending charges
- ☐ Charges have been dismissed
- ☐ Judge satisfied with explanation of charge
- ☐ Criminal history is old
- ☐ Alleged victim wants release
- ☐ Needs release from custody to reduce charges or have plea deal
- ☐ Judge did not specify
- ☐ Unknown
- ☐ Other:

Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk? *

- ◯ N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)
- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

If **NO** to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options *

- ☐ N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)
- ☐ DHS did not allege flight risk
- ☐ Has avenue for relief or won relief
- ☐ Flight risk mitigated by bond
- ☐ Has attorney for immigration case
- ☐ Likely to win their immigration case
- ☐ Family/friends ties to the community and/or fixed address
- ☐ Unknown
- ☐ Other:

Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc. *

- [ ] Adjustment of status (I-130, I-485)
- [ ] Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)
- [ ] Cancellation of removal
- [ ] Special Immigrant Juvenile Status (SIJS)
- [ ] T-visa (for trafficking survivors)
- [ ] U-visa (for survivors of crime)
- [ ] Violence Against Women Act (VAWA)
- [ ] Voluntary departure
- [ ] Unknown
- [ ] N/A
- [ ] Other:

Hearing outcome *

If the judge said that the respondent is ineligible for bond due to no jurisdiction, enter "No jurisdiction" and **NOT** "Denied bond"

- ○ No jurisdiction
- ○ Granted bond
- ○ Denied bond
- ○ No action or attorney withdrew

If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000) *

- ◯ N/A (because no bond set)
- ◯ Other:

For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent? *

- ◯ N/A (has attorney)
- ◯ Yes (explain in summary section)
- ◯ No

For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent? *

- ◯ N/A (has attorney)
- ◯ Yes (explain in summary section)
- ◯ No

Your name *

Your answer

Your email for follow-up *

Your answer

Any additional comments/notes/feedback

Your answer

Submit

Clear form

Never submit passwords through Google Forms.

This form was created inside of Georgia Asylum and Immigration Network. - Contact form owner

Does this form look suspicious? Report

Google Forms

IJ Brown

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
1/22/2026 8:49:	1/22/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Francisco Jadiel Vazquez Cortez	221-502-345	Mexico	Carlos Solormiany	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	Bond redetermination. DHS: Flight risk. Flounting laws of US. Driving violation. Eligible for adjustment through US citizen wife, but hadn't filed I-130. Attorney: Not flight risk or danger. Respondent originally entered legally on visa. He and his wife are trying to gather the funds to file the I-130. He got married before being placed in removal proceedings. He has a wife, one child, and another on the way, and will be motivated to show up at court. Bond will ensure he shows up to court. He is exactly whom bond is designed for. Judge: Respondent overstayed his visa and any relief is speculative because no I-130 has been filed. Flight risk and bond denied.	Did not address	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Wife planning to file I-130	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
1/23/2026 8:49:	1/23/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	UNK	UNK (ending in 621)	UNK	Carlos Martinez	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: no jurisdiction EWI, no habeas Attorney: "case this month mentions this fact of month and we have jurisdiction," no crimes, had TPS at some point, family has TPS Judge: no current class actions are binding, no jurisdiction	No	Anyone who entered without inspection is an "applicant for admission" under INA 235	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
1/23/2026 8:54:	1/23/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	UNK (Sophia First name)	UNK (ends in 647)	UNK	Monar Ead	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: no jurisdiction issue, visa overstay. Respondent has a case with a violent crime against a family member. No sponsor proof. Bigger concern of the two is danger Attorney: She is 19 and ACDC was happy for her to be released. Incident was between her and her mother, mother told Judge Kell on the 17th, they were happy to release her, but ICE had a hold which is why were here today. Strong Christian leader, studying architecture, issue with her visa overstay/ she isn't one. She has a pending asylum. Attorney: has not met burden to show not danger	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Domestic/family violence	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~1/26/2026 8:44:~~	~~1/26/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Brown (Stewart)~~	~~n/a~~	~~n/a~~	~~n/a~~	~~n/a~~	~~n/a~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Unknown~~	~~n/a~~	~~Did not address~~	~~n/a - no hearings~~	~~n/a no hearings~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~n/a no hearings~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~n/a no hearings~~	~~N/A~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~n/a no hearings~~	~~No~~	~~No~~	
1/27/2026 8:35:	1/27/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Odira Chavez Lopez	N/A	N/A	Allyson Russel-Blair	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	Stated Cortado not good law. Asked that court take jurisdiction and hear bond motion.	No	lacked jurisdiction	None	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	N/A	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
1/30/2026 8:46:	1/30/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Chamberlin	962	UNK	Adams	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	conceded JX to determine bond Government - no bond, request hold responded to burden because respondent moved to another state without prior approval and missed his required biometric check in Respondent - hasn't moved and same house since this case, has not left state, runs a business in ATL, married to US citizen (lack of flight risk), no criminal history, reasonable bond requested to afford release, $5k requested	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	No criminal history at all, including no arrests	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	N/A	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
1/30/2026 8:53:	1/30/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Garcia	816	UNK	Rosenbluth	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	Conceded JX DHS - no bond and hold respondent to burden, driving without license convictions and charges Attorney - been here years, 3 US citizen kids, all fees and filing fees paid for 42b, not a flight risk, has paid taxes for 2019-2023	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license	No	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	Yes	Unknown	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~1/30/2026 9:06:~~	~~1/30/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Brown (Stewart)~~	~~Victor Pastor Ezquol~~	~~651~~	~~UNK~~	~~Cochran~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~conceded to JX DHS - no bond due to criminal history and flight risk, arrest with battery Attorney - asked to take no action because was unaware of the arrest and wife issues~~	~~Yes~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~Assault/battery~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~N/A~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
~~1/30/2026 9:10:~~	~~1/30/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Brown (Stewart)~~	~~Omar Martinez~~	~~902~~	~~UNK~~	~~Diaz~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~DHS - no objection to below Attorney - asked for more time to prepare for bond, was just told of hearing today, wants to file bond documents~~	~~Did not address~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~N/A~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
1/30/2026 9:18:	1/30/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Mohammad Guiriadi	655	UNK	Weinstock	French	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	JX conceded DHS - no bond, hold respondent to burden, recently entered US Attorney - recently entered in last 3 years, habeas court found entitled to bond, employer and meets all 7 factor analysis (fixed address, employment history, resident), history of compliance with reporting requirements	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Unknown	No	Judge did not specify	Yes	Unknown	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/6/2026 9:35:1	2/6/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	UNK	135	Venezuela	Matt Boles	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	Yes	DHS: Notes a habeas petition is pending. Asserts the respondent has failed to show that aggravated assault and possession of a weapon charges do not establish danger to the community. References events prior to the Laken Riley Act. Notes there is no evidence of a sponsor in the record. Attorney: States regarding the offense date, the respondent was originally charged but was never incarcerated. Reports the case was remanded in December 2025, and there are now new charges-two pending charges of assault-related to the manner of apprehension. Notes the respondent had TPS, affirmatively applied for asylum, and has proof of employment. Acknowledges two pending charges but states they have been reduced. Submits nine letters of recommendation describing the respondent as someone who does not drink and works, and notes support from organizations including the Freedom Fund. Judge's Ruling: Denies bond, finding the respondent has not shown he is not a danger to the community, even though the charges have been reduced.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Assault/battery, Possession of a weapon	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	

IJ Brown

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/6/2026 9:46:3	2/6/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Edgar Hernandez Hernandez	328	UNK	Julio Valentine	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS : Notes a habeas order and does not dispute jurisdiction. Cites driving twice without a license and asserts the respondent has established a pattern. Notes the respondent does not have a license and references his criminal history. In addition to unlawful driving habits, asserts the respondent has no intention of following the laws. Attorney: Notes no offenses to person or property, only minor traffic offenses. Regarding flight risk equities, states the respondent lives in the same household as a U.S. citizen cousin who can personally transport him. Notes the respondent filed Form I-589 with USCIS and that the matters the government is referring to are pending. States the respondent fully desires to resolve the traffic violations. Emphasizes strong family and financial support and no serious offenses. Notes the respondent came to the United States as an unaccompanied minor in or around January 2023. Respondent made a statement reading a letter acknowledging he made a mistake. Judge: Denies bond, noting the respondent is a significant flight risk, citing his relatively recent entry into the United States and propensity to disobey the laws of the United States.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license, Speeding	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/6/2026 9:53:3	2/6/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Jorge Gabriella Norte	937	UNK	Shennia Laurence	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Concedes jurisdiction. Asserts the respondent has failed to show he is not a substantial flight risk, citing limited ties to the community. Attorney: Notes the respondent timely filed Form I-589, has complied with all ICE requirements, filed his taxes, and has proof of employment verification. States the respondent has continued to attend all ICE check-ins and was paroled into the United States. Argues the respondent is not a flight risk. Judge: Finds the respondent is a flight risk, that relief is speculative, and that the respondent has not proven he is not a flight risk.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Unknown	No	Unknown	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/6/2026 9:58:0~~	~~2/6/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Brown (Stewart)~~	~~Eduardo Hernandez Lopez~~	~~259~~	~~UNK~~	~~Eszter Bardi~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~DHS: Concedes jurisdiction. Asserts the respondent has failed to show he is not a danger to the community or a flight risk, citing numerous instances of driving without a license. States the concerns cannot be mitigated by the bond amount.~~ ~~Attorney: Files a motion to withdraw the bond request, noting less than 24 hours has passed since receiving information and that counsel is waiting on the respondent's tax returns. Requests the motion be withdrawn with intent to refile. Asks the court to take no action today.~~ ~~Judge: States the case will not be heard today.~~	~~Yes~~	~~Withdrawal of bond hearing~~	~~Withdrawal of bond hearing~~	~~No~~	~~Withdrawal of bond hearing~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk); Withdrawal of bond hearing~~	~~Withdrawal of bond hearing~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
2/6/2026 10:14:	2/6/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Lydia Niva	UNK	UNK	Ms. Cole	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: References manufacturing fraudulent ID and an alternative conviction for fraudulent ID. States DHS is not aware of a sponsor. Attorney: Moves to withdraw the motion for bond hearing, noting there are several documents missing and an email received from the court saying that the documents have not been submitted, and that counsel is not in a position to move forward. Judge: Notes there are two filings before the court. DHS Follow-Up: States evidence has been filed and notes a short turnaround. Reports the respondent requested a bond hearing with a habeas petition and references the notices for the habeas and uploading documents to DHS. Judge: Notes supporting documents were filed. Finds the respondent has a conviction for possession or manufacturing of fraudulent identification documents and concludes there is a significant flight risk.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Possession or manufacturing of fraudulent identification	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/6/2026 10:22:	2/6/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Julio Francisco	404	Mexico	Karla Verma	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Concedes jurisdiction given the habeas petition. Asserts the respondent has failed to show he is not a danger to the community, citing misuse of passport and false statements to the government. Notes the respondent was removed in September after entering without inspection and argues there is no incentive to appear for future hearings. Asserts bond should be denied. Attorney: States the respondent came to the United States over 10 years ago and is not a flight risk. Notes that Respondent is the father to a minor U.S. citizen and that the respondent has already atoned for the crime. Argues he is statutorily eligible for bond, is not a flight risk, and is very well respected in the church community. Respondent: Explains that one of the reasons for returning is that his father lost his vision and there is no support from anyone else. References Pastor Jason as a witness. States that was before, and he was just brought here and is just coming back to the United States. Expresses concern about his father, noting he has eye appointments. Judge: Notes the court must look at criminal history, but the law requires looking at everything. Cites false representation of U.S. citizenship and misuse of passport. Appeal rights reserved; appeal date March 9, 2026.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Misuse of passport and false statements to the government.	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/10/2026 9:00:	2/10/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	RICARDO ALLEN BAEZ	220-668-448	UNK	Daniel Ortiz	spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: habeas granted, case is on appeal, already been ordered removed, large flight risk, relief is extremely speculative Attorney: that would be indefinite detention, did nothing to breach his original terms, has been very vigilant about timely submissions, has children in the United States so community ties, numerous letters, no flight risk because he wants to be with his family. Judge: denied, hasn't met burden to show not a flight risk	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/10/2026 9:03:~~	~~2/10/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Brown (Stewart)~~	~~Yael Gomez *~~	~~206-947-676~~	~~UNK~~	~~Jessica Galmes~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~DHS: habeas granted, lacking community ties evidence, lease provided expired in 2020, no financials to show he can support himself, no taxes~~ ~~Attorney: has EAD, lease documents have been renewed and is current. Filed evidence of a sponsor but hasn't been accepted. 54 years old, been here since 2000, has a pending 42b that has been pending since 2019. Active member of his church, 3 USC children, bond can mitigate any possible flight risk~~ ~~Judge: denied, relief is speculative (proceeded to allow withdrawal)~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~No~~	~~DHS never alleged danger~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Cancellation of removal~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	

IJ Brown

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/10/2026 9:05:	2/10/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	UNK	245313931	UNK	pro se	spanish	Yes or already speaks English	No	DHS: not a habeas, regular bond request, no jurisdiction under Hurtado Judge: no jurisdiction	No	Anyone who entered without inspection is an "applicant for admission" under INA 235	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	No	No	
~~2/11/2026 8:23:~~	~~2/11/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Brown (Stewart)~~	~~UNK~~	~~UNK~~	~~UNK~~	~~UNK~~	~~UNK~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Unknown~~	~~The Judge did not appear~~	~~Did not address~~	~~The Judge did not appear~~	~~No appearances~~	~~No~~	~~No appearances~~	~~No~~	~~No appearances~~	~~No appearances~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~No appearances~~	~~No~~	~~No~~	
2/12/2026 8:59:	2/12/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Arturo Garcia Ramon	203-611-399	Guatemala	Peter Isbister	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Flit risk. Respondent is a 31-year-old who entered without authorization in 2020 and is not 42b-eligible. Respondent has not established the requisite presence in the US and none of the three children he claims as his own, including one US citizen, have his name listed on the birth certificates. Arrested for driving without a license in GA in 2025, and all supporting letters issued from Tennessee, supporting flight risk assertion. Attorney: Respondent's pending 589 (not confirmed) and retention of counsel indicates his respect for the court proceedings, reducing flight risk. Respondent submitted a support letter from the pastor at the church he attends, who married Respondent and his wife. Judge: Flight risk not mitigated by bond due to recent entry and speculative supporting evidence. Bond denied.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license	No	Judge did not specify	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/12/2026 9:09:~~	~~2/12/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Brown (Stewart)~~	~~Tito Farson Perez Esteban~~	~~213-356-137~~	~~Guatemala~~	~~Mr. Alexandros Cornejo~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~DHS: Flight risk, Respondent not eligible for 42b and will likely be time-barred from an asylum claim. Arrested for driving while license suspended/revoked. Sponsor letters are from another state and while there is a pending I-130, Respondent has not been admitted to the US. Attorney: Requested continuance, which was denied, in advance of masters hearing scheduled for 2/18. Counsel withdraws bond request with the intent to re-file.~~	~~Yes~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~Driving without a license~~	~~No~~	~~Judge did not specify~~	~~Yes~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~Adjustment of status~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
2/12/2026 9:20:	2/12/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	UNK Montoya	213-598-109	UNK	Ashley Heuman Deadwyler	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent was apprehended by border patrol after a 235b illegal entry at southern border in 2021. Not eligible for bond due to unauthorized entry into the US. Subject to mandatory detention under the Laken Riley Act for shoplifting arrest. Attorney: Respondent requested asylum and was granted a TPS authorization. Respondent had defense counsel in shoplifting arest and made a disorderly conduct plea which means he is not precluded from bond under the Laken Riley Act. Judge: No evidence of lawful entry on file. Bond denied for lack of jurisdiction.	No	Anyone who entered without inspection is an "applicant for admission" under INA 235	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Adjustment of status	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/18/2026 9:09:	2/18/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Alexandria (last name UNK) - 243141701		Venezuela	Ashley Deadwyler Heuman	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Habeas granted, danger and flight risk. Simple assault charge in 2024, pending driving without license and speeding, recent arrival, minimal ties. I589 is speculative because centered around maduro regime, unclear where she would live if released Attorney: not a danger or flight risk. She is a victim of DV, no disqualifying convictions, her pending charges are not sufficient to show danger. I589 was filed in 2019 without counsel so that's why there may be some grammar issues. Has followed legal process entire time here, applied for TPS and obtained. Judge: denied, not met burden to show not a significant flight risk, relief is speculative	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Assault/battery, Driving without a license, Speeding	No	Judge did not specify	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/18/2026 9:12:	2/18/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Maria (last name UNK)		Guatemala	Carlos Martinez	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: mandatory detention under laken riley act (shoplifting) Attorney: indigenous woman who did not actually shoplift, paid for everything just a big misunderstanding. USC children with special needs, tons of letters of support, taxes, professor and housewife and bookkeeper to husbands landscaping business. Had EAD 2023-2025. I 589 filed in 2019, pending T visa. Judge: shoplifting conviction so no jurisdiction	No	Mandatory detention due to criminal history	Theft/robbery	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589), T-visa (for trafficking survivors)	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/18/2026 9:14:	2/18/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Fransisco Trujillo		UNK	Jorge Gavilanes	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: habeas granted, both danger and flight. Danger- arrested for driving without license 3x. flight- respondents daughter offers to pay bond but makes no further assurances to keep him coming to court. Has been working without authorization, no taxes. Attorney: flight risk- been here 28 years, owns property, has 4 USC citizen (2 under 21), has a cancellation of removal case, best interest to continue to appear. Strong ties to community. Danger- been here almost 30 years and only LEO encounters are driving without license. Judge: flight risk burden not met, not a danger. Relief is speculative, bond denied.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license	No	Pending charges are minor	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Cancellation of removal	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/18/2026 9:15:~~	~~2/18/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Brown (Stewart)~~	~~UNK~~		~~UNK~~	~~Uriel Delgado~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A attorney withdrew bond request~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk~~	~~Unknown~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
2/19/2026 9:09:	2/19/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Tyriq wahlb		UNK	Tamara Murray	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: no significant changed circumstances from bond denial 2 weeks ago Attorney: mom is suffering sever depression (worsened) since her sons are detained, high blood pressure, no criminal record, no flight risk, mom has green card and will petition for them Judge: denied, flight risk	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Adjustment of status (I-130, I-485)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
2/19/2026 9:11:	2/19/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Youssef Thomas Wahib		UNK	Tamara Murray	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	Dhs: no changed circumstances just like in his brothers case, last bond denial was 2 weeks ago Attorney: he has medical issue (gallstones) he needs an operation for, not a flight risk, would be living with his mom, mom holds green card and will petition for him Judge:"I am not a doctor and don't get involved with medical care," bond denied, not a change in circumstances.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license	No	DHS never alleged danger, Charges have been dismissed	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Adjustment of status (I-130, I-485)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
2/19/2026 9:13:	2/19/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Shaniqua Thompson		Bahamas	Phyllis Powers	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: pattern of disregarding immigration laws, visa overstay, driving without license, significant flight risk, relief is speculative, clearly no asylum case or cancellation of removal Attorney: she has a USC child, been married 5 years and I130 will likely be approved, they couldn't file papers due to finances, I am pro bono, she is a stay at home mom with 3 kids. No reckless immigration history, she entered in 2012 and left before her visa expired, with this current visa overstay she had a baby and had to make a choice for her child. Judge: denied, hasn't met burden to show not a significant flight risk, relatively new arrival (6 years)	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license	No	DHS never alleged danger, Charges have been dismissed	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Adjustment of status (I-130, I-485)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
2/19/2026 9:47:	2/11/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Marjarita Alverez		Honduras	Kazuma Sonoda	Spanish	Unknown	N/A (has attorney)	This is a hearing to redetermine bond. DHS: flight risk because has only been in US since 2022 and did not have consistent work (car wash); collateral arrest. Attorney: Not a flight risk; has US sponsor; worked at car wash and other seasonal work; lives with sister and two nieces; sought fear-based relief; never arrested. Judge: Denied bond; did not meet burden to show not a flight risk; relatively recent to US; tenuous ties to US.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	Judge did not specify, No express finding, but noted a collateral group arrest in car.	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Unknown

