

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Milciades Jose OSORIO Molina

Case No. 2:26-cv-95

Petitioner,

v.

**TRAVERSE IN SUPPORT OF
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS
AND RESPONSE TO ANSWER**

Cammilla WAMSLEY, Seattle Field Office
Director, Enforcement and Removal Operations,
United States Immigration and Customs
Enforcement (ICE); et al.,

Noting Date: Jan. 28, 2026

Respondents.

TRAVERSE IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT
OF HABEAS AND RESPONSE TO ANSWER
Case No. 2:26-cv-95

Stephen C. Robbins
Robbins Law, PLLC
6 South 2nd St. Ste. 1002
Yakima, WA 98901
Telephone (509) 823-4523

INTRODUCTION

This is a case about due process—specifically, the Constitution’s demand that the government not revoke an individual’s established liberty by unilateral fiat.

The petitioner was detained at the borer in September of 2023. He was released on his own recognizance and issued a Notice to Appear in immigration court with a November 2023 hearing date. *See*, Exhibit 1.

The respondents cliam that Mr. Osorio was required to check-in with local ICE following his release, hwoever, the Order of Release on Recognizance does not list a date, time, or place for such a check-in. Exhibit 3. Mr. Osorio was unrepresented, yet attended his first hearing in New Jersey and successfully changed venue to the Seattle Immigration Court, a process that necessarily would have involved updated Immigration and Customs Enforcement of his address change.

Mr. Osorio was arrested in a Walmart parking lot, loading groceries into his car on Christmas Eve. Yet the respondent’s evidence claim that he was interviewed on December 23. Exhibit 2 at 2.

Most importantly, Mr. Osorio was not provided written notice or the chance to present his case before a neutral decisionmaker to determine whether re-detention was warranted based on individualized findings of flight or danger.

That is the constitutional defect at the center of this litigation. Due process protects “freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint,” and it requires notice and an individualized hearing before a neutral decisionmaker before the government revokes a person’s established liberty. *Zadydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001); *Goldberg v. Kelly*, 397 U.S. 254, 267 (1970); *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408

U.S. 471, 485 (1972). Courts in this District have repeatedly applied those principles to immigration re-detention and held that pre-deprivation process is required. *E.A. T.-B. v. Wamsley*, No. C25-1192-KKE, 2025 WL 2402130 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 19, 2025); *Ramirez Tesara v. Wamsley*, No. 2:25-CV-01723-MJP-TLF, 2025 WL 2637663 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 12, 2025); *Kumar v. Wamsley*, No. 2:25-CV-01772-JHC-BAT, 2025 WL 2677089 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 17, 2025).

The Court should grant the Petition, order Petitioner's immediate release, and enter prospective relief requiring Respondents to provide constitutionally sufficient pre deprivation procedures before any future effort to re-detain Petitioner.

ARGUMENT

I. Respondents Re-Detained Petitioner Without the Process the Constitution Requires—and They Do Not Dispute That Failure.

This case turns on a straightforward constitutional defect.

Respondents re-detained Petitioner after a prolonged period of liberty in the community without affording her any pre-deprivation hearing before a neutral decisionmaker at which ICE was required to justify the deprivation of liberty. Respondents do not meaningfully contest that such process is constitutionally required.

The Supreme Court has long held that conditional liberty is liberty nonetheless. When the government confers freedom from physical custody—whether styled as parole, probation, or supervised release—it creates a protected liberty interest that cannot be revoked without due process. *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471, 481–84 (1972); *Gagnon v. Scarpelli*, 411 U.S. 778, 782 (1973); *Young v. Harper*, 520 U.S. 143, 147–49 (1997).

Morrissey explains why. Conditional liberty permits a person “to live and work in the community,” to form relationships, and to rely on the government’s implicit assurance that

liberty will not be withdrawn absent cause. 408 U.S. at 482. Revocation “inflicts a grievous loss” and therefore triggers the protections of the Due Process Clause. *Id.* at 481.

Courts applying *Morrissey* in the immigration context have reached the same conclusion: release from immigration detention gives rise to a constitutionally protected liberty interest inherent in the Due Process Clause itself. See *Guillermo M. R. v. Kaiser*, No. 25-cv-05436-RFL, 2025 WL 1983677, at *4 (N.D. Cal. July 17, 2025); *Ortega v. Kaiser*, No. 25-cv-05259-JST, 2025 WL 1771438, at *3 (N.D. Cal. June 26, 2025).

The petitioner’s experience fits squarely within this framework. He lived in the community for over two years without incident and did his best to comply with all the conditions set by respondents.

II. Under *Mathews v. Eldridge*, Due Process Required a Pre-Deprivation Hearing—and Every Factor Favors Petitioner

Whether due process requires particular procedures is assessed under *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976), which weighs the:

- (1) Private interest affected;
- (2) Risk of erroneous deprivation and the value of additional safeguards; and
- (3) Government’s interest.

