Katie Hurrelbrink
Federal Defenders of San Diego, Inc.
225 Broadway, Suite 900
San Diego, California 92101-5030
Telephone: (619) 234-8467
Facsimile: (619) 687-2666
katie_hurrelbrink@fd.org

Attorneys for Mr. Hagos
[redacted]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TESFAY GEBREMDHIM HAGOS,

Petitioner,

v.

KRISTI NOEM, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, PAMELA JO BONDI, Attorney General, TODD M. LYONS, Acting Director, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, JESUS ROCHA, Acting Field Office Director, San Diego Field Office, CHRISTOPHER LAROSE, Warden at Otay Mesa Detention Center,

Respondents.

CIVIL CASE NO.: '26CV0150 JES DEB

Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus

[28 U.S.C. § 2241]

INTRODUCTION

Tesfay Hagos received withholding of removal to his native country of Eritrea in 2010. When ICE proved unable to remove him to any other country, ICE released him on an order of supervision. He complied perfectly with his release conditions for the next 15 years.

Nevertheless, ICE detained him on November 13, 2025. So far as Mr. Hagos understood it, ICE gave him no paperwork explaining why his release was being revoked—and ICE certainly did not let him read any such paperwork or give him a copy. ICE also did not tell him why verbally, despite his requests that ICE do so. And ICE did not identify any changed circumstances that would make his removal more likely now that it had been for the last 15 years. That's probably because there are no changed circumstances. Mr. Hagos still can't be removed to any country to which he has any connection, and there is no indication that any other country will take him, either. Worse yet, if—despite all indications to the contrary—ICE were able to remove him, they could do so with no notice, six hours' notice, or 24 hours' notice, depending on the circumstances.

Mr. Hagos must be released. ICE gave him no adequate notice before re-detaining him and arrested him with no changed circumstances, violating their own regulations. "[T]here is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future," meaning that Mr. Hagos's detention is not statutorily authorized. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001). And if ICE is able to remove him to a third country, ICE threatens to do so in violation of the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause. This Court should grant this petition on all three grounds.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

I. Mr. Hagos came to the United States seeking asylum from Eritrea, and an immigration judge granted him withholding of removal.

Mr. Hagos fled Eritrea's brutal dictatorship in 2008. Exh. A at ¶ 1. In 2010, he turned himself in at the San Ysidro Port of Entry and requested asylum. *Id.* The

immigration judge denied the asylum claim on June 25, 2010. *Id.* at ¶ 2. But he was granted withholding of removal to Eritrea. *Id.* About three months later, he was released on an order of supervision. *Id.*

Mr. Hagos complied perfectly with his release conditions for the next 15 years. *Id.* at ¶ 3. Nevertheless, ICE detained him at his check in on November 13, 2025. *Id.* at ¶ 4. He does not remember ICE giving him any paperwork explaining why his release was revoked. *Id.* ICE only gave him a notice saying that had had to cooperate with his removal, which he had already signed many years ago. *Id.* at ¶ 5. (Though he is almost sure he saw no revocation paperwork, he is even more confident that he was not given a chance to read any such notice and was not provided with a copy. *Id.* at ¶ 6.) He asked the arresting agent why he was being detained. She said that it was a new administration and things were changing. *Id.* at ¶ 4. He pointed out that that was not a valid reason. *Id.* The agent told him to hold on while she made a phone call. After talking to the person on the other end of the line, she confirmed that he would be detained. *Id.* He received no further explanation. *Id.*

She then gave Mr. Hagos a chance to explain why he shouldn't be re-detained. *Id.* at ¶ 7. He pointed out that he was the sole financial supporter for his wife and children. *Id.* She wrote that down, had him sign it, and sent him to detention. *Id.*

When Mr. Hagos got to detention, an ICE agent told him that he had been placed in expedited removal proceedings and would receive a credible fear interview. *Id.* at ¶ 8. Mr. Hagos was confused. He already had a removal order, along with a withholding grant. *Id.* The agent said that he would come back in a week or two. He never did. *Id.*

No other ICE agent ever came to talk to him about his removal. *Id.*

II. The government is carrying out deportations to third countries without providing sufficient notice and opportunity to be heard.