IJ Brown

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/19/2026 9:59:	2/11/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Orphedo Mejia Ollova		UNK	Pro se - but attorney appeared later saying her office never received notice of this hearing (Rokhaya Niang)	UNK	Unknown	Unknown	DHS: has pending misdemeanor charge in NC and prior arrest for consuming alcohol under 21 & driving with expired registration & traffic infractions; entered only in 2021 so flight risk. Pro se: asked to speak with lawyer. Judge: bond denied; not met burden to show not a flight risk due to recent entry in country in 2021; only have aunt and uncle so ties to community are attenuated; no confirmed fear of returning.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license, DUI, consuming alcohol under age of 21	No	Judge did not specify	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	No	No	Yes
2/20/2026 9:10:	2/20/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Eric Armando Basera-Basera		UNK	Stephanie Gomez	spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: habeas granted, failed to show not a flight risk/danger, i589 receipt but not actually filed, no evidence of EAD or valid drivers license, failure to maintain lane so arrested, Attorney: incident report shows he did not attempt to evade, there was a language barrier, no indication of resistance, ¾ charges dismissed, consistently shows up to immigration appointments, no danger or ongoing risk. Stable employment, housing, community ties, filed 2024 and intended to file for 2025, taken into custody at immigration appointment, asylum claim was properly filed with USCIS. Judge: denied, has not met burden to show not a flight risk, recent entrance	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	failure to maintain lane	No	Judge did not specify	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Yes
2/20/2026 9:12:	2/20/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Victorina Hernandez		UNK	Jeffery Foote	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: habeas granted, flight risk due to speculative relief, 42b relief is extremely speculative because hardship is allergies that require Zyrtec. Attorney: been here 20 years, church leader, 42b is strong, prima facia eligible, has a permanent fixed address, has consistently filed taxes, no flight risk Judge: denied finding has not met burden to show no flight risk, relief is speculative	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Yes
2/20/2026 9:14:	2/20/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Christopher De Jesus Rodriguez		UNK	Yesibel Falcon	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: (habeas) nothing to show employment history or EAD, sponsor only makes 19k, unclear how he could support him Attorney: sponsor does have a steady income, has already filed i589 and waiting on EAD so wont need sponsor soon, wife is pregnant so has every reason to show up. USC child and family ties Judge: denied, hasn't met burden to show not a flight risk, recent entry in 2021, relief speculative	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Adjustment of status (I-130, I-485)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Yes
2/20/2026 9:17:	2/20/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Armando Cruz		UNK	Mo Idlibby	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: respondent has not shown any material change in circumstances, t visa is pending, still a flight risk because relief is speculative and will be pending for an unknown period. Attorney: last court was about to grant a bond and stated for record and said the only reason they did not was a sister Judge ordered a removal same day, that issue has been cured, order of removal is stayed, only reason hes in custody is because DHS made material misrepresentations of material fact. Prior denial had nothing to do with his T visa through USCIS. 2 USC children, tons of evidence of property, USC sponsor, stable fixed address. Clarified that a stay of removal is not a change of circumstances, Judge says yes. Judge: It is unfortunate that I have to do bond when other Judge did case in chief, does have bonified recognition, but case is still in same place, visa is not approved, still has a pending removal order, this court maintains that he is still a flight risk so I will not find changed circumstances. Will never dissuade you from filing bond, but this is your 3-4th bond hearing. "I don't have time to go back and forth, appeal it if you do not agree"	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Unknown	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	no changed circumstances, not met burden	T-visa (for trafficking survivors)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Yes
2/24/2026 9:31:	2/24/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Maria Rosa		Mexico	Akindiji Oloko	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: No jurisdiction, because of Hurtado and 5th Circuit case upholding Hurtado. Alternatively, Resp. hasn't carried burden of showing no flight risk. Resp. misrepresented she had no criminal history, but was arrested and convicted of shoplifting. Has been present in the US for many years and made no application to adjust status. She has been working without authorization. She submitted tax returns for 3 years, but utilized 2 different SSNs on the tax returns. Relief from removal is unlikely because, she alleges only unspecified threats, and she is time-barred from seeking asylum. Resp: There is jurisdiction under the MDGa standing order requiring bond hearings for people who entered without inspection. She is not a flight risk, as she has been in the country for 28 years, has purchased a home and has a stable US address, and has 2 US citizens (ages 18 and 21). She has a good employment history and works for Emory as a janitor. Has letters of recommendation from the community. Her criminal history is over 25 years ago. She drove without a license because she has to support her family. The tax ID numbers were different because they are assigned by the IRS and sometimes the IRS requires a changed number. She has had no other immigration problems. No history of trying to flee. As to assylum (application not yet filed), she and her Mexican born son who now lives here with her have received recent threats from Mexico. The assylum application will be filed shortly. Court: Finds no jurisdiction under Hurtado. Alternatively, she is a flight risk and relief is speculative. Concerned about her using 2 separate SSNs. Resp. reserved appeal.	No	Anyone who entered without inspection is an "applicant for admission" under INA 235 (Matter of Yajure Hurtado)	Driving without a license, Shoplifting	No	Danger to property or community not addressed	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
2/25/2026 9:01:	2/25/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Santos Jaques		UNK	Rokhaya Niang	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: habeas granted, flight risk, proposed sponsor is someone who admits she does not know respondent, no tax returns, pay stubs, etc. Attorney: new sponsor filed in our new evidence, who showed her income and ability to support respondent and make sure he attends all hearings. Strong and verifiable ties to the United States, only 19 so lack of spouse and children is consistent with age. Stable employment. Has clear way to LPR through his SIJS. Entered the United States in 2021. Judge: denied, has not met burden, relative recent entry, relief is speculative.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Special Immigrant Juvenile Status (SIJS)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Yes
2/25/2026 9:03:	2/25/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Petro Avilo Velmontes		UNK	J Britt Thames	spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: habeas granted, clear danger (3-4 DWL, marijuana, pending charges for battery and false imprisonment) Attorney: the record when looked at beyond the surface, all of those charges have been dismissed except the pending charge which brought him here today. For the marijuana, dismissed because he was driving and it was found in back and everyone in car was charged until they found whos it was. For assault, his wife did not intentionally call 911 and has wrote a letter of support that shows no physical altercation. Further, he entered in 2000 at 6 years old, strong ties to community, married to USC, 2 USC children, statutorily eligible for cancellation. Judge: denied- with those pending charges, hasn't met burden to show no danger	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Assault/battery, Domestic/family violence, Driving without a license, Drug-related	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Adjustment of status (I-130, I-485), Cancellation of removal	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Yes

IJ Brown

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/25/2026 9:05:	2/25/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Trinidad Mehia		UNK	Peter Tadeo	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	Withdrawn for more time to gather evidence	Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	N/A	No action or attorney withdrew	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Unknown