Id. at 335. Each factor points decisively in one direction.

1. Petitioner’s Interest in Freedom from Physical Confinement Is Profound

“Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that the Due Process Clause protects.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).

Courts in this District have repeatedly recognized that re-detention after release deprives a noncitizen of an already-vested liberty interest. *E.A. T.-B. v. Wamsley*, 2025 WL 2402130, at *3 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 19, 2025); *Ramirez Tesara v. Wamsley*, 2025 WL 2637663, at

1 *3 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 12, 2025). That interest is particularly weighty where, as here, Petitioner
2 had been living openly in the community in compliance with all government requirements.

3 The D.C. Circuit has explained that “a person who is in fact free of physical
4 confinement—even if that freedom is lawfully revocable—has a liberty interest that entitles
5 him to constitutional due process before he is re-incarcerated.” *Hurd v. District of Columbia*,
6 864 F.3d 671, 683 (D.C. Cir. 2017).

7 Respondents’ Return does not grapple with this interest. The first Mathews factor
8 weighs heavily in Petitioner’s favor.

9 **2. Unilateral ICE Re-Detention Creates an Acute Risk of Error—Neutral**
10 **Review Substantially Reduces That Risk**

11 The risk of erroneous deprivation is substantial when ICE acts as investigator,
12 prosecutor, and jailer—revoking liberty based on its own unreviewed determinations.

13 This Court has already identified that precise danger in a series of recent re-detention
14 cases, holding that revocation of release without a pre-deprivation hearing presents an
15 unacceptably high risk of error. *E.A. T.-B.*, 2025 WL 2402130, at *4–5; *Ramirez Tesara*, 2025
16 WL 2637663, at *3–4; *Kumar v. Wamsley*, 2025 WL 2677089, at *3–4; *Ledesma Gonzalez v.*
17 *Wamsley*, 2025 WL 2841574, at *7–9 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 29, 2025).

18 The Ninth Circuit has similarly recognized that DHS’s internal custody assessments
19 are not an adequate substitute for neutral adjudication. *Dionf v. Napolitano*, 634 F.3d 1081, 1092
20 (9th Cir. 2011).

21 Petitioner’s case illustrates the problem. ICE provided no contemporaneous
22 explanation for re-detention, no assessment of flight risk or danger, and no opportunity for
23 Petitioner to contest the deprivation before it occurred. They claim to have been doing
targeted surveillance, however, the evidence suggests Mr. Osorio was subject to a random

1 enforcement event in a Walmart parking lot. They cannot even document that Mr. Osorio
2 “missed” an appointment with local ICE as alleged in their response.

3 **3. The Government’s Interest Does Not Justify Dispensing with Fundamental**
4 **Process**

5 The government’s interest in enforcing the immigration laws does not depend on
6 abandoning constitutional safeguards. Immigration custody hearings are routine,
7 administratively modest, and already embedded in the system. See *Ortega v. Bonnar*, 415 F. Supp.
8 3d 963, 970 (N.D. Cal. 2019); *Doe v. Becerra*, 2025 WL 691664, at *6 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 3, 2025).

9 Nothing in Petitioner’s history suggests that a brief, pre-deprivation hearing would
10 have impaired removal efforts or public safety. To the contrary, such a hearing would have
11 avoided unlawful detention altogether.

12 All three Mathews factors converge: due process required a pre-deprivation hearing
13 before a neutral adjudicator at which Respondents bore the burden of justification.
14 Respondents provided none.

15 **CONCLUSION**

16 The Due Process Clause does not permit Respondents to re-detain Petitioner—after
17 years of established liberty in the community—without notice and a pre-deprivation hearing
18 before a neutral decisionmaker at which ICE must justify the deprivation of liberty by
19 individualized findings. Petitioner was seized in December, and has remained detained since,
20 without the basic procedures the Constitution requires at the moment liberty is revoked. The
21 Court should grant the writ, order Petitioner’s immediate release, and enter prospective relief
22 declaring that Petitioner’s re-detention without a neutral, pre-deprivation individualized
23 determination violates the Due Process Clause.

Dated: Wednesday, January 28, 2026

s/ Stephen C. Robbins

TRAVERSE IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT
OF HABEAS AND RESPONSE TO ANSWER
Case No. 2:26-cv-95

Stephen C. Robbins
Robbins Law, PLLC
6 South 2nd St. Ste. 1002
Yakima, WA 98901
Telephone (509) 823-4523

1 Stephen Robbins, WSBA No. 53398
2 stephen@robbinsimmigration.com
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

TRAVERSE IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT
OF HABEAS AND RESPONSE TO ANSWER
Case No. 2:26-cv-95

Stephen C. Robbins
Robbins Law, PLLC
6 South 2nd St. Ste. 1002
Yakima, WA 98901
Telephone (509) 823-4523