ICE's inability to remove Mr. Hagos, and the lack of changed circumstances in his case, makes it highly unlikely that ICE can remove Mr. Hagos to a third country in the reasonably foreseeable future. But should something unexpectedly change, and ICE does succeed in removing Mr. Hagos to a third country, he is in grave danger of removal without due process.

The Trump administration reportedly has negotiated with at least 58 countries to accept deportees from other nations. Edward Wong et al, *Inside the Global Deal-Making Behind Trump's Mass Deportations*, N.Y. Times, June 25, 2025. On June 25, 2025, the New York Times reported that seven countries—Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Kosovo, Mexico, Panama, and Rwanda—had agreed to accept deportees who are not their own citizens. *Id.* Since then, ICE has carried out highly publicized third country deportations to South Sudan and Eswatini.

The Administration has reportedly negotiated with countries to have many of these deportees imprisoned in prisons, camps, or other facilities. The government paid El Salvador about $5 million to imprison more than 200 deported Venezuelans in a maximum-security prison notorious for gross human rights abuses, known as CECOT. *See id.* In February, Panama and Costa Rica took in hundreds of deportees from countries in Africa and Central Asia and imprisoned them in hotels, a jungle camp, and a detention center. *Id.*; Vanessa Buschschluter, *Costa Rican court orders release of migrants deported from U.S.*, BBC (Jun. 25, 2025). On July 4, 2025, ICE deported eight men, including one pre-1995 Vietnamese refugee, to South Sudan. *See* Wong, *supra*. On July 15, ICE deported five men to the tiny African nation of Eswatini, including one man from Vietnam, where they are reportedly being held in solitary confinement. Gerald Imray, *3 Deported by US held in African Prison Despite Completing Sentences,*

Lawyers Say, PBS (Sept. 2, 2025). Many of these countries are known for human rights abuses or instability. For instance, conditions in South Sudan are so extreme that the U.S. State Department website warns Americans not to travel there, and if they do, to prepare their will, make funeral arrangements, and appoint a hostage-taker negotiator first. *See* Wong, *supra*.

On June 23 and July 3, 2025, the Supreme Court issued a stay of a national class-wide preliminary injunction issued in *D.V.D. v. U.S. Department of Homeland Security*, No. CV 25-10676-BEM, 2025 WL 1142968, at *1, 3 (D. Mass. Apr. 18, 2025), which required ICE to follow statutory and constitutional requirements before removing an individual to a third country. *U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec. v. D.V.D.*, 145 S. Ct. 2153 (2025) (mem.); *id.*, No. 24A1153, 2025 WL 1832186 (U.S. July 3, 2025).[1] On July 9, 2025, ICE rescinded previous guidance meant to give immigrants a "'meaningful opportunity' to assert claims for protection under the Convention Against Torture (CAT) before initiating removal to a third country" like the ones just described. Exh. B.

Under the new guidance, ICE may remove any immigrant to a third country "without the need for further procedures," as long as—in the view of the State Department—the United States has received "credible" "assurances" from that country that deportees will not be persecuted or tortured. *Id.* at 1. If a country fails to credibly promise not to persecute or torture releasees, ICE may still remove

---

[1] Though the Supreme Court's order was unreasoned, the dissent noted that the government had sought a stay based on procedural arguments applicable only to class actions. *Dep't of Homeland Sec. v. D.V.D.*, 145 S. Ct. 2153, 2160 (2025) (Sotomayor, J., dissenting). Thus, "even if the Government [was] correct that classwide relief was impermissible" in *D.V.D.*, Respondents still "remain[] obligated to comply with orders enjoining [their] conduct with respect to individual plaintiffs" like Mr. Hagos. *Id.* Thus, the Supreme Court's decision does not override courts' authority to grant individual injunctive relief. *See Nguyen v. Scott*, No. 2:25-CV-01398, 2025 WL 2419288, at *20–23 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 21, 2025).

immigrants there with minimal notice. *Id.* Ordinarily, ICE must provide 24 hours' notice. But "[i]n exigent circumstances," a removal may take place in as little as six hours, "as long as the alien is provided reasonably means and opportunity to speak with an attorney prior to the removal." *Id.*