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/2/2026 8:51:2	1/30/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Alexis Jose Ardenard Barbosa	246-141-199	UNK	Mr. Elston	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	Attorney: Need to delay proceeding because he needs more time to prepare. Judge: Granted, moves date.	No	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	N/A	No action or attorney withdrew	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/2/2026 9:01:1	2/2/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Elisna De Santos	215-516-199	Brazil	Massiel Silva	Portugese	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	Attorney: Requests continuance for attorney prep. Judge: Granted	Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	No action or attorney withdrew	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/3/2026 10:43:	2/3/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	UNK	213384285	UNK	Paige Stewart	UNK	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	***DHS lawyer didn't actually show up, then did and had technical issues, so sort-of was able to communicate thru calling in. No jurisdiction, the NTA reflects the respondent did present himself at a point of entry and was paroled but that appears to have been revoked by the act of him being detained and he would revert back to his original status	No	Anyone who entered without inspection is an "applicant for admission" under INA 235	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/3/2026 10:45:	2/3/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Argelia Garcia Viatorro	235488714	UNK	Daniela Fink	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: flight risk. No info for family ties or employment, no relief pending Resp: Has habeus, so no problems with jurisdiction. filed taxes since 2006, worked at a nursery for the past 20 years, has a pending 42b (judge was trying to get more info on that because she doesn't think that's a good argument) Judge finds there is little reason to believe she will get the 42b even though the attorney was in the process of getting the evidence, and since that relief is so speculative Denied bond	No	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Cancellation of removal	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/3/2026 10:50:	2/3/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Rafael Marcia	254054424	UNK	Allison Lukanich	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Flight risk, numerous traffic violations, failed to update his address with the DMV. Doesn't have the ten years of continuous physical presence for cancellation of removal. Resp: Not a flight risk. He filed an application for a T visa, he was a victim of human trafficking. Sole caregiver of his son. Has a relative sponsor (he was the witness at her wedding, niece by marriage), evidence of financials for her. Judge: Very speculative relief, especially since he waited to file the T visa for 9 years. Is the kid an adult? Sponsor doesn't have special ties to the U.S. Denied bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Other traffic	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	T visa	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/5/2026 8:58:3	2/5/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Carvahall Cardegnas	XXX-XXX-380	Columbia	Jessica Calmes	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: No jurisdiction issues, habeas order. She poses a danger of harm to personal property because she was expelled from Mexico. She said she presented herself to immigration authorities but she was encountered at the border. There is also a flight risk. Resp: (Judge swore in resp to answer questions about why she was expelled from Mexico. Still a little unclear why she was expelled from Mexico). She is applying for an asylum and shows a viable case with past persecution and fear of future persecution on a protected status. Sponsor provided. Nothing to show there is a danger. Judge: No fixed address, only here since March of 2023. No family ties to the United States. She does have employment authorization. Sponsor is unclear about how she knows her but sponsorship info indicates the family income is sufficient. Evidence is not sufficient to establish that she is not a specific risk of flight. Denied.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	No charges	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/5/2026 9:00:0	2/5/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Rupert, Hisiana-Boques	221-480-191	UNK	Nancy Powell	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Deny bond. Pending charges of larceny make them a risk of danger to personal property and flight risk. (After rap sheet doesn't count). No jurisdiction because of Hurtado. Still a flight risk. Resp: No violent or criminal history. In detention because of traffic stop. Married to a U.S. citizen child and a medically dependent U.S. child. Pending 42(b) application. Judge: Department did not file the rap sheet so cannot rely on that. Visa overstay so Hurtado is not an issue. Not a danger. Been in the U.S. since 2011. Granted bond. $10,000.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	Judge did not specify	No	Has avenue for relief or won relief, Flight risk mitigated by bond, Family/friends ties to the community and/or fixed address	Cancellation of removal	Granted bond	$10,000	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/5/2026 9:02:0	2/5/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Sergio Alexander Morales Meriquin	240-367-796	UNK	Alejandro Roque	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Flight risk because no dependents or relief. Resp: Married to U.S. citizen can pursue adjustment of status. Also has U.S. citizen child with another lady, more ties. Judge: Pending assault charge. Denied bond because danger to community/partner.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Assault/battery	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/5/2026 13:50:	2/5/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	E Rodriguez	702	Not stated	Mario Pereira	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	Bond hearing deferred.	Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date	Evidence by respondent filed too late for court or DHS to review.	Did not get to this in case.	No	Judge did not rule on this.	No	Not addressed.	Unknown	No action or attorney withdrew	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/5/2026 14:07:	2/5/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Fuentes Galdames	209339270	Honduras	Peter Isbister	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	1. DHS opposes bond because he is a "flight risk" but had no particular evidence of this but she said she did not review all of the evidence. 2. Respondent's counsel says that this risk is not particularized. He has been here since 2016, timely asylum application in 2017, it was not heard (likely caught up in COVID); not caught up in any ACA arrangements for 2019, multiple US citizen children, 6 letters of support from co-workers, had 589 work permit. One of the places he was working is a naval facility and he had to go through security check for military. Picked up while duly reporting to ICE for pending 589. Attorney's position that bond should be $4000 instead of $5000. Has permanent address. He is married. Asylum is gang related case and he has a past persecution argument. 3. Judge says he would not be eligible for 42b relief (as indicated by his attorney) because he was served by an NTA, although notice was stated as date to be set, so depends how quickly. Timely filed 589, but speculative. Judge said he has significant ties to US (kids), good moral character letters, no criminal record indication, government made no argument that he violent to a person or property, has employment authorization and history, has been employed (attorney does not know whether he has been paying taxes). Judge said relief is speculative in this case. LPR sponsor, not a direct family member. Bond is high, at $12,500 and respondent is subject to electronic monitoring. Appeal was waived moving forward. Department reserved right to appeal.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	No	Family/friends ties to the community and/or fixed address	Asylum application is pending	Granted bond	$12,500	N/A (has attorney)	No	
2/6/2026 8:26:5	2/6/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Hong Li Binh	226-098-214	China	J. Britt Thames	Mandarin	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent does not have significant ties to the community and therefore amounts to a flight risk. Attorney: Respondent is from China and entered in 2024; he has filed statements regarding his fear of persecution in China for his Christian beliefs; he has been gainfully employed while in the US; he has provided evidence of multiple sponsors in the US; he did not evade ICE, he complied, reporting himself after learning of his obligation to report; this is a true asylum claim that meets all the criteria. Judge: Respondent has not met his burden to show that he is not a risk of flight; he very recently entered in the United States; his relief is very speculative.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/6/2026 8:42:4	2/6/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	UNK	221-480-512	UNK	Jorge Gavilanes	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	(I missed most of the attorney arguments due to technical difficulties with Webex, but I heard the Judge's holding). Judge: Flight risk, denies bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Unknown	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/6/2026 9:00:2	2/6/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Victor Pasque	219-994-651	UNK	Johanna Cochran	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent constitutes both a danger to the community (arrested four times for violent crimes and domestic violence) and a flight risk. Attorney: The arrest reports were all false and the respondent has significant ties to the community. Judge: Respondent has not met burden to show that he is not a danger to the community, denies bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Assault/battery, Domestic/family violence	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/6/2026 9:13:5	2/6/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Hahmed Denuze Gorum	UNK	UNK	Kazuma Sonoda	UNK	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Immigration violations and failure to comply with voluntary departures create a flight risk. Attorney: There is an 18-year-old qualifying relative and we have filed for 42B relief. Judge: Respondent has been in the United States for some time, but he does not have significant ties to the community sufficient to overcome his flight risk, denies bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Cancellation of removal	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/10/2026 8:41:	2/10/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	UNK	241-101-959	UNK	Yesibel Falcon	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Flight risk. No ties to community. Proof of employment but only for 2011-2013. Address for sister (sponsor) is same address as the respondent in the past before he was homeless, so not promising. Resp: Been here since 2009. He has a filed 589, and is dedicated to the process. His sister is a U.S. citizen. Judge: Nothing in the record to say that he owns any property (no)? No relief that has been identified other than the 589 scheduled for a merits hearing this afternoon. In terms of current employment there is nothing in the record. His relief is very very speculative, he's been in U.S. for 15 years, I'm not litigating the 589 at this point but I have to consider the speculativeness of the relief, the motions filed include one based upon agreements with two different countries so there are potentially two he could be removed to besides his own country, but there is another motion saying it was not timely filed and he would have to reach the higher burden under CAT, and DHS is also arguing that the application on its own does not raise specific facts. No evidence submitted says how the resp has fear or would be unable to return to his home country, or the other two countries in the motion. Denied bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/17/2026 8:51:~~	~~2/17/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Harness (Stewart)~~	~~UNK~~		~~UNK~~	~~Arturo R. Rios~~	~~Gujarati~~	~~Waives~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Had a whole speech at the beginning about how she could not guarantee she had seen anything uploaded past close of business. Says she typically allows parties to submit late-filed evidence but now she has not had the opportunity to review it. Granted, it was 217 pages long.~~ ~~Gives the option to move forward or withdraw. Withdraws.~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~N/A~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
2/17/2026 8:53:	2/17/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Lucky Lucky		UNK	Johnathan Pearson	Hindi	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Court does not have jurisdiction pursuant to Matter of Hurtado. Resp: Argued class member of Maldonado Bautista. Judge: No - does not apply nationwide. Not even sure he's an eligible class member.	No	Anyone who entered without inspection is an "applicant for admission" under INA 235 (Matter of Yajure Hurtado)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	N/A	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/19/2026 16:3~~	~~2/19/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Harness (Stewart)~~	~~UNK~~		~~UNK~~	~~pro se~~	~~UNK~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Unknown~~	~~I logged on a little early my slot today, February 19 just before 1pm. They were finishing up a case, and then the judge set a 30 min recess starting at 1pm and announced that the afternoon sessions would be closed so observers would not be allowed in. It wasn't clear to me why that was. All I could determine was that it seemed to be a situation where they were revisiting a case from earlier.~~ ~~The judge dismissed the Spanish language interpreter at that time, and did mention that the two cases in the afternoon were pro se. She also mentioned that there would be witnesses present.~~	~~Did not address~~	~~See notes~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~see notes~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~see notes~~	~~see notes~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~No~~	~~No~~	~~Unknown~~
2/20/2026 8:37:	2/20/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Emanuela Ado		UNK	Courtney Han	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent has only recently moved to Georgia; has been arrested for giving false information to the police; she is a flight risk. Attorney: We are in agreement there is not a jurisdictional issue and DHS is not arguing danger; she is a flight risk but it is mitigatable (she has a community). Judge: Have jurisdiction, no evidence of danger, respondent is a significant risk of flight (she has pending charges against her).	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license, Giving false name to police officer	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
~~2/20/2026 8:51:~~	~~2/18/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Harness (Stewart)~~	~~N/A~~		~~N/A~~	~~N/A~~	~~N/A~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A~~	~~Did not address~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~N/A~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Unknown~~
2/20/2026 8:58:	2/20/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Vilandia Cirate		UNK	Cecilia Sam	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Minor ties to the community and highly speculative nature of relief. Attorney: Not a danger to the community (minor traffic citations); he has a pending asylum application; he has custody of his child and has a U.S.-citizen sponsor. Judge: Respondent's young child in U.S. but no path to relief; only been here 2 years, overstayed J1 VISA program, he is a flight risk, denies bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Speeding	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
2/20/2026 9:23:	2/20/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Freddy Alexander Lopez Gomez		Guatemala	Shaudi Khansari	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent is a flight risk; arrested for driving without a license three time in the past 20 years. Judge: That arrest information is not in the record, opposing counsel what would you like to do? Attorney: We object to filing them in the middle of the bond hearing. DHS: My apologies, that is the wrong file that I had pulled up--all of that argument was for another bond applicant. Judge: Please put on the record what you would like for this respondent. DHS: No information showing that this person is not a flight risk. Attorney: he has been living in the United States for over 10 years; he has a fixed permanent address; he is a fixed member of his community, churchgoing individual, had a steady job; he is eligible for relief; no actual arrest history in Georgia; no indication that he would pose a danger. Judge: No real relief has been identified in the record, nothing indicating a fear to return back to his home country; does not have significant family ties; denies bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
~~2/20/2026 9:34:~~	~~2/20/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Harness (Stewart)~~	~~Alberto Juan Tocora Rafael~~		~~UNK~~	~~Alyson Russell Blair~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~DHS: We have an I-213 that we would like to file on the record. Judge: Opposing counsel, would you like to withdraw without prejudice? Attorney: May I review it here before I am able to do that? Judge: Yes, I will pass this case until later this morning to give you time to review.~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Yes~~
2/23/2026 8:33:	2/23/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	UNK - 002		UNK	Ana Jacob Lopes	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS - opposes bond for danger and flight risk. charged with driving without license and registration - this is criminal and public safety concern. has a sponsor, but annual income stated was $12.5k, but the IRS tax returns show gross $22k which is below poverty, so not a sufficient or reliable sponsor to mitigate flight risk. respondent is a visa overstay. Respondent - no crimes other than the traffic violation, family ties to US and two US citizen children that are babies, eligible for asylum and has sponsor Judge - record shows that she paid someone to bring her children here illegally, which shows danger	No	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license, Speeding	No	crimes are small are not history of crime	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	N/A	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/24/2026 8:46:	2/24/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Jose De Nova		UNK	Jessica Calmes	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Flight risk. No significant ties. Resp: Entered in 1991, been here for well over half his life. Stable address. Lives there with his 21 year old US citizen son, and two month old baby. We submitted his business card. Works at a window cleaner and has been there for nearly 30 years. Owners wrote letters. He is prima facie eligible for cancellation of removal. First arrest in his 35 years after being pulled over for a broken taillight. Been paying taxes. Judge: Has to do all the factors in Guerra. Nothing to indicate he's a danger. Move directly to flight risk. It does appear he has been here for a while. Letter doesn't indicate that they are actually his employers. No indication of employment authorization. No clue if his son has enough money here. Notes obviously he has been working because he is paying taxes on his earnings. Without a 42b having been filed and without anything other than his child being premature, that relief is too speculative. Bond denied.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Cancellation of removal	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Yes
2/24/2026 8:50:	2/24/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Joel Marido Gomez		UNK	Jessica Calmes	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Flight risk Resp: 54, entered in 2000, 42b pending, current valid employment authorization, three US citizen children, evidence to show his prima facie 42b case, lease given. Judge: Not a flight risk because of work auth and other factors. 8k bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	No	DHS never alleged danger	No	Family/friends ties to the community and/or fixed address	Cancellation of removal	Granted bond	$8k	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Unknown
2/26/2026 8:33:	2/26/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Gabriella: 221-485-218		UNK	Anna Jacob Lopes	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	#1: DHS: Flight risk; illegal presence in US; no proof of employment or tax returns; discrepancies related to W-2 income from sponsor and tax return; no evidence of income submitted for 2025; no US family ties. Attorney: Has work permit, has a partner in US, has a sponsor, presence is not unlawful because she has pending application for asylum, even if flight risk can be mitigated by a bond; DUI, but respondent claims not intoxicated, dismissed by DA; no criminal history. Judge: Flight risk, while there is sponsor, no significant family ties, only in US for 3 years and no record of spouse, parent, or child, overstayed visa, no property or assets in US - bond denied.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None, Unknown	No	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
~~2/26/2026 9:07:~~	~~2/26/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Harness (Stewart)~~	~~Miguel: 216-045-894~~		~~UNK~~	~~Johanna Cochran~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Evidence was not timely submitted; Judge offered opportunity to withdraw and reschedule for afternoon.~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~N/A~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~No~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Yes~~
2/26/2026 9:09:	2/26/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	UNK: 221-441-772		UNK	Maura Finn	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	#1: DHS: Flight risk, illegally in US and worked illegal with no employment visa, criminal history of driving without license; #2 Attorney: Not a flight risk, family ties, worked in US. Judge: Flight risk mitigated by bond, bond granted (condition: no driving without license)	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license	No	DHS never alleged danger	No	Flight risk mitigated by bond, Family/friends ties to the community and/or fixed address	Unknown	Granted bond	$15,000	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Unknown
~~2/26/2026 17:3~~	~~2/26/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Harness (Stewart)~~	~~NA~~		~~NA~~	~~NA~~	~~NA~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Unknown~~	~~NA~~	~~Did not address~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~None;~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~N/A~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~No~~	~~No~~	~~Unknown~~
2/27/2026 8:27:	2/27/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Charles Anthony Faulkner		UNK	Tyrese Cruise	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	Attorney: Jurisdiction is proper under Bautista. DHS: Jurisdiction is not proper because Respondent was detained upon entry. Judge: Respondent was detained upon entry, no jurisdiction.	No	Matter of Q. Li (apprehended near border, not just at port-of-entry)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
2/27/2026 8:56:	2/27/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Jose Ramirez Romero		UNK	Zenylisse Melendez	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: The Respondent has not met burden to show he is not a significant risk of flight. Attorney: Respondent has been here for 4 years and has a significant other here. Judge: Factors not met, not met burden of showing not a significant risk of flight, denies bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Unknown	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/3/2026 9:31:0	2/3/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Louis Perez	A221481 (UNK)	Mexico	UNK	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: flight risk, speculative nature of relief. Attorney: As shown by evidence, he has fixed address at rental property, US Citizen spouse, US Citizen child (2 year old), US Citizen stepchild (7 year old), expecting US Citizen child to be born, steady employment, household earner, attends church, and submitted attestations in support of his character. He has no arrests and only a traffic stop for a broken taillight.He also has a friend as a sponsor and adjusted status relating to marriage. Judge: Not a danger nor a significant flight risk; risk mitigated by bond, grants bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Traffic stop due to broken taillight.	No	No criminal history at all, including no arrests	No	Flight risk mitigated by bond	Adjustment of status	Granted bond	$5,000	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/3/2026 9:39:0	2/3/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Maria Columbo Hernandez	UNK	Mexico	Peynado	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Relief speculative and possibly time-barred; Attorney: Came to US seeking asylum after kidnapping threats from cartel. She suffers anxiety and panic attacks, as well as circulation issues. She immediately filed for asylum and has attended all ICE check-ins. Her wife has DACA. She has no criminal records. She owns a home with her wife and is co-owner of a cleaning business with her wife. She employs US citizens and files taxes. She has done everything required. Attorney requested any high bond amount so that she could be released so she could gather paperwork and avoid continued suffering. Detention is triggering to her panic attacks given the kidnapping threats. Judge: flight risk mitigated by bond, bond granted but said he needed time to think about amount.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	No criminal history at all, including no arrests	No	Flight risk mitigated by bond	Asylum	Granted bond	Judge advised he would set bond after thinking about it more.	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/3/2026 9:48:1	2/3/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Alberto Pena Perez	A22148025	UNK	Peynado	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Relief is speculative and Respondent demonstrated pattern of inability to follow law given 6 arrests for driving without a license since he entered in 2000; Attorney: Respondent has a fixed address, lives with his family with wife and 4 kids (1 child is DACA; 3 children are US citizens), he is the main breadwinner of the family and they face losing housing if he is not released. He has been consistently employed, filed taxes, and had about 20 affidavits attesting to his good moral character. He is also remorseful about prior driving without a license; however only occurred twice in the past 10 years. He will get a license. Attorney pointed to strong family unit, who all attended the hearing along with the sponsor who drove to the hearing from a distance; Judge: Acknowledged propensity to disregard law requiring drivers license, but found that does not equate to having propensity for dangerous conduct. His long-term community ties, employment supported his finding that Respondent is not a significant flight risk. Flight risk mitigated by bond, grants bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license	No	Pending charges are minor	No	Flight risk mitigated by bond	Unknown	Granted bond	$6,000	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/5/2026 9:03:1~~	~~2/5/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Fuller (Stewart)~~	~~Ghadari UNK~~	~~226149988~~	~~India~~	~~Mengyu Peng~~	~~Hindi~~	~~Waives~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~DHS previous habeas granted so no jurisdiction issue, hasn't showed not significant flight risk. Add violator~~ ~~Attorney: not a danger or flight risk. No criminal history, entered in 2024 with intention of filing asylum and obtained counsel in reasonable time. Asylum is likely to prevail due to his political status and dissent. Never missed a check in, arrested when ICE did a home visit. Even provided his gate code to ICE to enter his neighborhood. Has filed taxes, employer is his sponsor.~~ ~~Judge: allowing extra evidence submission and will decide later today~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~None~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~Asylum~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
2/5/2026 9:05:3	2/5/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Victoria (last name UNK)	221502308	Bahamas	M. Ead	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: visa overstay, didn't show shes not a danger, has driving without license charges and fraud charges, medical issues not relevant. Has used 2 different names and has not shown any potential form of relief. Attorney: severe medical/heart issues, has not been able to speak with her or receive adequate medical attention. No risk outside of facilities. Judge: no family ties or relief sought, burden on respondent. Has arrests and attorney did not show anything against that. Not really a danger but certainly a flight risk and hasn't met burden.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license, Theft/robbery	No	Judge did not specify	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/5/2026 9:07:3~~	~~2/5/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Fuller (Stewart)~~	~~Bryan Alexander Torres~~	~~UNK~~	~~UNK~~	~~pro se~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~Yes~~	~~Respondent asked for more time to obtain representation; withdrew request~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~No~~	~~No~~	
2/6/2026 9:11:2	2/6/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Adelua	236-248-728	Nigeria	Matt Boles	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Danger. Assault by pointing a gun, domestic violence, assault with a minor child. Not allowed to have a gun as a student visa holder either. Criminal courts don't set bond because they think ICE will take care of it all the time. Resp: Entered with a student visa, legally married to U.S. citizen, child who was just born last year. Husband has filed a petition for her last year. Only charge of remove state is non-immigrant overstay. Had to step away from college for a medical issue, but letter of support saying she's welcome back anytime. Some misdemeanor assault that ended with no money needed to be paid. Alleged victim is her husband who has provided letters of support. Judge: Fixed address. Married to U.S. citizen, has U.S. citizen child. I-130 pending, if approved, eligible to adjust. Possible relief would be adjustment of status. Court does not believe she is a significant flight risk. Key issue is danger. Mr. Boles always presents the court with the best possible packet with all the information I need. But very serious pending charge, cut her husband bad enough to see the bone. Her husband's lack of fear is not dispositive, it is danger to the community.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Assault/battery, Domestic/family violence, Firearms-related	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Adjustment of status	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/10/2026 9:36:~~	~~2/10/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Fuller (Stewart)~~	~~Victor Lorenzo Montez~~	~~UNK~~	~~Mexico~~	~~Brennan Barr~~	~~English~~	~~Waives~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~DHS: Flight risk; relief is speculative. Attorney: Respondent was brought to US at the age of 4 and has attended US schools from kindergarten through high school. US citizen stepmother will sponsor. He has no criminal convictions- only traffic offenses. Judge: Did not have all evidence prior to hearing and did not, therefore, have an opportunity to review. Will review evidence and issue ruling later today. Put on record: Respondent entered at 4 years old, has a US citizen stepmom sponsor, entire education in US, arrest for speeding and alluding, and no criminal record.~~	~~Did not address~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~None~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~Adjustment of status~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
2/10/2026 9:43:	2/10/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Carlos De la Certa de los Santos	UNK	Mexico	Harold Estrada	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Overstayed Visa. Risk to community because of driving record-reckless driving, speeding, etc. Relief speculative and no evidence of any qualifying relatives that would suffer undue hardship if deported. Attorney: Respondent entered US lawfully with a visa. No criminal history that make him a danger to the community. Not a flight risk because he has 2 US citizen minor children and is the sole financial provider. He has a registered business in NC, paid taxes, and provided 20+ letters of support. He has 3 potential sponsors, including a US military. His traffic matters were administratively dismissed. Judge: Traffic offenses not criminal. Not a danger to community. Flight risk mitigated by bond, granted bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	No	No charges	No	Flight risk mitigated by bond	Unknown	Granted bond	$7,500	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/17/2026 10:21~~	~~2/17/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Fuller (Stewart)~~	~~Constance Crystal Delgado Varas~~		~~Mexico~~	~~David Lunel~~	~~English~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Attorney: Respondent came to U.S. when she was 7 years old and has remained here for over 20 years. She is relief eligible and is married to a U.S. citizen with two U.S. citizen stepchildren. She's been continuously employed and does not present flight risk. She had one prior DUI conviction in 2022. Letter from her probation officer was submitted to show that she complied with probation and never failed to appear for Court. She had a second arrest for DUI and obstruction of law enforcement in 2025. She refused breathalyzer test because she claims she was not drinking because she thought she was pregnant. Counsel argued case law where danger to community found in situations with 4-5 prior convictions and argued only one here and one charge pending. DHS: Danger to the community given second DUI arrest and obstruction of law enforcement. Judge: Put facts on the record. Married to a U.S. citizen in 2025 and eligible for relief. No pattern or practice of failing to appear in court. Not concerned she is a flight risk. Concern is danger to community. Relied on cases cited by Respondent's attorney and noted court's discretion based on facts of each case. Judge takes seriously situations where respondents have lived in U.S. for so long, like Respondent. Will review evidence and issue a ruling on bond later in the day.~~	~~Yes~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~2023 DUI conviction; 2025 DUI and obstruction of law enforcement charges~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~No~~	~~DHS did not allege flight risk. Has avenue for relief or won't relief. Family/friends ties to the community and/or fixed address~~	~~N/A~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
2/17/2026 10:25	2/17/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Sahir Zan Zun Papa Iz Lapel		UKN	Rokhaya Niang	UNK	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Hurtado applies. Attorney: Respondent is bond eligible and cited cases for authority to hear bond determinations. Judge: Put facts on the record - family friend willing to sponsor, entered U.S. illegally, and no evidence to show admitted. Found Hurtado applies.	No	Anyone who entered without inspection is an "applicant for admission" under INA 235 (Matter of Yajure Hurtado)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/18/2026 10:06	2/18/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	UNK		UNK	Sergey Risko	UNK	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent is a flight risk and a danger to community; has had 5 arrests in 5 years, 1 for domestic abuse, 3 for DUI, and 1 conviction for DUI. V2 Visa remained unauthorized, I-139 was filed after his arrest by ICE. Attorney: Respondent has been sober for 2 years, all arrests were before he went to rehab; he is married with one child, his MIL and FIL wrote letters of support, he is requesting bond. Judge: Evidence was submitted late, before the bond request and was not uploaded until today. Judge is taking no action today and counsel can refile for a new hearing.	Did not address	N/A (because found jurisdiction; did not address it, etc.)	Domestic/family violence; DUI	No	Evidence was not uploaded in time.	No	Evidence was not uploaded in time.	Adjustment of status (I-130, I-485), Bond	No action or attorney withdrew	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/18/2026 10:29	2/18/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Joel Garcia Salazar		Mexico	Ricardo Gonzalez	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent failed to show they are not a flight risk; has immigration violations - overstayed VISA; no work authorization; taken into ICE custody on Jan 21; I-139 was received the next day. Attorney: Respondent is a 25-year-old Mexican citizen married to a US citizen; he has a H2 VISA; works in landscaping; has filed taxes for 2022-2024 and working on current year; no crim history; no negative immigration history; was admitted and inspected; I-139 was filed prior to his detention; detained on routine traffic stop; his MIL is his sponsor; his in-laws have written reference letters; no danger or flight risk. Judge: Resp is not a danger, poses minimal flight risk, $6000 bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	No criminal history at all, including no arrests, No charges	No	Flight risk mitigated by bond, Family/friends ties to the community and/or fixed address	Unknown	Granted bond	$6,000	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/18/2026 10:48	2/18/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Cabron Alvarado		Guatemala	Matthew Boles	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent is a flight risk; entered on V2 VISA and overstayed; no wife or children, only family member is one cousin; his fear of criminals might be time-barred. Attorney: Respondent lives in LaGrange where he owns property; he works in construction making over $54,000/year; was detained while at Peachtree Mall with his cousin; case has no jurisdictional issues; no criminal history; not a flight risk; was detained after lawful inspection; no ACA agreement (does not apply); his father was murdered 3 months ago. Judge: Respondent is not a danger, has a fixed address and good employment; will sign bond after he has had time to review case and determine flight risk.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	No criminal history at all, including no arrests, No charges	No	Judge needs time to determine.	Adjustment of status (I-130, I-485)	Granted bond	Judge said he will grant bond after reviewing to determine flight risk.	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/19/2026 13:34	2/19/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Christina Martinez Martinez		Mexico	Kathleen Moscato	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent has the burden to show no danger and no flight risk and has not done so. That is really all they argued. Resp: She entered in February 2006 on a B-2 visa. Had entered and left the country multiple times. She has been working for 13 years and has sponsor letters. No criminal record. Was detained when stopped because the tag light on her car was not working. She is elligible for cancellation of removal. She has an adult US citizen son. Court: She overstayed her visa and has a US citizen child. She has a cousin sponsor, though the adult child has not offered any statement. She has a long employment history and got her degree in 2020 at ABAC. She is not a danger. Has no criminal record. Sufficient evidence that her flight risk can be mitigated. She's a long term resident with long term employment and a US citizen (adult) child. $5000 bond	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	Car's missing tag light, though serious, was minor.	No	DHS did not allege flight risk, Has avenue for relief or work relief, Flight risk mitigated by bond	Cancellation of removal	Granted bond	$5,000	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/19/2026 13:41	2/19/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	UNK		India	UNK	UNK	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	Resp.: Is a father who entered lawfully with an application for asylum pending for 3 years. Has a wife and children who also seek assylum. Pays taxes and has been convicted of no crimes. An aggravated assault (domestic) charge and charge for interference with a 911 call are pending, but the State court judge granted bail on these. Has counsel. DHS – Entry was in 4/23, fairly recent. Was charged with shoplifting, but this was dropped due to a pretrial diversion program. Shortly thereafter, Resp. was charged with domestic violence and also interfering with a 911 call. Judge: within a short period of time, Resp has managed to get arrested twice. Not swayed because state court judge granted bail. Not a significant flight risk, but does find danger.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Domestic/family violence, dismissed shoplifting charge; pending interference with 911 call charge	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/25/2026 23:15~~	~~2/25/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Fuller (Stewart)~~	~~Saman Hosseinzadeh~~		~~Iran~~	~~Ben Osorio~~	~~Farsi~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Judge: Stated that he always reviews evidence for bond hearings the night before, but lately he is not receiving evidence until the morning of the hearing or sometimes not at all. This is true for evidence from both DHS and respondent attorneys. Sometimes he can see that the evidence is pending, but he cannot open it. He has no time to review evidence the morning of the trial because he has a very full docket every day. Also stated that he is getting no updated guidance on Matter of Hurtado. Attorneys can either move forward with no evidence or request no action and refile.~~ ~~DHS: Cases are getting put on the docket within 48 hours of notice, which does not give anyone enough time to upload all evidence in advance.~~ ~~Attorney: Will take no action and refile. He has to notify the family because he does not speak Farsi.~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Bond redetermination~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Yes~~
~~2/25/2026 23:38~~	~~2/25/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Fuller (Stewart)~~	~~UNK~~		~~UNK~~	~~Shirley Zambrano~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Judge: Stated that he always reviews evidence for bond hearings the night before, but lately he is not receiving evidence until the morning of the hearing or sometimes not at all. This is true for evidence from both DHS and respondent attorneys. Sometimes he can see that the evidence is pending, but he cannot open it. He has no time to review evidence the morning of the trial because he has a very full docket every day. Also stated that he is getting no updated guidance on Matter of Hurtado. Attorneys can either move forward with no evidence or request no action and refile.~~ ~~DHS: Cases are getting put on the docket within 48 hours of notice, which does not give anyone enough time to upload all evidence in advance.~~ ~~Attorney: She submitted the evidence before noon yesterday (2/24/2026) but can see that it still shows as "pending". She will take no action and refile.~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction; did not address it, etc.)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Unknown~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Yes~~
~~2/25/2026 23:51~~	~~2/25/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Fuller (Stewart)~~	~~Name is UNK. A numbers are 221-480-668 and 241-156-541 (see notes)~~		~~UNK~~	~~Eddie Lopez~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Judge: Stated that he always reviews evidence for bond hearings the night before, but lately he is not receiving evidence until the morning of the hearing or sometimes not at all. This is true for evidence from both DHS and respondent attorneys. Sometimes he can see that the evidence is pending, but he cannot open it. He has no time to review evidence the morning of the trial because he has a very full docket every day. Also stated that he is getting no updated guidance on Matter of Hurtado. Attorneys can either move forward with no evidence or request no action and refile.~~ ~~DHS: Cases are getting put on the docket within 48 hours of notice, which does not give anyone enough time to upload all evidence in advance.~~ ~~Attorney: He submitted the evidence on Monday (2/23/2026). Evidence sat in limbo until suddenly being uploaded just 2 minutes ago. Attorneys are not being notified with sufficient time for evidence to be uploaded. Respondent for some reason has 2 different A numbers (provided above but I do not have the name). Other judges accept evidence submitted on the same day, IJ Fuller is the only one who does not. Atty will take no action today and refile.~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction; did not address it, etc.)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Unknown~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Yes~~
2/26/2026 16:20	2/26/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Edwin Sarabio Medina 240-992-109		Mexico	Colby T. Morris	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	Respondent EWI '22. Atty says he has no criminal record, was picked up in an ICE raid at his house and claims Bautista class. DHS says no evidence provided to substantiate Bautista class and claims respondent has a felony cocaine arrest (documentation for that disconnect not discussed). Ultimately no bond granted for following reasons: No evidence respondent would not be a danger/flight risk, prospect of relief is highly speculative and no evidence of Bautista criteria. Respondent has no sponsor, letters of support, no employment history, single, no children. Judge scheduled next MCH for 3/6/26 10 am so atty can compile whatever he can to defend or present relief docs.	No	Mandatory detention due to criminal history	Drug-related	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
~~2/26/2026 16:47~~	~~2/26/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Fuller (Stewart)~~	~~Maria Guadalupe Ramos Lazaro 216 666 777~~		~~Mexico~~	~~Elizabeth Matherne~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Messy case. No bond action today. Respondent has appeared several times before, most recently there was a habeas issue in Jan. where federal court granted EOIR to hold a bond hearing. Hurtado is forcing detention and govt argues 235 holding and opposes continuance. Appears to be unresolved issues surrounding habeas so respondent atty is w/drawing & will file new habeas; therefore no consideration/jurisdiction for bond in today's hearing. Next MCH will be 3/12 10am to allow time to resolve habeas. Atty is ready to set date for fi'on 589 merits at the 3/12 MCH~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~See argument notes above~~	~~Simple possession of marijuana was mentioned but also indicated there had been a defect in the cases so it sounded like that alone should not be a technicality to prevent bond.~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)~~	~~No jurisdiction~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~No~~

IJ Fuller

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/26/2026 17:07	2/26/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Herman Maldonado 221-482-125		UNK	pro se	Spanish, but fluent in English so waived interpretation	Yes or already speaks English	Yes	Govt indicates danger & flight risk. Respondent entered US '02 w/ family, single, no children. Worked as a mechanic. No evidence of relief pursued; no sponsor or letters of support. Resp. suffers from schizophrenia and maintains that is the source of what results in his acting out (as defense) but has led to at least 2 assault convictions ('21 & '22). Appeal would be due by 3/30 if pursued. Bond denied today. Did not indicate he'd be hiring an atty.	No	Mandatory detention due to criminal history	Assault/battery, 12/25 larceny conviction. Multiple arrest, mostly small larceny	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	No	No	No
2/27/2026 9:06:	2/27/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Antonio Gabrado		UNK	William Malaver	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	A little back and forth and then the judge took over: Never encountered border, been here for 20 years, extensive community ties, eligible for 42b relief. Question is whether the court has jurisdiction. "Judges being told one way or another is the furthest thing from the truth." This truth for months and months was granting bond despite the DHS arguments that eventually became Hurtado. After Hurtado, everything changed. After Bautista nothing changed. But now we have to instruct everyone during master calendar hearings that they should check if they are Bautista class members and may be eligible for a bond. Respondent appears to be a class member of Bautista. I believe now that we have jurisdiction based on the Bautista class. Based on that the respondent has met his burden. $5,000 ***essentially, all of a sudden gave into the arguments that someone can be a Bautista class member and therefore be eligible for bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	No	Flight risk mitigated by bond	Cancellation of removal	Granted bond	$5,000	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
2/27/2026 9:09:	2/27/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Shadhari		India	Mengyu Peng	Gujarati	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	Resp: Trying to get another hearing off of initial habeas petition (no particularly clear argument on why that should be allowed). Material change would be: sponsor and filled out asylum application DHS: bond was denied last time, asylum is time barred, speculative political persecution from India. No tax forms from non-family sponsor. Judge: Entered in 2024, had a fixed address. Resp initially had a habeas petition to conduct a hearing, which we did. Denied for flight risk because no sponsor and blank asylum app - flight risk. Concern is no case law saying the habeas justifies unlimited number of hearings. Even if that's okay, this is probably matter of Q Ii. Even if that's not right, this doesn't appear like a material change because everything was available to you at the first hearing. No jurisdiction/material change	No	Sort of both Hurtado and Q Li I think - generally a concern that you can't use a habeas petition to get into court twice	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/4/2026 8:41:3	2/4/2026	Stewart	Ward (Stewart)	Eliana Dos	219516199	UNK	Massiel Silva	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: No problems with jurisdiction because he entered on a visa. Flight risk always a concern with sanctuary cities around the countries. Pending charge of some drug (he was very inarticulate on this point). Driving without a license, felony charge of drug possession. Resp: The drugs were pills prescribed from her doctor, two years ago. The reason we didn't provide a more formal document from the county is that it takes about a year to get a docketed document. We will try to get a letter from the district attorney if that is required to move forward. Resp has been here for 10 years, victim of severe domestic violence, 5-year old U.S. citizen daughter. We're looking at VAWA cancellation (judge isn't sure about the time period). Withdraws. Judge: Reviewed the evidence, doesn't know if he is convinced by a letter from the defense attorney in the pending charges. You can withdraw and refile. Note: Judge Ward was walking her through what she might need to have a more successful petition. It was honestly pretty nice.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license, Drug-related	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Cancellation of removal, VAWA	No action or attorney withdrew	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/4/2026 8:42:5	2/4/2026	Stewart	Ward (Stewart)	Dudley, Dominquez	221-445-735	UNK	Paola Rodriguez	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: No jurisdiction, Hurtado. Resp: Tried the Bautista class argument. Judge: No habeas grant, unfortunately no jurisdiction.	No	Anyone who entered without inspection is an "applicant for admission" under INA 235	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/4/2026 8:48:1	2/4/2026	Stewart	Ward (Stewart)	Daniel, Barron	221-580-944	UNK	Peter Isbister	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: No jurisdiction. Hold respondent to their burden. Resp: Compelling candidate for bond. No criminal history, he has been in the United States for 26 years, head of household, married with two minor children (one of which is the qualifying relative for 42b, the other has DACA). U.S. citizen sponsor with financial information. Lots of letters of support. Judge: Habeas petition, we have jurisdiction. Seems like a good guy, and seems prima facie eligible for cancellation of removal. Strong letters of support, very diligent now in his attempts to stay.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	A few traffic citations, very minor	No	DHS never alleged danger	No	Has avenue for relief or won relief, Flight risk mitigated by bond, Has attorney for immigration case, Family/friends ties to the community and/or fixed address	Cancellation of removal	Granted bond	$8,000	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/10/2026 8:53:	2/10/2026	Stewart	Ward (Stewart)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Unknown	Unknown	No session this morning for IJ Ward (I waited till 8:45 am).	No	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	N/A	No action or attorney withdrew	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/12/2026 8:18:	2/12/2026	Stewart	Ward (Stewart)	The judge did not have bond for the day	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Unknown	Unknown	N/A	Did not address	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	N/A	No action or attorney withdrew	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	

IJ Brown

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
1/22/2026 8:49:	1/22/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Francisco Jadiel Vazquez Cortez	221-502-345	Mexico	Carlos Solormiany	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	Bond redetermination. DHS: Flight risk. Flounting laws of US. Driving violation. Eligible for adjustment through US citizen wife, but hadn't filed I-130. Attorney: Not flight risk or danger. Respondent originally entered legally on visa. He and his wife are trying to gather the funds to file the I-130. He got married before being placed in removal proceedings. He has a wife, one child, and another on the way, and will be motivated to show up at court. Bond will ensure he shows up to court. He is exactly whom bond is designed for. Judge: Respondent overstayed his visa and any relief is speculative because no I-130 has been filed. Flight risk and bond denied.	Did not address	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Wife planning to file I-130	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
1/23/2026 8:49:	1/23/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	UNK	UNK (ending in 621)	UNK	Carlos Martinez	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: no jurisdiction EWI, no habeas Attorney: "case this month mentions this fact of month and we have jurisdiction," no crimes, had TPS at some point, family has TPS Judge: no current class actions are binding, no jurisdiction	No	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	Anyone who entered without inspection is an "applicant for admission" under INA 235	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
1/23/2026 8:54:	1/23/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	UNK (Sophia First name)	UNK (ends in 647)	UNK	Monar Ead	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: no jurisdiction issue, visa overstay. Respondent has a case with a violent crime against a family member. No sponsor proof. Bigger concern of the two is danger Attorney: She is 19 and ACDC was happy for her to be released. Incident was between her and her mother, mother told Judge Kell on the 17th, they were happy to release her, but ICE had a hold which is why were here today. Strong Christian leader, studying architecture, issue with her visa overstay/ she isn't one. She has a pending asylum. Attorney: has not met burden to show not danger	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Domestic/family violence	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~1/26/2026 8:44:~~	~~1/26/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Brown (Stewart)~~	~~n/a~~	~~n/a~~	~~n/a~~	~~n/a~~	~~n/a~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Unknown~~	~~n/a~~	~~Did not address~~	~~n/a - no hearings~~	~~n/a no hearings~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~n/a no hearings~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~n/a no hearings~~	~~N/A~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~n/a no hearings~~	~~No~~	~~No~~	
1/27/2026 8:35:	1/27/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Odira Chavez Lopez	N/A	N/A	Allyson Russel-Blair	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	Stated Cortado not good law. Asked that court take jurisdiction and hear bond motion.	No	lacked jurisdiction	None	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	N/A	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
1/30/2026 8:46:	1/30/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Chamberlin	962	UNK	Adams	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	conceded JX to determine bond Government - no bond, request hold responded to burden because respondent moved to another state without prior approval and missed his required biometric check in Respondent - hasn't moved and same house since this case, has not left state, runs a business in ATL, married to US citizen (lack of flight risk), no criminal history, reasonable bond requested to afford release, $5k requested	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	No criminal history at all, including no arrests	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	N/A	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
1/30/2026 8:53:	1/30/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Garcia	816	UNK	Rosenbluth	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	Conceded JX DHS - no bond and hold respondent to burden, driving without license convictions and charges Attorney - been here years, 3 US citizen kids, all fees and filing fees paid for 42b, not a flight risk, has paid taxes for 2019-2023	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license	No	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	Yes	Unknown	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~1/30/2026 9:06:~~	~~1/30/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Brown (Stewart)~~	~~Victor Pastor Ezquol~~	~~651~~	~~UNK~~	~~Cochran~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~conceded to JX DHS - no bond due to criminal history and flight risk, arrest with battery Attorney - asked to take no action because was unaware of the arrest and wife issues~~	~~Yes~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~Assault/battery~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~N/A~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
~~1/30/2026 9:10:~~	~~1/30/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Brown (Stewart)~~	~~Omar Martinez~~	~~902~~	~~UNK~~	~~Diaz~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~DHS - no objection to below Attorney - asked for more time to prepare for bond, was just told of hearing today, wants to file bond documents~~	~~Did not address~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~N/A~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
1/30/2026 9:18:	1/30/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Mohammad Guiriadi	655	UNK	Weinstock	French	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	JX conceded DHS - no bond, hold respondent to burden, recently entered US Attorney - recently entered in last 3 years, habeas court found entitled to bond, employer and meets all 7 factor analysis (fixed address, employment history, resident), history of compliance with reporting requirements	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Unknown	No	Judge did not specify	Yes	Unknown	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/6/2026 9:35:1	2/6/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	UNK	135	Venezuela	Matt Boles	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	Yes	DHS: Notes a habeas petition is pending. Asserts the respondent has failed to show that aggravated assault and possession of a weapon charges do not establish danger to the community. References events prior to the Laken Riley Act. Notes there is no evidence of a sponsor in the record. Attorney: States regarding the offense date, the respondent was originally charged but was never incarcerated. Reports the case was remanded in December 2025, and there are now new charges-two pending charges of assault-related to the manner of apprehension. Notes the respondent had TPS, affirmatively applied for asylum, and has proof of employment. Acknowledges two pending charges but states they have been reduced. Submits nine letters of recommendation describing the respondent as someone who does not drink and works, and notes support from organizations including the Freedom Fund. Judge's Ruling: Denies bond, finding the respondent has not shown he is not a danger to the community, even though the charges have been reduced.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Assault/battery, Possession of a weapon	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	

IJ Brown

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/6/2026 9:46:3	2/6/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Edgar Hernandez Hernandez	328	UNK	Julio Valentine	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS : Notes a habeas order and does not dispute jurisdiction. Cites driving twice without a license and asserts the respondent has established a pattern. Notes the respondent does not have a license and references his criminal history. In addition to unlawful driving habits, asserts the respondent has no intention of following the laws. Attorney: Notes no offenses to person or property, only minor traffic offenses. Regarding flight risk equities, states the respondent lives in the same household as a U.S. citizen cousin who can personally transport him. Notes the respondent filed Form I-589 with USCIS and that the matters the government is referring to are pending. States the respondent fully desires to resolve the traffic violations. Emphasizes strong family and financial support and no serious offenses. Notes the respondent came to the United States as an unaccompanied minor in or around January 2023. Respondent made a statement reading a letter acknowledging he made a mistake. Judge: Denies bond, noting the respondent is a significant flight risk, citing his relatively recent entry into the United States and propensity to disobey the laws of the United States.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license, Speeding	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/6/2026 9:53:3	2/6/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Jorge Gabriella Norte	937	UNK	Shennia Laurence	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Concedes jurisdiction. Asserts the respondent has failed to show he is not a substantial flight risk, citing limited ties to the community. Attorney: Notes the respondent timely filed Form I-589, has complied with all ICE requirements, filed his taxes, and has proof of employment verification. States the respondent has continued to attend all ICE check-ins and was paroled into the United States. Argues the respondent is not a flight risk. Judge: Finds the respondent is a flight risk, that relief is speculative, and that the respondent has not proven he is not a flight risk.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Unknown	No	Unknown	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/6/2026 9:58:0~~	~~2/6/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Brown (Stewart)~~	~~Eduardo Hernandez Lopez~~	~~259~~	~~UNK~~	~~Eszter Bardi~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~DHS: Concedes jurisdiction. Asserts the respondent has failed to show he is not a danger to the community or a flight risk, citing numerous instances of driving without a license. States the concerns cannot be mitigated by the bond amount.~~ ~~Attorney: Files a motion to withdraw the bond request, noting less than 24 hours has passed since receiving information and that counsel is waiting on the respondent's tax returns. Requests the motion be withdrawn with intent to refile. Asks the court to take no action today.~~ ~~Judge: States the case will not be heard today.~~	~~Yes~~	~~Withdrawal of bond hearing~~	~~Withdrawal of bond hearing~~	~~No~~	~~Withdrawal of bond hearing~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk); Withdrawal of bond hearing~~	~~Withdrawal of bond hearing~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
2/6/2026 10:14:	2/6/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Lydia Niva	UNK	UNK	Ms. Cole	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: References manufacturing fraudulent ID and an alternative conviction for fraudulent ID. States DHS is not aware of a sponsor. Attorney: Moves to withdraw the motion for bond hearing, noting there are several documents missing and an email received from the court saying that the documents have not been submitted, and that counsel is not in a position to move forward. Judge: Notes there are two filings before the court. DHS Follow-Up: States evidence has been filed and notes a short turnaround. Reports the respondent requested a bond hearing with a habeas petition and references the notices for the habeas and uploading documents to DHS. Judge: Notes supporting documents were filed. Finds the respondent has a conviction for possession or manufacturing of fraudulent identification documents and concludes there is a significant flight risk.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Possession or manufacturing of fraudulent identification	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/6/2026 10:22:	2/6/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Julio Francisco	404	Mexico	Karla Verma	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Concedes jurisdiction given the habeas petition. Asserts the respondent has failed to show he is not a danger to the community, citing misuse of passport and false statements to the government. Notes the respondent was removed in September after entering without inspection and argues there is no incentive to appear for future hearings. Asserts bond should be denied. Attorney: States the respondent came to the United States over 10 years ago and is not a flight risk. Notes that Respondent is the father to a minor U.S. citizen and that the respondent has already atoned for the crime. Argues he is statutorily eligible for bond, is not a flight risk, and is very well respected in the church community. Respondent: Explains that one of the reasons for returning is that his father lost his vision and there is no support from anyone else. References Pastor Jason as a witness. States that was before, and he was just brought here and is just coming back to the United States. Expresses concern about his father, noting he has eye appointments. Judge: Notes the court must look at criminal history, but the law requires looking at everything. Cites false representation of U.S. citizenship and misuse of passport. Appeal rights reserved; appeal date March 9, 2026.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Misuse of passport and false statements to the government.	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/10/2026 9:00:	2/10/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	RICARDO ALLEN BAEZ	220-668-448	UNK	Daniel Ortiz	spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: habeas granted, case is on appeal, already been ordered removed, large flight risk, relief is extremely speculative Attorney: that would be indefinite detention, did nothing to breach his original terms, has been very vigilant about timely submissions, has children in the United States so community ties, numerous letters, no flight risk because he wants to be with his family. Judge: denied, hasn't met burden to show not a flight risk	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/10/2026 9:03:~~	~~2/10/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Brown (Stewart)~~	~~Yael Gomez *~~	~~206-947-676~~	~~UNK~~	~~Jessica Galmes~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~DHS: habeas granted, lacking community ties evidence, lease provided expired in 2020, no financials to show he can support himself, no taxes~~ ~~Attorney: has EAD, lease documents have been renewed and is current. Filed evidence of a sponsor but hasn't been accepted. 54 years old, been here since 2000, has a pending 42b that has been pending since 2019. Active member of his church, 3 USC children, bond can mitigate any possible flight risk~~ ~~Judge: denied, relief is speculative (proceeded to allow withdrawal)~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~No~~	~~DHS never alleged danger~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Cancellation of removal~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	

IJ Brown

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/10/2026 9:05:	2/10/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	UNK	245313931	UNK	pro se	spanish	Yes or already speaks English	No	DHS: not a habeas, regular bond request, no jurisdiction under Hurtado Judge: no jurisdiction	No	Anyone who entered without inspection is an "applicant for admission" under INA 235	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	No	No	
~~2/11/2026 8:23:~~	~~2/11/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Brown (Stewart)~~	~~UNK~~	~~UNK~~	~~UNK~~	~~UNK~~	~~UNK~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Unknown~~	~~The Judge did not appear~~	~~Did not address~~	~~The Judge did not appear~~	~~No appearances~~	~~No~~	~~No appearances~~	~~No~~	~~No appearances~~	~~No appearances~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~No appearances~~	~~No~~	~~No~~	
2/12/2026 8:59:	2/12/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Arturo Garcia Ramon	203-611-399	Guatemala	Peter Isbister	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Flit risk. Respondent is a 31-year-old who entered without authorization in 2020 and is not 42b-eligible. Respondent has not established the requisite presence in the US and none of the three children he claims as his own, including one US citizen, have his name listed on the birth certificates. Arrested for driving without a license in GA in 2025, and all supporting letters issued from Tennessee, supporting flight risk assertion. Attorney: Respondent's pending 589 (not confirmed) and retention of counsel indicates his respect for the court proceedings, reducing flight risk. Respondent submitted a support letter from the pastor at the church he attends, who married Respondent and his wife. Judge: Flight risk not mitigated by bond due to recent entry and speculative supporting evidence. Bond denied.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license	No	Judge did not specify	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/12/2026 9:09:~~	~~2/12/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Brown (Stewart)~~	~~Tito Farson Perez-Esteban~~	~~213-356-137~~	~~Guatemala~~	~~Mr. Alexandros Cornejo~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~DHS: Flight risk, Respondent not eligible for 42b and will likely be time-barred from an asylum claim. Arrested for driving while license suspended/revoked. Sponsor letters are from another state and while there is a pending I-130, Respondent has not been admitted to the US. Attorney: Requested continuance, which was denied, in advance of masters hearing scheduled for 2/18. Counsel withdraws bond request with the intent to re-file.~~	~~Yes~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~Driving without a license~~	~~No~~	~~Judge did not specify~~	~~Yes~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~Adjustment of status~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
2/12/2026 9:20:	2/12/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	UNK Montoya	213-598-109	UNK	Ashley Heuman Deadwyler	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent was apprehended by border patrol after a 235b illegal entry at southern border in 2021. Not eligible for bond due to unauthorized entry into the US. Subject to mandatory detention under the Laken Riley Act for shoplifting arrest. Attorney: Respondent requested asylum and was granted a TPS authorization. Respondent had defense counsel in shoplifting arest and made a disorderly conduct plea which means he is not precluded from bond under the Laken Riley Act. Judge: No evidence of lawful entry on file. Bond denied for lack of jurisdiction.	No	Anyone who entered without inspection is an "applicant for admission" under INA 235	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Adjustment of status	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/18/2026 9:09:	2/18/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Alexandria (last name UNK) - 243141701		Venezuela	Ashley Deadwyler Heuman	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Habeas granted, danger and flight risk. Simple assault charge in 2024, pending driving without license and speeding, recent arrival, minimal ties. I589 is speculative because centered around maduro regime, unclear where she would live if released Attorney: not a danger or flight risk. She is a victim of DV, no disqualifying convictions, her pending charges are not sufficient to show danger. I589 was filed in 2019 without counsel so that's why there may be some grammar issues. Has followed legal process entire time here, applied for TPS and obtained. Judge: denied, not met burden to show not a significant flight risk, relief is speculative	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Assault/battery, Driving without a license, Speeding	No	Judge did not specify	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/18/2026 9:12:	2/18/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Maria (last name UNK)		Guatemala	Carlos Martinez	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: mandatory detention under laken riley act (shoplifting) Attorney: indigenous woman who did not actually shoplift, paid for everything just a big misunderstanding. USC children with special needs, tons of letters of support, taxes, professor and housewife and bookkeeper to husbands landscaping business. Had EAD 2023-2025. I 589 filed in 2019, pending T visa. Judge: shoplifting conviction so no jurisdiction	No	Mandatory detention due to criminal history	Theft/robbery	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589), T-visa (for trafficking survivors)	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/18/2026 9:14:	2/18/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Fransisco Trujillo		UNK	Jorge Gavilanes	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: habeas granted, both danger and flight. Danger- arrested for driving without license 3x. flight- respondents daughter offers to pay bond but makes no further assurances to keep him coming to court. Has been working without authorization, no taxes. Attorney: flight risk- been here 28 years, owns property, has 4 USC citizen (2 under 21), has a cancellation of removal case, best interest to continue to appear. Strong ties to community. Danger- been here almost 30 years and only LEO encounters are driving without license. Judge: flight risk burden not met, not a danger. Relief is speculative, bond denied.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license	No	Pending charges are minor	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Cancellation of removal	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/18/2026 9:15:~~	~~2/18/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Brown (Stewart)~~	~~UNK~~		~~UNK~~	~~Uriel Delgado~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A attorney withdrew bond request~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
2/19/2026 9:09:	2/19/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Tyriq wahlb		UNK	Tamara Murray	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: no significant changed circumstances from bond denial 2 weeks ago Attorney: mom is suffering sever depression (worsened) since her sons are detained, high blood pressure, no criminal record, no flight risk, mom has green card and will petition for them Judge: denied, flight risk	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Adjustment of status (I-130, I-485)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
2/19/2026 9:11:	2/19/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Youssef Thomas Wahib		UNK	Tamara Murray	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	Dhs: no changed circumstances just like in his brothers case, last bond denial was 2 weeks ago Attorney: he has medical issue (gallstones) he needs an operation for, not a flight risk, would be living with his mom, mom holds green card and will petition for him Judge:"I am not a doctor and don't get involved with medical care," bond denied, not a change in circumstances.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license	No	DHS never alleged danger, Charges have been dismissed	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Adjustment of status (I-130, I-485)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
2/19/2026 9:13:	2/19/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Shaniqua Thompson		Bahamas	Phyllis Powers	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: pattern of disregarding immigration laws, visa overstay, driving without license, significant flight risk, relief is speculative, clearly no asylum case or cancellation of removal Attorney: she has a USC child, been married 5 years and I130 will likely be approved, they couldn't file papers due to finances, I am pro bono, she is a stay at home mom with 3 kids. No reckless immigration history, she entered in 2012 and left before her visa expired, with this current visa overstay she had a baby and had to make a choice for her child. Judge: denied, hasn't met burden to show not a significant flight risk, relatively new arrival (6 years)	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license	No	DHS never alleged danger, Charges have been dismissed	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Adjustment of status (I-130, I-485)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
2/19/2026 9:47:	2/11/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Marjarita Alverez		Honduras	Kazuma Sonoda	Spanish	Unknown	N/A (has attorney)	This is a hearing to redetermine bond. DHS: flight risk because has only been in US since 2022 and did not have consistent work (car wash); collateral arrest. Attorney: Not a flight risk; has US sponsor; worked at car wash and other seasonal work; lives with sister and two nieces; sought fear-based relief; never arrested. Judge: Denied bond; did not meet burden to show not a flight risk; relatively recent to US; tenuous ties to US.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	Judge did not specify, No express finding, but noted a collateral group arrest in car.	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Unknown

IJ Brown

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/19/2026 9:59:	2/11/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Orphedo Mejia Ollova		UNK	Pro se - but attorney appeared later saying her office never received notice of this hearing (Rokhaya Niang)	UNK	Unknown	Unknown	DHS: has pending misdemeanor charge in NC and prior arrest for consuming alcohol under 21 & driving with expired registration & traffic infractions; entered only in 2021 so flight risk. Pro se: asked to speak with lawyer. Judge: bond denied; not met burden to show not a flight risk due to recent entry in country in 2021; only have aunt and uncle so ties to community are attenuated; no confirmed fear of returning.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license, DUI, consuming alcohol under age of 21	No	Judge did not specify	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	No	No	Yes
2/20/2026 9:10:	2/20/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Eric Armando Basera-Basera		UNK	Stephanie Gomez	spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: habeas granted, failed to show not a flight risk/danger, i589 receipt but not actually filed, no evidence of EAD or valid drivers license, failure to maintain lane so arrested, Attorney: incident report shows he did not attempt to evade, there was a language barrier, no indication of resistance, ¾ charges dismissed, consistently shows up to immigration appointments, no danger or ongoing risk. Stable employment, housing, community ties, filed 2024 and intended to file for 2025, taken into custody at immigration appointment, asylum claim was properly filed with USCIS. Judge: denied, has not met burden to show not a flight risk, recent entrance	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	failure to maintain lane	No	Judge did not specify	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Yes
2/20/2026 9:12:	2/20/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Victorina Hernandez		UNK	Jeffery Foote	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: habeas granted, flight risk due to speculative relief, 42b relief is extremely speculative because hardship is allergies that require Zyrtec. Attorney: been here 20 years, church leader, 42b is strong, prima facia eligible, has a permanent fixed address, has consistently filed taxes, no flight risk Judge: denied finding has not met burden to show no flight risk, relief is speculative	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Yes
2/20/2026 9:14:	2/20/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Christopher De Jesus Rodriguez		UNK	Yesibel Falcon	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: (habeas) nothing to show employment history or EAD, sponsor only makes 19k, unclear how he could support him Attorney: sponsor does have a steady income, has already filed i589 and waiting on EAD so wont need sponsor soon, wife is pregnant so has every reason to show up. USC child and family ties Judge: denied, hasn't met burden to show not a flight risk, recent entry in 2021, relief speculative	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Adjustment of status (I-130, I-485)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Yes
2/20/2026 9:17:	2/20/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Armando Cruz		UNK	Mo Idlibby	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: respondent has not shown any material change in circumstances, t visa is pending, still a flight risk because relief is speculative and will be pending for an unknown period. Attorney: last court was about to grant a bond and stated for record and said the only reason they did not was a sister Judge ordered a removal same day, that is sue has been cured, order of removal is stayed, only reason hes in custody is because DHS made material misrepresentations of material fact. Prior denial had nothing to do with his T visa through USCIS. 2 USC children, tons of evidence of property, USC sponsor, stable fixed address. Clarified that a stay of removal is not a change of circumstances, Judge says yes. Judge: It is unfortunate that I have to do bond when other Judge did case in chief, does have bonified recognition, but case is still in same place, visa is not approved, still has a pending removal order, this court maintains that he is still a flight risk so I will not find changed circumstances. Will never dissuade you from filing bond, but this is your 3-4th bond hearing. "I don't have time to go back and forth, appeal it if you do not agree"	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Unknown	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	no changed circumstances, not met burden	T-visa (for trafficking survivors)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Yes
2/24/2026 9:31:	2/24/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Maria Rosa		Mexico	Akindiji Oloko	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: No jurisdiction, because of Hurtado and 5th Circuit case upholding Hurtado. Alternatively, Resp. hasn't carried burden of showing no flight risk. Resp. misrepresented she had no criminal history, but was arrested and convicted of shoplifting. Has been present in the US for many years and made no application to adjust status. She has been working without authorization. She submitted tax returns for 3 years, but utilized 2 different SSNs on the tax returns. Relief from removal is unlikely because, she alleges only unspecified threats, and she is time-barred from seeking asylum. Resp: There is jurisdiction under the MDGa standing order requiring bond hearings for people who entered without inspection. She is not a flight risk, as she has been in the country for 28 years, has purchased a home and has a stable US address, and has 2 US citizens (ages 18 and 21). She has a good employment history and works for Emory as a janitor. Has letters of recommendation from the community. Her criminal history is over 25 years ago. She drove without a license because she has to support her family. The tax ID numbers were different because they are assigned by the IRS and sometimes the IRS requires a changed number. She has had no other immigration problems. No history of trying to flee. As to assylum (application not yet filed), she and her Mexican born son who now lives here with her have received recent threats from Mexico. The assylum application will be filed shortly. Court: Finds no jurisdiction under Hurtado. Alternatively, she is a flight risk and relief is speculative. Concerned about her using 2 separate SSNs. Resp. reserved appeal.	No	Anyone who entered without inspection is an "applicant for admission" under INA 235 (Matter of Yajure Hurtado)	Driving without a license, Shoplifting	No	Danger to property or community not addressed	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
2/25/2026 9:01:	2/25/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Santos Jaques		UNK	Rokhaya Niang	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: habeas granted, flight risk, proposed sponsor is someone who admits she does not know respondent, no tax returns, pay stubs, etc. Attorney: new sponsor filed in our new evidence, who showed her income and ability to support respondent and make sure he attends all hearings. Strong and verifiable ties to the United States, only 19 so lack of spouse and children is consistent with age. Stable employment. Has clear way to LPR through his SIJS. Entered the United States in 2021. Judge: denied, has not met burden, relative recent entry, relief is speculative.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Special Immigrant Juvenile Status (SIJS)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Yes
2/25/2026 9:03:	2/25/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Petro Avilo Velmontes		UNK	J Britt Thames	spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: habeas granted, clear danger (3-4 DWL, marijuana, pending charges for battery and false imprisonment) Attorney: the record when looked at beyond the surface, all of those charges have been dismissed except the pending charge which brought him here today. For the marijuana, dismissed because he was driving and it was found in back and everyone in car was charged until they found whos it was. For assault, his wife did not intentionally call 911 and has wrote a letter of support that shows no physical altercation. Further, he entered in 2000 at 6 years old, strong ties to community, married to USC, 2 USC children, statutorily eligible for cancellation. Judge: denied- with those pending charges, hasn't met burden to show no danger	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Assault/battery, Domestic/family violence, Driving without a license, Drug-related	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Adjustment of status (I-130, I-485), Cancellation of removal	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Yes

IJ Brown

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/25/2026 9:05:	2/25/2026	Stewart	Brown (Stewart)	Trinidad Mehia		UNK	Peter Tadeo	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	Withdrawn for more time to gather evidence	Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	N/A	No action or attorney withdrew	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Unknown

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/2/2026 8:51:2	1/30/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Alexis Jose Ardenard Barbosa	246-141-199	UNK	Mr. Elston	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	Attorney: Need to delay proceeding because he needs more time to prepare. Judge: Granted, moves date.	No	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	N/A	No action or attorney withdrew	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/2/2026 9:01:1	2/2/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Elisna De Santos	215-516-199	Brazil	Massiel Silva	Portugese	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	Attorney: Requests continuance for attorney prep. Judge: Granted	Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	No action or attorney withdrew	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/3/2026 10:43:	2/3/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	UNK	213384285	UNK	Paige Stewart	UNK	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	***DHS lawyer didn't actually show up, then did and had technical issues, so sort-of was able to communicate thru calling in. No jurisdiction, the NTA reflects the respondent did present himself at a point of entry and was paroled but that appears to have been revoked by the act of him being detained and he would revert back to his original status	No	Anyone who entered without inspection is an "applicant for admission" under INA 235	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/3/2026 10:45:	2/3/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Argelia Garcia Viatorro	235488714	UNK	Daniela Fink	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: flight risk. No info for family ties or employment, no relief pending Resp: Has habeus, so no problems with jurisdiction. filed taxes since 2006, worked at a nursery for the past 20 years, has a pending 42b (judge was trying to get more info on that because she doesn't think that's a good argument) Judge finds there is little reason to believe she will get the 42b even though the attorney was in the process of getting the evidence, and since that relief is so speculative Denied bond	No	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Cancellation of removal	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/3/2026 10:50:	2/3/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Rafael Marcia	254054424	UNK	Allison Lukanich	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Flight risk, numerous traffic violations, failed to update his address with the DMV. Doesn't have the ten years of continuous physical presence for cancellation of removal. Resp: Not a flight risk. He filed an application for a T visa, he was a victim of human trafficking. Sole caregiver of his son. Has a relative sponsor (he was the witness at her wedding, niece by marriage), evidence of financials for her. Judge: Very speculative relief, especially since he waited to file the T visa for 9 years. Is the kid an adult? Sponsor doesn't have special ties to the U.S. Denied bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Other traffic	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	T visa	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/5/2026 8:58:3	2/5/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Carvahall Cardegnas	XXX-XXX-380	Columbia	Jessica Calmes	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: No jurisdiction issues, habeas order. She poses a danger of harm to personal property because she was expelled from Mexico. She said she presented herself to immigration authorities but she was encountered at the border. There is also a flight risk. Resp: (Judge swore in resp to answer questions about why she was expelled from Mexico. Still a little unclear why she was expelled from Mexico). She is applying for an asylum and shows a viable case with past persecution and fear of future persecution on a protected status. Sponsor provided. Nothing to show there is a danger. Judge: No fixed address, only here since March of 2023. No family ties to the United States. She does have employment authorization. Sponsor is unclear about how she knows her but sponsorship info indicates the family income is sufficient. Evidence is not sufficient to establish that she is not a specific risk of flight. Denied.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	No charges	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/5/2026 9:00:0	2/5/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Rupert, Hisiana-Boques	221-480-191	UNK	Nancy Powell	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Deny bond. Pending charges of larceny make them a risk of danger to personal property and flight risk. (After rap sheet doesn't count). No jurisdiction because of Hurtado. Still a flight risk. Resp: No violent or criminal history. In detention because of traffic stop. Married to a U.S. citizen child and a medically dependent U.S. child. Pending 42(b) application. Judge: Department did not file the rap sheet so cannot rely on that. Visa overstay so Hurtado is not an issue. Not a danger. Been in the U.S. since 2011. Granted bond. $10,000.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	Judge did not specify	No	Has avenue for relief or won relief, Flight risk mitigated by bond, Family/friends ties to the community and/or fixed address	Cancellation of removal	Granted bond	$10,000	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/5/2026 9:02:0	2/5/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Sergio Alexander Morales Meriquin	240-367-796	UNK	Alejandro Roque	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Flight risk because no dependents or relief. Resp: Married to U.S. citizen can pursue adjustment of status. Also has U.S. citizen child with another lady, more ties. Judge: Pending assault charge. Denied bond because danger to community/partner.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Assault/battery	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/5/2026 13:50:	2/5/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	E Rodriguez	702	Not stated	Mario Pereira	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	Bond hearing deferred.	Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date	Evidence by respondent filed too late for court or DHS to review.	Did not get to this in case.	No	Judge did not rule on this.	No	Not addressed.	Unknown	No action or attorney withdrew	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/5/2026 14:07:	2/5/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Fuentes Galdames	209339270	Honduras	Peter Isbister	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	1. DHS opposes bond because he is a "flight risk" but had no particular evidence of this but she said she did not review all of the evidence. 2. Respondent's counsel says that this risk is not particularized. He has been here since 2016, timely asylum application in 2017, it was not heard (likely caught up in COVID); not caught up in any ACA arrangements for 2019, multiple US citizen children, 6 letters of support from co-workers, had 589 work permit. One of the places he was working is a naval facility and he had to go through security check for military. Picked up while duly reporting to ICE for pending 589. Attorney's position that bond should be $4000 instead of $5000. Has permanent address. He is married. Asylum is gang related case and he has a past persecution argument. 3. Judge says he would not be eligible for 42b relief (as indicated by his attorney) because he was served by an NTA, although notice was stated as date to be set, so depends how quickly. Timely filed 589, but speculative. Judge said he has significant ties to US (kids), good moral character letters, no criminal record indication, government made no argument that he violent to a person or property, has employment authorization and history, has been employed (attorney does not know whether he has been paying taxes). Judge said relief is speculative in this case. LPR sponsor, not a direct family member. Bond is high, at $12,500 and respondent is subject to electronic monitoring. Appeal was waived moving forward. Department reserved right to appeal.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	No	Family/friends ties to the community and/or fixed address	Asylum application is pending	Granted bond	$12,500	N/A (has attorney)	No	
2/6/2026 8:26:5	2/6/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Hong Li Binh	226-098-214	China	J. Britt Thames	Mandarin	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent does not have significant ties to the community and therefore amounts to a flight risk. Attorney: Respondent is from China and entered in 2024; he has filed statements regarding his fear of persecution in China for his Christian beliefs; he has been gainfully employed while in the US; he has provided evidence of multiple sponsors in the US; he did not evade ICE, he complied, reporting himself after learning of his obligation to report; this is a true asylum claim that meets all the criteria. Judge: Respondent has not met his burden to show that he is not a risk of flight; he very recently entered in the United States; his relief is very speculative.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/6/2026 8:42:4	2/6/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	UNK	221-480-512	UNK	Jorge Gavilanes	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	(I missed most of the attorney arguments due to technical difficulties with Webex, but I heard the Judge's holding). Judge: Flight risk, denies bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Unknown	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	

IJ Harness

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/6/2026 9:00:2	2/6/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Victor Pasque	219-994-651	UNK	Johanna Cochran	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent constitutes both a danger to the community (arrested four times for violent crimes and domestic violence) and a flight risk. Attorney: The arrest reports were all false and the respondent has significant ties to the community. Judge: Respondent has not met burden to show that he is not a danger to the community, denies bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Assault/battery, Domestic/family violence	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/6/2026 9:13:5	2/6/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Hahmed Denuze Gorum	UNK	UNK	Kazuma Sonoda	UNK	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Immigration violations and failure to comply with voluntary departures create a flight risk. Attorney: There is an 18-year-old qualifying relative and we have filed for 42B relief. Judge: Respondent has been in the United States for some time, but he does not have significant ties to the community sufficient to overcome his flight risk, denies bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Cancellation of removal	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/10/2026 8:41:	2/10/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	UNK	241-101-959	UNK	Yesibel Falcon	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Flight risk. No ties to community. Proof of employment but only for 2011-2013. Address for sister (sponsor) is same address as the respondent in the past before he was homeless, so not promising. Resp: Been here since 2009. He has a filed 589, and is dedicated to the process. His sister is a U.S. citizen. Judge: Nothing in the record to say that he owns any property (no)? No relief that has been identified other than the 589 scheduled for a merits hearing this afternoon. In terms of current employment there is nothing in the record. His relief is very very speculative, he's been in U.S. for 15 years, I'm not litigating the 589 at this point but I have to consider the speculativeness of the relief, the motions filed include one based upon agreements with two different countries so there are potentially two he could be removed to besides his own country, but there is another motion saying it was not timely filed and he would have to reach the higher burden under CAT, and DHS is also arguing that the application on its own does not raise specific facts. No evidence submitted says how the resp has fear or would be unable to return to his home country, or the other two countries in the motion. Denied bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/17/2026 8:51:~~	~~2/17/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Harness (Stewart)~~	~~UNK~~		~~UNK~~	~~Arturo R. Rios~~	~~Gujarati~~	~~Waives~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Had a whole speech at the beginning about how she could not guarantee she had seen anything uploaded past close of business. Says she typically allows parties to submit late-filed evidence but now she has not had the opportunity to review it. Granted, it was 217 pages long.~~ ~~Gives the option to move forward or withdraw. Withdraws.~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~N/A~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
2/17/2026 8:53:	2/17/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Lucky Lucky		UNK	Johnathan Pearson	Hindi	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Court does not have jurisdiction pursuant to Matter of Hurtado. Resp: Argued class member of Maldonado Bautista. Judge: No - does not apply nationwide. Not even sure he's an eligible class member.	No	Anyone who entered without inspection is an "applicant for admission" under INA 235 (Matter of Yajure Hurtado)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	N/A	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/19/2026 16:3~~	~~2/19/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Harness (Stewart)~~	~~UNK~~		~~UNK~~	~~pro se~~	~~UNK~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Unknown~~	~~I logged on a little early my slot today, February 19 just before 1pm. They were finishing up a case, and then the judge set a 30 min recess starting at 1pm and announced that the afternoon sessions would be closed so observers would not be allowed in. It wasn't clear to me why that was. All I could determine was that it seemed to be a situation where they were revisiting a case from earlier.~~ ~~The judge dismissed the Spanish language interpreter at that time, and did mention that the two cases in the afternoon were pro se. She also mentioned that there would be witnesses present.~~	~~Did not address~~	~~See notes~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~see notes~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~see notes~~	~~see notes~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~No~~	~~No~~	~~Unknown~~
2/20/2026 8:37:	2/20/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Emanuela Ado		UNK	Courtney Han	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent has only recently moved to Georgia; has been arrested for giving false information to the police; she is a flight risk. Attorney: We are in agreement there is not a jurisdictional issue and DHS is not arguing danger; she is a flight risk but it is mitigatable (she has a community). Judge: Have jurisdiction, no evidence of danger, respondent is a significant risk of flight (she has pending charges against her).	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license, Giving false name to police officer	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
~~2/20/2026 8:51:~~	~~2/18/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Harness (Stewart)~~	~~N/A~~		~~N/A~~	~~N/A~~	~~N/A~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A~~	~~Did not address~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~N/A~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Unknown~~
2/20/2026 8:58:	2/20/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Vilandia Cirate		UNK	Cecilia Sam	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Minor ties to the community and highly speculative nature of relief. Attorney: Not a danger to the community (minor traffic citations); he has a pending asylum application; he has custody of his child and has a U.S.-citizen sponsor. Judge: Respondent's young child in U.S. but no path to relief; only been here 2 years, overstayed J1 VISA program, he is a flight risk, denies bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Speeding	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
2/20/2026 9:23:	2/20/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Freddy Alexander Lopez Gomez		Guatemala	Shaudi Khansari	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent is a flight risk; arrested for driving without a license three time in the past 20 years. Judge: That arrest information is not in the record, opposing counsel what would you like to do? Attorney: We object to filing them in the middle of the bond hearing. DHS: My apologies, that is the wrong file that I had pulled up--all of that argument was for another bond applicant. Judge: Please put on the record what you would like for this respondent. DHS: No information showing that this person is not a flight risk. Attorney: he has been living in the United States for over 10 years; he has a fixed permanent address; he is a fixed member of his community, churchgoing individual, had a steady job; he is eligible for relief; no actual arrest history in Georgia; no indication that he would pose a danger. Judge: No real relief has been identified in the record, nothing indicating a fear to return back to his home country; does not have significant family ties; denies bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
~~2/20/2026 9:34:~~	~~2/20/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Harness (Stewart)~~	~~Alberto Juan Tocora Rafael~~		~~UNK~~	~~Alyson Russell Blair~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~DHS: We have an I-213 that we would like to file on the record. Judge: Opposing counsel, would you like to withdraw without prejudice? Attorney: May I review it here before I am able to do that? Judge: Yes, I will pass this case until later this morning to give you time to review.~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Yes~~
2/23/2026 8:33:	2/23/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	UNK - 002		UNK	Ana Jacob Lopes	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS - opposes bond for danger and flight risk. charged with driving without license and registration - this is criminal and public safety concern. has a sponsor, but annual income stated was $12.5k, but the IRS tax returns show gross $22k which is below poverty, so not a sufficient or reliable sponsor to mitigate flight risk. respondent is a visa overstay. Respondent - no crimes other than the traffic violation, family ties to US and two US citizen children that are babies, eligible for asylum and has sponsor Judge - record shows that she paid someone to bring her children here illegally, which shows danger	No	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license, Speeding	No	crimes are small are not history of crime	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	N/A	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/24/2026 8:46:	2/24/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Jose De Nova		UNK	Jessica Calmes	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Flight risk. No significant ties. Resp: Entered in 1991, been here for well over half his life. Stable address. Lives there with his 21 year old US citizen son, and two month old baby. We submitted his business card. Works at a window cleaner and has been there for nearly 30 years. Owners wrote letters. He is prima facie eligible for cancellation of removal. First arrest in his 35 years after being pulled over for a broken taillight. Been paying taxes. Judge: Has to do all the factors in Guerra. Nothing to indicate he's a danger. Move directly to flight risk. It does appear he has been here for a while. Letter doesn't indicate that they are actually his employers. No indication of employment authorization. No clue if his son has enough money here. Notes obviously he has been working because he is paying taxes on his earnings. Without a 42b having been filed and without anything other than his child being premature, that relief is too speculative. Bond denied.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Cancellation of removal	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Yes
2/24/2026 8:50:	2/24/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Joel Marido Gomez		UNK	Jessica Calmes	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Flight risk Resp: 54, entered in 2000, 42b pending, current valid employment authorization, three US citizen children, evidence to show his prima facie 42b case, lease given. Judge: Not a flight risk because of work auth and other factors. 8k bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	No	DHS never alleged danger	No	Family/friends ties to the community and/or fixed address	Cancellation of removal	Granted bond	$8k	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Unknown
2/26/2026 8:33:	2/26/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Gabriella: 221-485-218		UNK	Anna Jacob Lopes	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	#1: DHS: Flight risk; illegal presence in US; no proof of employment or tax returns; discrepancies related to W-2 income from sponsor and tax return; no evidence of income submitted for 2025; no US family ties. Attorney: Has work permit, has a partner in US, has a sponsor, presence is not unlawful because she has pending application for asylum, even if flight risk can be mitigated by a bond; DUI, but respondent claims not intoxicated, dismissed by DA; no criminal history. Judge: Flight risk, while there is sponsor, no significant family ties, only in US for 3 years and no record of spouse, parent, or child, overstayed visa, no property or assets in US - bond denied.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None, Unknown	No	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
~~2/26/2026 9:07:~~	~~2/26/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Harness (Stewart)~~	~~Miguel: 216-045-894~~		~~UNK~~	~~Johanna Cochran~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Evidence was not timely submitted; Judge offered opportunity to withdraw and reschedule for afternoon.~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~N/A~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~No~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Yes~~
2/26/2026 9:09:	2/26/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	UNK: 221-441-772		UNK	Maura Finn	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	#1: DHS: Flight risk, illegally in US and worked illegal with no employment visa, criminal history of driving without license; #2 Attorney: Not a flight risk, family ties, worked in US. Judge: Flight risk mitigated by bond, bond granted (condition: no driving without license)	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license	No	DHS never alleged danger	No	Flight risk mitigated by bond, Family/friends ties to the community and/or fixed address	Unknown	Granted bond	$15,000	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	Unknown
~~2/26/2026 17:3~~	~~2/26/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Harness (Stewart)~~	~~NA~~		~~NA~~	~~NA~~	~~NA~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Unknown~~	~~NA~~	~~Did not address~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~None;~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~N/A~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~No~~	~~No~~	~~Unknown~~
2/27/2026 8:27:	2/27/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Charles Anthony Faulkner		UNK	Tyrese Cruise	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	Attorney: Jurisdiction is proper under Bautista. DHS: Jurisdiction is not proper because Respondent was detained upon entry. Judge: Respondent was detained upon entry, no jurisdiction.	No	Matter of Q. Li (apprehended near border, not just at port-of-entry)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
2/27/2026 8:56:	2/27/2026	Stewart	Harness (Stewart)	Jose Ramirez Romero		UNK	Zenylisse Melendez	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: The Respondent has not met burden to show he is not a significant risk of flight. Attorney: Respondent has been here for 4 years and has a significant other here. Judge: Factors not met, not met burden of showing not a significant risk of flight, denies bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Unknown	No	DHS never alleged danger	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmtigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/3/2026 9:31:0	2/3/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Louis Perez	A221481 (UNK)	Mexico	UNK	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: flight risk, speculative nature of relief. Attorney: As shown by evidence, he has fixed address at rental property, US Citizen spouse, US Citizen child (2 year old), US Citizen stepchild (7 year old), expecting US Citizen child to be born, steady employment, household earner, attends church, and submitted attestations in support of his character. He has no arrests and only a traffic stop for a broken taillight.He also has a friend as a sponsor and adjusted status relating to marriage. Judge: Not a danger nor a significant flight risk; risk mitigated by bond, grants bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Traffic stop due to broken taillight.	No	No criminal history at all, including no arrests	No	Flight risk mitigated by bond	Adjustment of status	Granted bond	$5,000	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/3/2026 9:39:0	2/3/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Maria Columbo Hernandez	UNK	Mexico	Peynado	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Relief speculative and possibly time-barred; Attorney: Came to US seeking asylum after kidnapping threats from cartel. She suffers anxiety and panic attacks, as well as circulation issues. She immediately filed for asylum and has attended all ICE check-ins. Her wife has DACA. She has no criminal records. She owns a home with her wife and is co-owner of a cleaning business with her wife. She employs US citizens and files taxes. She has done everything required. Attorney requested any high bond amount so that she could be released so she could gather paperwork and avoid continued suffering. Detention is triggering to her panic attacks given the kidnapping threats. Judge: flight risk mitigated by bond, bond granted but said he needed time to think about amount.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	No criminal history at all, including no arrests	No	Flight risk mitigated by bond	Asylum	Granted bond	Judge advised he would set bond after thinking about it more.	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/3/2026 9:48:1	2/3/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Alberto Pena Perez	A22148025	UNK	Peynado	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Relief is speculative and Respondent demonstrated pattern of inability to follow law given 6 arrests for driving without a license since he entered in 2000; Attorney: Respondent has a fixed address, lives with his family with wife and 4 kids (1 child is DACA; 3 children are US citizens), he is the main breadwinner of the family and they face losing housing if he is not released. He has been consistently employed, filed taxes, and had about 20 affidavits attesting to his good moral character. He is also remorseful about prior driving without a license; however only occurred twice in the past 10 years. He will get a license. Attorney pointed to strong family unit, who all attended the hearing along with the sponsor who drove to the hearing from a distance; Judge: Acknowledged propensity to disregard jury requiring drivers license, but found that does not equate to having propensity for dangerous conduct. His long-term community ties, employment supported his finding that Respondent is not a significant flight risk. Flight risk mitigated by bond, grants bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license	No	Pending charges are minor	No	Flight risk mitigated by bond	Unknown	Granted bond	$6,000	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/5/2026 9:03:1~~	~~2/5/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Fuller (Stewart)~~	~~Ghadari UNK~~	~~226149988~~	~~India~~	~~Mengyu Peng~~	~~Hindi~~	~~Waives~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~DHS previous habeas granted so no jurisdiction issue, hasn't showed not significant flight risk. Add violator~~ ~~Attorney: not a danger or flight risk. No criminal history, entered in 2024 with intention of filing asylum and obtained counsel in reasonable time. Asylum is likely to prevail due to his political status and dissent. Never missed a check in, arrested when ICE did a home visit. Even provided his gate code to ICE to enter his neighborhood. Has filed taxes, employ is his sponsor.~~ ~~Judge: allowing extra evidence submission and will decide later today~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~None~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~Asylum~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
2/5/2026 9:05:3	2/5/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Victoria (last name UNK)	221502308	Bahamas	M. Ead	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: visa overstay, didn't show shes not a danger, has driving without license charges and fraud charges, medical issues not relevant. Has used 2 different names and has not shown any potential form of relief. Attorney: severe medical/heart issues, has not been able to speak with her or receive adequate medical attention. No risk outside of facilities. Judge: no family ties or relief sought, burden on respondent. Has arrests and attorney did not show anything against that. Not really a danger but certainly a flight risk and hasn't met burden.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license, Theft/robbery	No	Judge did not specify	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/5/2026 9:07:3~~	~~2/5/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Fuller (Stewart)~~	~~Bryan Alexander Torres~~	~~UNK~~	~~UNK~~	~~pro se~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~Yes~~	~~Respondent asked for more time to obtain representation; withdrew request~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~No~~	~~No~~	
2/6/2026 9:11:2	2/6/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Adelua	236-248-728	Nigeria	Matt Boles	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Danger. Assault by pointing a gun, domestic violence, assault with a minor child. Not allowed to have a gun as a student visa holder either. Criminal courts don't set bond because they think ICE will take care of it all the time. Resp: Entered with a student visa, legally married to U.S. citizen, child who was just born last year. Husband has filed a petition for her last year. Only charge of remove date is non-immigrant overstay. Had to step away from college for a medical issue, but letter of support saying she's welcome back anytime. Some misdemeanor assault that ended with no money needed to be paid. Alleged victim is her husband who has provided letters of support. Judge: Fixed address. Married to U.S. citizen, has U.S. citizen child. I-130 pending, if approved, eligible to adjust. Possible relief would be adjustment of status. Court does not believe she is a significant flight risk. Key issue is danger. Mr. Boles always presents the court with the best possible packet with all the information I need. But very serious pending charge, cut her husband bad enough to see the bone. Her husband's lack of fear is not dispositive, it is danger to the community.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Assault/battery, Domestic/family violence, Firearms-related	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Adjustment of status	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/10/2026 9:36:~~	~~2/10/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Fuller (Stewart)~~	~~Victor Lorenzo Montez~~	~~UNK~~	~~Mexico~~	~~Brennan Barr~~	~~English~~	~~Waives~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~DHS: Flight risk; relief is speculative. Attorney: Respondent was brought to US at the age of 4 and has attended US schools from kindergarten through high school. US citizen stepmother will sponsor. He has no criminal convictions- only traffic offenses. Judge: Did not have all evidence prior to hearing and did not, therefore, have an opportunity to review. Will review evidence and issue ruling later today. Put on record: Respondent entered at 4 years old, has a US citizen stepmom sponsor, entire education in US, arrest for speeding and alluding, and no criminal record.~~	~~Did not address~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~None~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~Adjustment of status~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
2/10/2026 9:43:	2/10/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Carlos De la Certa de los Santos	UNK	Mexico	Harold Estrada	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Overstayed Visa. Risk to community because of driving record-reckless driving, speeding, etc. Relief speculative and no evidence of any qualifying relatives that would suffer undue hardship if deported. Attorney: Respondent entered US lawfully with a visa. No criminal history that make him a danger to the community. Not a flight risk because he has 2 US citizen minor children and is the sole financial provider. He has a registered business in NC, paid taxes, and provided 20+ letters of support. He has 3 potential sponsors, including a US military. His traffic matters were administratively dismissed. Judge: Traffic offenses not criminal. Not a danger to community. Flight risk mitigated by bond, granted bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	No	No charges	No	Flight risk mitigated by bond	Unknown	Granted bond	$7,500	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/17/2026 10:21~~	~~2/17/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Fuller (Stewart)~~	~~Constance Crystal Delgado Varas~~		~~Mexico~~	~~David Lunel~~	~~English~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Attorney: Respondent came to U.S. when she was 7 years old and has remained here for over 20 years. She is relief eligible and is married to a U.S. citizen with two U.S. citizen stepchildren. She's been continuously employed and does not present flight risk. She had one prior DUI conviction in 2022. Letter from her probation officer was submitted to show that she complied with probation and never failed to appear for Court. She had a second arrest for DUI and obstruction of law enforcement in 2025. She refused breathalyzer test because she claims she was not drinking because she thought she was pregnant. Counsel argued case law where danger to community found in situations with 4-5 prior convictions and argued only one here and one charge pending. DHS: Danger to the community given second DUI arrest and obstruction of law enforcement. Judge: Put facts on the record. Married to a U.S. citizen in 2025 and eligible for relief. No pattern or practice of failing to appear in court. Not concerned she is a flight risk. Concern is danger to community. Relevant to cases cited by Respondent's attorney and noted court's discretion based on facts of each case. Judge takes seriously situations where respondents have lived in U.S. for so long, like Respondent. Will review evidence and issue a ruling on bond later in the day.~~	~~Yes~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~2023 DUI conviction; 2025 DUI and obstruction of law enforcement charges~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~No~~	~~DHS did not allege flight risk. Has avenue for relief or won relief. Family/friends ties to the community and/or fixed address~~	~~N/A~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	
2/17/2026 10:25	2/17/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Sahir Zan Zun Papa Iz Lapel		UKN	Rokhaya Niang	UNK	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Hurtado applies. Attorney: Respondent is bond eligible and cited cases for authority to hear bond determinations. Judge: Put facts on the record - family friend willing to sponsor, entered U.S. illegally, and no evidence to show admitted. Found Hurtado applies.	No	Anyone who entered without inspection is an "applicant for admission" under INA 235 (Matter of Yajure Hurtado)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/18/2026 10:06	2/18/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	UNK		UNK	Sergey Rasko	UNK	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent is a flight risk and a danger to community; has had 5 arrests in 5 years, 1 for domestic abuse, 3 for DUI, and 1 conviction for DUI. V2 Visa remained unauthorized, I-139 was filed after his arrest by ICE. Attorney: Respondent has been sober for 2 years, all arrests were before he went to rehab; he is married with one child, his MIL and FIL wrote letters of support, he is requesting bond. Judge: Evidence was submitted late, before the bond request and was not uploaded until today. Judge is taking no action today and counsel can refile for a new hearing.	Did not address	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Domestic/family violence; DUI	No	Evidence was not uploaded in time.	No	Evidence was not uploaded in time.	Adjustment of status (I-130, I-485), Bond	No action or attorney withdrew	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/18/2026 10:29	2/18/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Joel Garcia Salazar		Mexico	Ricardo Gonzalez	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent failed to show they are not a flight risk; has immigration violations - overstayed VISA; no work authorization; taken into ICE custody on Jan 21; I-139 was received the next day. Attorney: Respondent is a 25-year-old Mexican citizen married to a US citizen; he has a H2 VISA; works in landscaping; has filed taxes for 2022-2024 and working on current year; no crim history; no negative immigration history; was admitted and inspected; I-139 was filed prior to his detention; detained on routine traffic stop; his MIL is his sponsor; his in-laws have written reference letters; no danger or flight risk. Judge: Resp is not a danger, poses minimal flight risk, $6000 bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	No criminal history at all, including no arrests, No charges	No	Flight risk mitigated by bond, Family/friends ties to the community and/or fixed address	Unknown	Granted bond	$6,000	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/18/2026 10:48	2/18/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Cabron Alvarado		Guatemala	Matthew Boles	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent is a flight risk; entered on V2 VISA and overstayed; no wife or children, only family member is one cousin; his fear of criminals might be time-barred. Attorney: Respondent lives in LaGrange where he owns property; he works in construction making over $54,000/year; was detained while at Peachtree Mall with his cousin; case has no jurisdictional issues; no criminal history; not a flight risk; was detained after lawful inspection; no ACA agreement (does not apply); his father was murdered 3 months ago. Judge: Respondent is not a danger, has a fixed address and good employment; will sign bond after he has had time to review case and determine flight risk.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	No criminal history at all, including no arrests, No charges	No	Judge needs time to determine.	Adjustment of status (I-130, I-485)	Granted bond	Judge said he will grant bond after reviewing to determine flight risk.	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/19/2026 13:34	2/19/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Christina Martinez Martinez		Mexico	Kathleen Moscato	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: Respondent has the burden to show no danger and no flight risk and has not done so. That is really all they argued. Resp: She entered in February 2006 on a B-2 visa. Had entered and left the country multiple times. She has been working for 13 years and has sponsor letters. No criminal record. Was detained when stopped because the tag light on her car was not working. She is elligible for cancellation of removal. She has an adult US citizen son. Court: She overstayed her visa and has a US citizen child. She has a cousin sponsor, though the adult child has not offered any statement. She has a long employment history and got her degree in 2020 at ABAC. She is not a danger. Has no criminal record. Sufficient evidence that her flight risk can be mitigated. She's a long term resident with long term employment and a US citizen (adult) child. $5000 bond	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	Car's missing tag light, though serious, was minor.	No	DHS did not allege flight risk, Has avenue for relief or work relief, Flight risk mitigated by bond	Cancellation of removal	Granted bond	$5,000	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/19/2026 13:41	2/19/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	UNK		India	UNK	UNK	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	Resp.: Is a father who entered lawfully with an application for asylum pending for 3 years. Has a wife and children who also seek assylum. Pays taxes and has been convicted of no crimes. An aggravated assault (domestic) charge and charge for interference with a 911 call are pending, but the State court judge granted bail on these. Has counsel. DHS – Entry was in 4/23, fairly recent. Was charged with shoplifting, but this was dropped due to a pretrial diversion program. Shortly thereafter, Resp. was charged with domestic violence and also interfering with a 911 call. Judge: within a short period of time, Resp has managed to get arrested twice. Not swayed because state court judge granted bail. Not a significant flight risk, but does find danger.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Domestic/family violence, dismissed shoplifting charge; pending interference with 911 call charge	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
~~2/25/2026 23:15~~	~~2/25/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Fuller (Stewart)~~	~~Saman Hosseinzadeh~~		~~Iran~~	~~Ben Osorio~~	~~Farsi~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Judge: Stated that he always reviews evidence for bond hearings the night before, but lately he is not receiving evidence until the morning of the hearing or sometimes not at all. This is true for evidence from both DHS and respondent attorneys. Sometimes he can see that the evidence is pending, but he cannot open it. He has no time to review evidence the morning of the trial because he has a very full docket every day. Also stated that he is getting no updated guidance on Matter of Hurtado. Attorneys can either move forward with no evidence or request no action and refile.~~ ~~DHS: Cases are getting put on the docket within 48 hours of notice, which does not give anyone enough time to upload all evidence in advance.~~ ~~Attorney: Will take no action and refile. He has to notify the family because he does not speak Farsi.~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Bond redetermination~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Yes~~
~~2/25/2026 23:38~~	~~2/25/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Fuller (Stewart)~~	~~UNK~~		~~UNK~~	~~Shirley Zambrano~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Judge: Stated that he always reviews evidence for bond hearings the night before, but lately he is not receiving evidence until the morning of the hearing or sometimes not at all. This is true for evidence from both DHS and respondent attorneys. Sometimes he can see that the evidence is pending, but he cannot open it. He has no time to review evidence the morning of the trial because he has a very full docket every day. Also stated that he is getting no updated guidance on Matter of Hurtado. Attorneys can either move forward with no evidence or request no action and refile.~~ ~~DHS: Cases are getting put on the docket within 48 hours of notice, which does not give anyone enough time to upload all evidence in advance.~~ ~~Attorney: She submitted the evidence before noon yesterday (2/24/2026) but can see that it still shows as "pending". She will take no action and refile.~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Unknown~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Yes~~
~~2/25/2026 23:51~~	~~2/25/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Fuller (Stewart)~~	~~Name is UNK. A numbers are 221-480-668 and 241-156-541 (see notes)~~		~~UNK~~	~~Eddie Lopez~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Judge: Stated that he always reviews evidence for bond hearings the night before, but lately he is not receiving evidence until the morning of the hearing or sometimes not at all. This is true for evidence from both DHS and respondent attorneys. Sometimes he can see that the evidence is pending, but he cannot open it. He has no time to review evidence the morning of the trial because he has a very full docket every day. Also stated that he is getting no updated guidance on Matter of Hurtado. Attorneys can either move forward with no evidence or request no action and refile.~~ ~~DHS: Cases are getting put on the docket within 48 hours of notice, which does not give anyone enough time to upload all evidence in advance.~~ ~~Attorney: He submitted the evidence on Monday (2/23/2026). Evidence sat in limbo until suddenly being uploaded just 2 minutes ago. Attorneys are not being notified with sufficient time for evidence to be uploaded. Respondent for some reason has 2 different A numbers (provided above but I do not have the name). Other judges accept evidence submitted on the same day, IJ Fuller is the only one who does not. Atty will take no action today and refile.~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~Unknown~~	~~Unknown~~	~~No action or attorney withdrew~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Yes~~
2/26/2026 16:20	2/26/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Edwin Sarabio Medina 240-992-109		Mexico	Colby T. Morris	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	Respondent EWI '22. Atty says he has no criminal record, was picked up in an ICE raid at his house and claims Bautista class. DHS says no evidence provided to substantiate Bautista class and claims respondent has a felony cocaine arrest (documentation for that disconnect not discussed). Ultimately no bond granted for following reasons: No evidence respondent would not be a danger/flight risk, prospect of relief is highly speculative and no evidence of Bautista criteria. Respondent has no sponsor, letters of support, no employment history, single, no children. Judge scheduled next MCH for 3/6/26 10 am so atty can compile whatever he can to defend or present relief docs.	No	Mandatory detention due to criminal history	Drug-related	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
~~2/26/2026 16:47~~	~~2/26/2026~~	~~Stewart~~	~~Fuller (Stewart)~~	~~Maria Guadalupe Ramos Lazaro 216 666 777~~		~~Mexico~~	~~Elizabeth Matherne~~	~~Spanish~~	~~Yes or already speaks English~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~Messy case. No bond action today. Respondent has appeared several times before, most recently there was a habeas issue in Jan. where federal court granted EOIR to hold a bond hearing. Hurtado is forcing detention and govt argues 235 holding and opposes continuance. Appears to be unresolved issues surrounding habeas so respondent atty is w/drawing & will file new habeas; therefore no consideration/jurisdiction for bond in today's hearing. Next MCH will be 3/12 10am to allow time to resolve habeas. Atty is ready to set date for tr on 5/8 merits at the 3/12 MCH~~	~~Withdrew bond request or continued to a later date~~	~~See argument notes above~~	~~Simple possession of marijuana was mentioned but also indicated there had been a defect in the case so it sounded like that alone should not be a technicality to prevent bond.~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)~~	~~N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)~~	~~Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)~~	~~No jurisdiction~~	~~N/A (because no bond set)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~N/A (has attorney)~~	~~No~~

IJ Fuller

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the respondent?	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/26/2026 17:07	2/26/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Herman Maldonado	221-482-125	UNK	pro se	Spanish, but fluent in English so waived interpretation	Yes or already speaks English	Yes	Govt indicates danger & flight risk. Respondent entered US '02 w/ family, single, no children. Worked as a mechanic. No evidence of relief pursued; no sponsor or letters of support. Resp. suffers from schizophrenia and maintains that is the source of what results in his acting out (as defense) but has led to at least 2 assault convictions ('21 & '22). Appeal would be due by 3/30 if pursued. Bond denied today. Did not indicate he'd be hiring an atty.	No	Mandatory detention due to criminal history	Assault/battery, 12/25 larceny conviction. Multiple arrest, mostly small larceny	Yes	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	Denied bond	N/A (because no bond set)	No	No	No
2/27/2026 9:06:	2/27/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Antonio Gabrado		UNK	William Malaver	Spanish	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	A little back and forth and then the judge took over: Never encountered border, been here for 20 years, extensive community ties, eligible for 42b relief. Question is whether the court has jurisdiction. "Judges being told one way or another is the furthest thing from the truth." This truth for months and months was granting bond despite the DHS arguments that eventually became Hurtado. After Hurtado, everything changed. After Bautista nothing changed. But now we have to instruct everyone during master calendar hearings that they should check if they are Bautista class members and may be eligible for a bond. Respondent appears to be a class member of Bautista. I believe now that we have jurisdiction based on the Bautista class. Based on that the respondent has met his burden. $5,000 ***essentially, all of a sudden gave into the arguments that someone can be a Bautista class member and therefore be eligible for bond.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	None	No	DHS never alleged danger	No	Flight risk mitigated by bond	Cancellation of removal	Granted bond	$5,000	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No
2/27/2026 9:09:	2/27/2026	Stewart	Fuller (Stewart)	Shadhari		India	Mengyu Peng	Gujarati	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	Resp: Trying to get another hearing off of initial habeas petition (no particularly clear argument on why that should be allowed). Material change would be: sponsor and filled out asylum application DHS: bond was denied last time, asylum is time barred, speculative political persecution from India. No tax forms from non-family sponsor. Judge: Entered in 2024, had a fixed address. Resp initially had a habeas petition to conduct a hearing, which we did. Denied for flight risk because no sponsor and blank asylum app - flight risk. Concern is no case law saying the habeas justifies unlimited number of hearings. Even if that's okay, this is probably matter of Q Ii. Even if that's not right, this doesn't appear like a material change because everything was available to you at the first hearing. No jurisdiction/material change	No	Sort of both Hurtado and Q Li I think - generally a concern that you can't use a habeas petition to get into court twice	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture (I-589)	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	No

Timestamp	Date	Detention center (if Folkston, detained person will be appearing via Webex)	Judge Last Name	Respondent name (best approximation) (First name, Last name) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	A number (EXAMPLE: 123-456-789) (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Country of origin (UNK if not mentioned)	Attorney name (if not represented, write "pro se") (UNK if you didn't catch it)	What is their primary language? (UNK if you didn't catch it)	Is an interpreter provided in their primary language, if needed, or if they have an attorney, does the attorney waive interpretation?	If pro se respondent: Did the judge ask if respondent wanted more time to find legal counsel?	Summary of arguments by attorney, DHS, and judge's reasoning for their decision	Did the judge state that the respondent was eligible for bond/the court had jurisdiction?	If NO to the previous question: Why not?	What criminal charges or convictions does the respondent have? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was a danger to the community?	If NO to the previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not a danger? You may select multiple options	Did the judge find that the respondent was an unmitigable flight risk?	If NO to previous question: What was the judge's reason for finding they were not an unmitigatable flight risk? You may select multiple options	Note any forms of relief the respondent is seeking. Ex: Asylum, cancellation of removal, adjustment of status, etc.	Hearing outcome	If the judge set a bond, what amount did they set? ($0,000)	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge reprimand or criticize the respondent?	For pro se respondent: At any point in time, did the judge use legal jargon or confusing language when communicating with the	Was this bond hearing the result of a habeas petition being filed?
2/4/2026 8:41:3	2/4/2026	Stewart	Ward (Stewart)	Eliana Dos	219516199	UNK	Massiel Silva	English	Yes or already speaks English	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: No problems with jurisdiction because he entered on a visa. Flight risk always a concern with sanctuary cities around the countries. Pending charge of some drug (he was very inarticulate on this point). Driving without a license, felony charge of drug possession. Resp: The drugs were pills prescribed from her doctor, two years ago. The reason we didn't provide a more formal document from the county is that it takes about a year to get a docketed document. We will try to get a letter from the district attorney if that is required to move forward. Resp has been here for 10 years, victim of severe domestic violence, 5-year old U.S. citizen daughter. We're looking at VAWA cancellation (judge isn't sure about the time period). Withdraws. Judge: Reviewed the evidence, doesn't know if he is convinced by a letter from the defense attorney in the pending charges. You can withdraw and refile. Note: Judge Ward was walking her through what she might need to have a more successful petition. It was honestly pretty nice.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	Driving without a license, Drug-related	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Cancellation of removal, VAWA	No action or attorney withdrew	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/4/2026 8:42:5	2/4/2026	Stewart	Ward (Stewart)	Dudley, Dominquez	221-445-735	UNK	Paola Rodriguez	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: No jurisdiction, Hurtado. Resp: Tried the Bautista class argument. Judge: No habeas grant, unfortunately no jurisdiction.	No	Anyone who entered without inspection is an "applicant for admission" under INA 235	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	Unknown	No jurisdiction	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/4/2026 8:48:1	2/4/2026	Stewart	Ward (Stewart)	Daniel, Barron	221-580-944	UNK	Peter Isbister	Spanish	Waives	N/A (has attorney)	DHS: No jurisdiction. Hold respondent to their burden. Resp: Compelling candidate for bond. No criminal history, he has been in the United States for 26 years, head of household, married with two minor children (one of which is the qualifying relative for 42b, the other has DACA). U.S. citizen sponsor with financial information. Lots of letters of support. Judge: Habeas petition, we have jurisdiction. Seems like a good guy, and seems prima facie eligible for cancellation of removal. Strong letters of support, very diligent now in his attempts to stay.	Yes	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	A few traffic citations, very minor	No	DHS never alleged danger	No	Has avenue for relief or won relief, Flight risk mitigated by bond, Has attorney for immigration case, Family/friends ties to the community and/or fixed address	Cancellation of removal	Granted bond	$8,000	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/10/2026 8:53:	2/10/2026	Stewart	Ward (Stewart)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Unknown	Unknown	No session this morning for IJ Ward (I waited till 8:45 am).	No	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	N/A	No action or attorney withdrew	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	
2/12/2026 8:18:	2/12/2026	Stewart	Ward (Stewart)	The judge did not have bond for the day	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Unknown	Unknown	N/A	Did not address	N/A (because found jurisdiction, did not address it, etc.)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction or because found to be a danger)	N/A (because no jurisdiction, found to be a danger, or found to be a flight risk)	N/A	No action or attorney withdrew	N/A (because no bond set)	N/A (has attorney)	N/A (has attorney)	

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW
STEWART IMMIGRATION COURT

Respondent Name:
NAVA ORDUNO, LUIS

To:
Wong, Margaret W
3150 Chester Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

A-Number:
[redacted]
Riders:
In Custody Redetermination Proceedings

Date:
03/02/2026

ORDER OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE

The respondent requested a custody redetermination pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 1236. After full consideration of the evidence presented, the respondent's request for a change in custody status is hereby ordered:

☑ Denied, because
Respondent failed to show the court has jurisdiction to reconsider custody. The District Court directed this court to conduct "a" custody hearing IAW INA 236(a)(2), which was conducted on 26 January 2026. The immigration court denied two other subsequent bond hearings requests citing no material change. In the interim the immigration court granted the Respondent's relief application (42B).

Although the grant of relief is certainly a material change in circumstances, this court (this IJ did not conduct any of the previous hearings) is not convinced the Respondent has met his burden to show he is eligible for a subsequent bond hearing. The Habeas order states that Respondent shall be provided "with a bond hearing to determine if the Petitioner may be released on bond under § 1226(a)(2) and the applicable regulations. See 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1 & 1236.1." The habeas order does not address a right to a subsequent bond IAW 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19.

Additionally, there was no evidence presented that Respondent is a member of the Bautista class.

In the alternative, if the court has jurisdiction to consider a subsequent bond IAW 8 C.F.R. §1003.19, the court would find a material change in circumstances and grant a bond in the amount of $5000.

☐ Granted. It is ordered that Respondent be:
- ☐ released from custody on his own recognizance.
- ☐ released from custody under bond of $
- ☐ other:

☑ Other:

On the 21st day of January 2026 the U.S. District Court, Middle District of Georgia granted Respondent's petition for a writ of habeas corpus to the extent that the Court ordered a bond hearing to determine if Respondent may be released on bond under § 1226(a)(2) and the applicable regulations. A bond hearing was conducted on 26 January 2026 pursuant to that order. The court is not aware of another habeas grant in the case.

Immigration Judge: FULLER, STEVEN 03/02/2026

Appeal: Department of Homeland Security: ☐ waived ☑ reserved

Respondent: ☐ waived ☑ reserved

Appeal Due: 04/01/2026

Certificate of Service

This document was served:

Via: [M] Mail | [P] Personal Service | [E] Electronic Service | [U] Address Unavailable

To: [ ] Alien | [ ] Alien c/o custodial officer | [E] Alien atty/rep. | [E] DHS

Respondent Name : NAVA ORDUNO, LUIS | A-Number : [redacted]

Riders:

Date: 03/03/2026 By: Green, Ty, Court Staff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
COLUMBUS DIVISION

R.R.C., *et al*.,

Petitioners,

v.

Warden, Stewart Detention Center, et al.,

Respondents.

Civil Action No.: 4:25-CV-525 (CDL)
4:25-cv-527 (CDL)
4:26-cv-073 (CDL)
4:26-cv-076 (CDL)
4:26-cv-098 (CDL)
4:26-cv-163 (CDL)
4:26-cv-176 (CDL)
4:26-cv-226 (CDL)
4:26-cv-249 (CDL)
4:26-cv-266 (CDL)
4:26-cv-271 (CDL)

PETITIONERS' MOTION FOR TARGETED AND EXPEDITED DISCOVERY TO ACCOMPANY PETITIONERS' SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF ON JURISDICTION, BIAS, AND ENFORCEMENT OF CONDITIONAL HABEAS JUDGMENT

Petitioners respectfully move for targeted, expedited discovery into the Executive Office of Immigration Review (EOIR) and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) practices relevant to enforcement of this Court's conditional habeas writ. This motion is supported by empirical data, documented patterns of bias and futility, and evidence of systemic defects in bond-hearing practices. *See* contemporaneously filed Petitioners' Supplemental Brief. The discovery sought is narrowly tailored to factual issues of structural bias, futility of administrative remedies, and compliance with the Court's order. Respondents have indicated that they oppose this discovery request.

I. LEGAL STANDARD AND POSTURE

Petitioners seek expedited, narrowly tailored discovery into EOIR and ICE practices to further develop the record on bias, futility, and compliance, in the event the Court is unwilling to order immediate release or a burden-shifted bond hearing on the existing record. Habeas Rule 6 permits discovery upon a showing of "good cause," which requires the petitioner to present specific allegations that give reason to believe that, if the facts are fully developed, the petitioner may be able to demonstrate entitlement to relief.

Recent litigation stemming from unlawful detention at the Stewart Detention Center confirms that this Court has discretion to authorize targeted habeas discovery where, as here, threshold jurisdictional and custody questions cannot be fairly resolved on a one-sided record. In *E.D. .C. v. Warden, Stewart Detention Center*, 789 F. Supp. 3d 1234 (M.D. Ga. 2025), the Court granted expedited jurisdictional discovery and deferred ruling on the government's motion to dismiss, applying *Bracy v. Gramley*, 520 U.S. 899, 904 (1997) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(1) to allow non-privileged, proportional discovery into non-public detention arrangements and custodial practices.

Discovery in habeas proceedings must be limited and tailored to the specific allegations at issue. As the Supreme Court has emphasized, "a habeas petitioner, unlike the usual civil litigant in federal court, is not entitled to discovery as a matter of ordinary course." *Bracy v. Gramley*, 520 U.S. 899, 904 (1997). Rather, under Habeas Rule 6, "good cause is shown if the petitioner makes a specific allegation that shows reason to believe that the petitioner may be able to demonstrate that he is entitled to relief." *uesinberry v. Taylor*, 162 F.3d 273, 279 (4th Cir. 1998); *accord Arthur v. Allen*, 459 F.3d 1310, 1310 (11th Cir. 2006); *see also Claytor v. Masters*, 2015 WL 7301075, at *7 (S.D.W. Va. Oct. 7, 2015), R&R adopted, 2015 WL 7302765 (S.D.W. Va. Nov. 18, 2015).

Here, Petitioners have already made a detailed factual proffer—through data, declarations, and documentary evidence—showing systemic bias in EOIR and BIA adjudication of custody matters, near-categorical denial patterns at Stewart and Folkston immigration courts, and the absence of individualized, policy-compliant custody determinations by ICE. The information necessary to test and corroborate these showings lies largely within the exclusive control of EOIR and ICE. Good cause therefore exists for limited discovery targeted to those institutional practices and records.

II. FACTUAL BASIS FOR DISCOVERY GOOD-CAUSE SHOWING

A. EOIR Structural Changes and Policy Directives

Over the past year, DOJ and EOIR leadership have removed or forced out approximately twenty percent of the immigration-judge corps, disproportionately targeting judges with higher grant rates or perceived as granting too many forms of relief. Former IJs have described explicit pressure to "facilitate deportation" rather than act as neutral adjudicators, a pervasive climate in which grants of relief may trigger scrutiny or termination, and internal warnings that judges perceived as "favoring" noncitizens should consider "alternate career paths." As mentioned in

Petitioners' Motions to Enforce, about 20% of immigration judges nationwide were fired (over 130) without cause or explanation. The BIA composition has changed under current administration, down from 28 members to 15 total members, in a time where immigration case backlogs are in the millions and there are more detained noncitizens than any other time in history.

At the same time, EOIR leadership has issued directives undermining judicial independence and instructing IJs to disregard federal district-court rulings protecting bond-hearing rights. Most notably, in response to the final declaratory judgment and class-wide relief in *Maldonado Bautista*, EOIR circulated guidance telling IJs that the decision was "not a nationwide injunction" and that existing BIA precedent remained controlling, effectively instructing adjudicators to continue treating Bond Eligible Class members as § 1225(b) detainees notwithstanding the district court's declaration that § 1226(a) governs and its vacatur of the contrary DHS policy. Other internal communications warn judges not to be "adjudicatory outliers" and encourage pretermission of asylum applications without full evidentiary hearings.

B. Statistical Evidence of Bias in Bond Outcomes

Empirical data drawn from EOIR's own custody-appeal decisions show that between March 2025 and February 2026, the BIA decided 43 relevant bond appeals and did not grant relief to a noncitizen even in a single case yielding a 100% denial rate of bond appeals. In other published appeals, the BIA decided 99% of cases in favor of the government, with only one case out of 80 that was decided in favor of the noncitizen, yielding an approximate one-percent success rate for noncitizens. *See* Petitioners' Supplemental Brief on Jurisdiction, Bias and Enforcement of Conditional Habeas Judgment contemporaneously filed herein, including all exhibits (BIA appeals, Sheikh Declaration, GAIN spreadsheet, etc.). The reconstituted BIA has likewise issued an overwhelmingly pro-government body of precedents: as of late January 2026, it had issued

approximately 80 published decisions, 79 of which (approximately 99%) favored the government, a stark increase from the prior administration's roughly 60% pro-government rate. The rate of precedential decisions has also dramatically increased, as between 2017 and 2024, the BIA issued only 13-27 precedential decisions each year.[1] However, in 2025, the Board published 68 precedential cases, setting a record for the number of cases published in a single year.[2] These figures demonstrate both institutional bias and practical futility in BIA custody review.

C. Stewart Folkston (Atlanta Court) Bond-Hearing Practices

Court-watch data from the Georgia Asylum & Immigration Network (GAIN), as summarized in sworn declarations and contemporaneous spreadsheets, document a pattern of near-categorical bond denials by Stewart and Folkston IJs beginning in late January 2026. In that period, IJs—particularly Judges Brown and Harness—denied bond in nearly every case in which they reached the merits, typically invoking "flight risk" and, increasingly, "speculative" or "very speculative" relief as the rationale for denial, even where respondents had long residence, U.S.-citizen family members, steady employment, and a record of compliance with ICE supervision. *See* Exhibits 5, 6, 7 to Petitioners' Supplemental Brief on Jurisdiction, Bias and Enforcement of Conditional Habeas Judgment; *see also* Exhibit 8 to Supplemental Brief.

These data align with the conduct at issue in Petitioners' own hearings, where the IJ denied bond based on "speculative relief" and "flight risk" without taking testimony, without reviewing or engaging the evidentiary submissions, and without conducting an individualized assessment under *Matter of Guerra* or DOJ/EOIR policy. The pattern supports Petitioners' contention that

---

https://www.cliniclegal.org/resources/precedent-or-policy-quiet-transformation-board-immigration-appeals (last accessed March 2, 2026)

[2] Supra n.1;

current bond practices at Stewart and Folkston are perfunctory, outcome-driven, and inconsistent with due process and binding precedent.

D. ICE Policy and Practice FOIA and Public-Data Limits

ICE's Detention and Removal Operations Policy and Procedures Manual (DROPPM), including its Custody Management guidance (p. 203), requires officers to make individualized custody determinations considering, among other factors, criminal history, failure-to-appear history, equities and community ties, eligibility for and likelihood of relief, and health. The policy contemplates a structured, factor-based review and classification into priority levels, and recognizes that not every person taken into custody must be held in traditional detention; alternatives to detention are expressly contemplated for low-risk individuals.

In practice, however, ICE has not performed such DROPPM-compliant, individualized reviews before detaining Petitioners under § 1226(a), and there is no evidence that any risk-classification tools or DROPPM criteria were used in their cases. Petitioners were detained under mandatory provisions or categorical practices and then funneled into bond procedures that treated detention as presumptively warranted, without any prior factor-based custody determination.

Critically, the data and internal guidance necessary to verify these practices are not publicly available. FOIA requests for IJ-level bond data, internal EOIR emails, and ICE risk-classification records are often delayed for many months and frequently yield incomplete responses. The most relevant information—including bond-outcome databases, internal directives, training materials, and case-specific risk-tool outputs—resides exclusively within EOIR and ICE systems, beyond Petitioners' reach absent discovery.

While there are several FOIA litigation cases against agencies such as USCIS, such as *Nightingale v. USCIS*, 507 F. Supp. 3d 1193 (N.D. Cal. 2020), *Nightingale* does not resolve Petitioners' situation. Although the *Nightingale* injunction has pushed USCIS toward more timely adjudication of A-File FOIA requests, it does not compel production of the internal EOIR/ICE communications, bond-outcome databases, or training materials at issue here, and requestors continue to report qualitative deficiencies and incomplete productions, confirming that FOIA is not an adequate mechanism to obtain the discovery sought in this motion.

This information asymmetry is outcome-determinative: without access to the internal guidance, bond-outcome data, and risk-assessment records that only EOIR and ICE control, Petitioners cannot meaningfully test Respondents' assertions, demonstrate systemic bias and futility, or carry their burden to prove ongoing non-compliance with this Court's conditional writ. Limited discovery is therefore necessary to avoid a one-sided record in which Respondents alone control what the Court can see. Petitioners know the IJ failed to provide a fair, unbiased hearing that comports with due process and binding BIA precedent, but absent this discovery they cannot fully answer the Court's questions or substantiate those defects under the Federal Rules of Evidence.

E. Recent Stewart Habeas Litigation Confirms the Appropriateness of Targeted Discovery

Recent authority from this Court confirms both its power and its discretion to order targeted discovery in habeas cases raising complex jurisdictional and custody questions. In *E.D. .C. v. Warden, Stewart Detention Center*, 789 F. Supp. 3d 1234 (M.D. Ga. 2025), a Stewart detainee filed a § 2241 habeas petition upon being transferred to El Salvador, and the government moved to dismiss on INA-jurisdiction and custody grounds while opposing discovery. The case was assigned to Judge Land, but Magistrate Judge Helmick granted the petitioner's motion for expedited

discovery and deferred any recommendation on the motion to dismiss until discovery was complete, expressly holding that "jurisdictional discovery is necessary and appropriate" and that the court would decide jurisdiction only after that record was developed. *Id.* at 1238–39.

Relying on *Bracy v. Gramley*, 520 U.S. 899 (1997), Rule 6(a) of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, and Rule 26(b)(1), the court reiterated that although habeas petitioners are not entitled to discovery "as a matter of ordinary course," good-cause discovery is available and its "scope and extent" are committed to the district court's discretion. *E.D. .C.*, 789 F. Supp. 3d at 1245. Applying Rule 26(b)(1)'s relevance and proportionality factors—including the importance of the issues at stake, the parties' relative access to information, and whether the burden of the requested discovery outweighed its likely benefit—the court allowed discovery into precisely the kinds of institutional and records-based questions at issue here, such as:

> documents directly related to the terms of an inter-governmental detention arrangement and to the legal basis, location, conditions, anticipated length, and custodial status of the petitioner's confinement;
>
> communications between U.S. officials and foreign officials concerning the petitioner's detention; and
>
> Rule 30(b)(6) testimony from DHS and State Department designees on policies and practices governing the petitioner's transfer and confinement, i.e., **non-public institutional records analogous in kind to Petitioners' EOIR ICE categories**. *Id.* at 1245–47.

The court rejected the government's request to stay discovery pending resolution of a related class action that did not seek habeas release, emphasizing that the habeas petition presented a narrower but more urgent liberty question and that delaying discovery would only prolong

unlawful detention. *Id.* at 1243–44. The Court held that "jurisdictional discovery is necessary and appropriate," and **deferred ruling on the government's motion to dismiss until discovery was complete**.

E.D. .*C.* thus confirms four points directly applicable here: (1) this Court may order discovery in § 2241 immigration-detention cases notwithstanding INA jurisdictional objections, where discovery bears on threshold issues such as custody and the availability of meaningful relief; (2) Rule 6 "good cause" is satisfied where, as here, the petitioner has made specific allegations and the critical information lies within the government's exclusive control; (3) Rule 26(b)(1) proportionality supports targeted requests into non-public government records and institutional practices that go to jurisdiction, custody, and the feasibility of habeas relief; and (4) the Court may, in its discretion, defer ruling on jurisdictional or exhaustion defenses until after such discovery is completed, rather than accepting the government's assertions on an incomplete, one-sided record. The discovery Petitioners seek here—limited to EOIR/ICE communications, bond-outcome data, training materials, and DROPPM/risk-tool implementation—is at least as focused and proportional as the requests approved in *E.D.* .*C.*, and is likewise necessary to resolve jurisdictional and enforcement issues that cannot be decided fairly without access to the government-controlled information at issue.

III. SPECIFIC, NARROWLY TAILORED DISCOVERY REQUESTS FROM EOIR

Petitioners seek the following categories of discovery, subject to reasonable temporal and subject-matter limits the Court may impose. Much of what Petitioners seek consists of documents and data Respondents will necessarily have to collect and review in order to respond to the Motion to Enforce and to this Court's questions regarding bias, futility, and compliance. Targeted

production of those same materials therefore imposes little incremental burden and simply ensures that the evidentiary record is not curated exclusively by Respondents.

1. Written Communications

Emails, memoranda, and other communications (internal or external) from December 2025 throughout February 2026 to or among Immigration Judges, Assistant Chief Immigration Judges, and anyone else in EOIR leadership or any EOIR officials (including but not limited to the EOIR Director, Deputy Director, Chief Immigration Judge, Assistant Chief Immigration Judges, court administrators, and any other supervisory personnel) concerning:

jurisdiction to conduct bond hearings for individuals DHS claims are detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225 but are not arriving aliens seeking admission and should be classified as eligible for a discretionary custody determination under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).

- jurisdiction to conduct bond hearings or bond redetermination hearings after district court orders
- *Maldonado Bautista,* No. 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM, 2025 WL 3713987 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025) and the Bond Eligible Class;
- the *Rios Vega* or similar case enforcement decision and any related contempt warnings;

“adjudicatory outliers,” performance metrics, or discipline linked to bond-grant or asylum-grant rates or specific adjudication outcomes; and

- bond and flight-risk guidance, including but not limited to the use of “flight risk” or “speculative relief” as a ground to deny bond.

These materials are directly relevant to whether EOIR has instructed IJs to disregard federal-court bond rulings, to prioritize enforcement outcomes over neutral adjudication, and to adopt categorical approaches to bond that conflict with due process and binding BIA precedent.

2. **Oral Telephone Communications Regarding Bond Denials and Expedited Individual Merits Hearings**

Produce all documents and electronically stored information ("ESI") that reflect, summarize, memorialize, refer to, or evidence any oral, telephonic, video-conference, or in-person communications between or among EOIR officials (including but not limited to the EOIR Director, Deputy Director, Chief Immigration Judge, Assistant Chief Immigration Judges, court administrators, and any other supervisory personnel) and any Immigration Judge assigned to hear detained matters at Stewart Detention Center or Atlanta Immigration Court (for Folkston ICE Processing Center), from December 2025 to the present, concerning:

Instructions, guidance, suggestions, expectations, "talking points," or feedback regarding:

a. denying bond or minimizing bond grants based on "flight risk";

b. denying bond by characterizing relief from removal (including but not limited to asylum, withholding, CAT, or cancellation of removal) as "speculative," "very speculative," or otherwise using the perceived likelihood of relief as a basis to deny bond;

c. how to conduct or decide bond hearings, including any changes from previous guidance;

d. whether any changes from previous bond practice was recommended, including all details of any such recommendation(s) or change(s); and

e. All orders, directives, guidance, or instructions—formal or informal, and whether communicated orally or in writing—that encourage, request, or require Immigration Judges to schedule individual merits hearings within any specified time period for detained noncitizens generally and/or following the denial of bond.

Instructions, guidance, suggestions, expectations, "talking points," or feedback regarding expediting individual (merits) hearings for detained respondents (including setting such hearings within approximately two weeks of a bond hearing or initial master calendar) or otherwise prioritizing detained merits dockets in a manner that affects the timing, availability, or substance of bond hearings.

Any communications in which EOIR officials discussed, suggested, or directed that sensitive guidance on the topics in subparts (1)–(2) be conveyed by telephone, video, or other verbal means rather than by email or written memorandum, including any references to avoiding creation of written records or avoiding disclosure under FOIA or discovery.

This Request includes, without limitation:

– call logs, phone records, or other records of telephonic or video-conference communications;

– calendar entries, meeting invitations, agendas, minutes, chat logs, or notes reflecting the occurrence or substance of such communications;

– all information and substance of such calls and what was communicated to immigration judges during these calls;

– handwritten or typed notes taken by any participant;

– summaries, recaps, or "takeaways" circulated after any such call or meeting; and

– any audio or video recordings or transcripts of such communications.

. **Bond-Outcome Data by IJ at Stewart and Folkston (Atlanta Court sitting at Folkston)**

Aggregate data reporting, by individual IJ and by month, the number of bond hearings held, grants and denials (Separating into a different stacks, bonds that were denied for lack or jurisdiction

(e.g., *Yajure Hurtado*) or bonds denied under other grounds such as criminal aliens subject to mandatory detention under INA § 236(c), 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c) or noncitizens subject to final orders of removal), bond amounts set, and grants of release on non-monetary conditions for detainees at Stewart Detention Center and Folkston ICE Processing Center, for a defined period **from January 2025 through March 2026**, surrounding the Court's conditional writ and the structural changes described above.

This information is necessary to substantiate the empirical pattern of near-categorical denials, to correlate specific IJs' practices with the systemic bias alleged, and to test the government's contention that administrative remedies remain meaningful and non-futile.

4. Training Materials and Bench books

All training materials, bench books, PowerPoints, or written guidance provided to IJs since January 2025 until the present time concerning:

– § 1226(a) bond standards and the application of *Matter of Guerra*, *Matter of Andrade*, *Matter of R-A-V-P-*, and *Matter of Iurii Dobrotvorskii*;

– the concept of "speculative" relief in bond or continuance contexts; and

– expectations regarding "efficiency," pretermission of applications, or treatment of respondents with pending applications for relief.

These materials will clarify whether IJs are being trained or instructed to apply categorical rules—such as treating pending relief as inherently "speculative" or presuming flight risk from the existence of removal proceedings—rather than conducting the individualized assessments that due process and binding precedent require.

Binding BIA custody precedent—*Matter of Guerra*, *Matter of Andrade*, *Matter of R-A-V-P-*, *Matter of J-A-F-S-*, and *Matter of Iurii Dobrotvorskii*—treats "likelihood of relief" as,

at most, one factor that generally increases an applicant's incentive to appear, and reserves the label "speculative" for bare, unsubstantiated assertions of future eligibility. Under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(g)(1), IJs must follow those decisions in bond matters. Discovery into EOIR training, bench books, and internal guidance on "speculative relief" is therefore directly relevant to whether IJs at Stewart and Folkston are being instructed to apply a categorical "speculative relief" rationale that conflicts with governing BIA law.

C. Depositions (Rule 0(b)(6) or Comparable Mechanisms) EOIR Designee

A deposition of an EOIR-designated witness under Rule 30(b)(6) (or equivalent mechanism) on topics including:

– EOIR's policies and communications regarding *Maldonado Bautista*, the Bond Eligible Class, and the effect of that judgment on bond eligibility;

– directives, performance metrics, or disciplinary practices relating to bond-grant rates, discretionary benefit grant rates, or perceived "adjudicatory outliers"; and

– the development and dissemination of bond-hearing guidance, including any instructions concerning use of "speculative relief" rationales.

These limited depositions are warranted by the documented evidence of institutional pressure on adjudicators, suspected deviation from written policies, and the centrality of these institutional practices to the issues of bias, futility, and compliance with this Court's habeas order.

IV. SPECIFIC, NARROWLY TAILORED DISCOVERY REQUESTS FROM DHS

To confirm that ICE never gave Petitioners or similarly-situated non-citizen any custody determination and that ICE is violating its own regulations, DROPPM and binding BIA precedent and to confirm that DHS is categorically objecting to bond in nearly every single case involving a noncitizen, Petitioners wish the Court to order the following limited discovery from ICE/DHS:

1. **Policy Documents and Implementation Guidance**

   ICE policy documents, memoranda, and implementation guidance (whether written, oral or other communication) concerning DROPPM Custody Management p. 203-205 and any risk-classification tools or scoring systems used in making initial and subsequent custody determinations for noncitizens detained at Stewart and Folkston that was in effect from January 2025-March 2026.

   Any guidance, memo, criteria, policy, written or verbal to ICE officers on detention instructions or authority of noncitizens under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) or § 1226(a) from January 2025-March 2026;

   Any guidance, memo, criteria, policy, written or verbal to ICE officers on detention instructions or authority of detentions of noncitizens without a warrant under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) from January 2025-March 2026;

   Any guidance, memo, criteria, policy, written or verbal to ICE officers on detention of noncitizens who appear for reporting under any Alternative to Detention (ATD) program, including, but not limited to, ATD, ISAP (Intensive Supervision Appearance Program);

   Any revisions to the DROPPM since January 2025 until March 2026.

These materials are necessary to determine what standards ICE purports to apply in practice, and whether its detention decisions in Petitioners' cases comport with its own stated policies

requiring individualized, factor-based analysis. Respondents likewise must evaluate how DROPPM and any risk-classification tools have been applied in these cases in order to defend their detention decisions; producing those same materials to Petitioners is therefore not unduly burdensome.

2. **Risk-Assessment Usage in Petitioners' Cases**

   Records reflecting whether any risk-classification tools, checklists, or DROPPM-based custody reviews were applied in Petitioners' cases, including any risk scores, narrative justifications, or supervisory approvals associated with the decision to detain or continue detention between January 2025-March 2026.

   Any guidance, memo, criteria, policy, written or verbal to ICE attorneys appearing in immigration court instructing them to object to bond (January 2025-March 2026).

This discovery will clarify whether Petitioners' detention decisions were evidence-based and policy-compliant or instead arbitrary and detached from the factors ICE itself claims to consider.

C. Depositions (Rule 0(b)(6) or Comparable Mechanisms) ICE Designee

A deposition of an ICE-designated witness on topics including:

– implementation of DROPPM Custody Management p. 203-205 in interior-arrest and custody-review decisions;

– Apprehension of noncitizens coming to report to ICE on ATD/ISAP;

– use of risk-classification tools or scoring systems in determining detention, bond, and alternatives to detention at Stewart and Folkston; and

– ICE's practices and criteria for classifying noncitizens as detained under § 1225(b) versus § 1226(a) in circumstances analogous to Petitioners'.

These limited depositions are warranted by the documented evidence of institutional pressure on adjudicators, suspected deviation from written policies, and the centrality of these institutional practices to the issues of bias, futility, and compliance with this Court's habeas order.

V. NECESSITY AND TARGETED SCOPE

The requested discovery is carefully circumscribed to what is necessary for this Court to evaluate structural bias, the futility of BIA review, and Respondents' compliance with the Court's conditional writ. It does not seek to re-litigate the underlying removal proceedings or to conduct an open-ended inquiry into immigration-court merits adjudication. Instead, it focuses on discrete categories of information uniquely within EOIR's control: internal directives, training materials, outcome data, policy implementation records, and limited institutional testimony needed to interpret those materials. This discovery is necessary to show how the current system is structurally biased and as such, has resulted in Petitioners' continued detention due non-compliance with this Court's order to hold a bond hearing under § 1226(a).

Should the Court decline to order immediate release or to require a new, burden-shifted § 1226(a) bond hearing on the present record, Petitioners respectfully submit that targeted, time-limited discovery along the lines outlined above is essential to meaningful judicial review of structural bias, futility, and compliance, and to the Court's ability to fashion appropriate enforcement relief consistent with its habeas authority.

VI. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioners respectfully request that, if the Court declines on the current record to order immediate release or a burden-shifted § 1226(a) bond hearing, it grant this Motion for Targeted and Expedited Discovery, order Respondents to produce the requested documents, data, and Rule 30(b)(6) testimony on an expedited schedule, and defer ruling on Respondents' jurisdictional and merits defenses until completion of such discovery, together with such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted this 3rd Day of March, 2026.

/s/ Karen Weinstock
Karen Weinstock
Attorney for Petitioners
Weinstock Immigration Lawyers, P.C.
1827 Independence Square
Atlanta, GA 30338
Phone: (770) 913-0800
Fax: (770) 913-0888
kweinstock@visa-pros.com

/s/ Danielle M. Claffey
Danielle M. Claffey
KUCK BAXTER LLC
P.O. Box 501359
Atlanta, Georgia 31150
Tel.: (404) 949-8151
Dclaffey@immigration.net

/s/ Thomas Evans
Thomas Evans
KUCK BAXTER LLC
P.O. Box 501359
Atlanta, Georgia 31150
Tel.: (404) 949-8176
TEvans@immigration.net
Attorneys for Petitioners

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on March 3, 2026, I electronically filed the foregoing Document with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system which will automatically send e-mail notification of such filing to Respondents' attorney(s) of record.

/s/ Karen Weinstock
Karen Weinstock
Attorney for Petitioner
Weinstock Immigration Lawyers, P.C.
1827 Independence Square
Atlanta, GA 30338
Phone: (770) 913-0800
Fax: (770) 913-0888
kweinstock@visa-pros.com