Upon serving notice, ICE "will not affirmatively ask whether the alien is afraid of being removed to the country of removal." *Id.* (emphasis original). If the noncitizen "does not affirmatively state a fear of persecution or torture if removed to the country of removal listed on the Notice of Removal within 24 hours, [ICE] may proceed with removal to the country identified on the notice." *Id.* at 2. If the noncitizen "does affirmatively state a fear if removed to the country of removal" then ICE will refer the case to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services ("USCIS") for a screening for eligibility for withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). *Id.* at 2. "USCIS will generally screen within 24 hours." *Id.* If USCIS determines that the noncitizen does not meet the standard, the individual will be removed. *Id.* If USCIS determines that the noncitizen has met the standard, then the policy directs ICE to either move to reopen removal proceedings "for the sole purpose of determining eligibility for [withholding of removal protection] and CAT" or designate another country for removal. *Id.*

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

This Court should grant this petition and order Mr. Hagos's immediate release. *Zadvydas v. Davis* holds that immigration statutes do not authorize the government to detain immigrants like Mr. Hagos, for whom there is "no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future." 533 U.S. 678, 701 (2001). ICE's own regulations require changed circumstances before re-detention, as well as notice and a chance to contest a re-detention decision. And

due process requires ICE to provide notice and an opportunity to be heard before any removal to a third country.

I. Count 1: ICE failed to comply with its own regulations before re-detaining Mr. Hagos, violating his rights under the Fifth Amendment and the Administrative Procedures Act.

The Department of Homeland Security has enacted a series of regulations to protect the due process rights of someone who, like Mr. Hagos, is re-detained following a period of release. Title 8 C.F.R. § 241.4(*l*) applies to re-detention generally, while 8 C.F.R. § 241.13(i) applies to persons released after providing good reason to believe that they will not be removed in the reasonably foreseeable future, *see Rokhfirooz v. Larose*, No. 25-CV-2053-RSH-VET, 2025 WL 2646165, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2025), as Mr. Hagos was.

ICE is required to follow its own regulations. *United States ex rel. Accardi v. Shaughnessy*, 347 U.S. 260, 268 (1954); *see Alcaraz v. INS*, 384 F.3d 1150, 1162 (9th Cir. 2004) ("The legal proposition that agencies may be required to abide by certain internal policies is well-established."). A court may review a re-detention decision for compliance with the regulations. *See Phan v. Beccerra*, No. 2:25-CV-01757, 2025 WL 1993735, at *3 (E.D. Cal. July 16, 2025); *Nguyen v. Hyde*, No. 25-cv-11470-MJJ, 2025 WL 1725791, at *3 (D. Mass. June 20, 2025) (citing *Kong v. United States*, 62 F.4th 608, 620 (1st Cir. 2023)). Many judges in this district have granted habeas petitions or temporary restraining orders when ICE failed to follow 8 C.F.R. §§ 241.4(l), 241.13(i). *See, e.g.*, *Constantinovici v. Bondi*, 2025 WL 2898985, No. 25-cv-2405-RBM (S.D. Cal. Oct. 10, 2025); *Rokhfirooz v. Larose*, No. 25-cv-2053-RSH, 2025 WL 2646165 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2025); *Phan v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2898977, No. 25-cv-2422-RBM-MSB, *3–*5 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 10, 2025); *Sun v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2800037, No. 25-cv-2433-CAB (S.D. Cal. Sept. 30, 2025); *Van Tran v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2770623, No. 25-cv-2334-JES, *3 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2025); *Truong v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02597-JES, ECF No. 10 (S.D.

Cal. Oct. 10, 2025); *Khambounheuang v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02575-JO-SBC, ECF No. 12 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 9, 2025).[2]

Here, ICE violated § 241.13 in at least two respects.[3]

First, ICE did not comply with §§ 241.4(l), 241.13(i)'s requirement that, "upon revocation," the re-detained person be "notified of the reasons for revocation." As Judge Moskowitz recently explained, the regulation's text and due process require that the notice be written. *Tran v. Noem*, 25-cv-2391-BTM, Dkt. 16, at 5–6 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 27, 2025). Here, Mr. Hagos does not remember seeing any notice at all. Exh. A at ¶ 4. But he is especially confident he was never given a chance to read any such notice, was never given a copy of any such notice, and was never told verbally why his release was being revoked. *Id.* at ¶¶ 4–6.

Second, ICE did not revoke Mr. Hagos's release for a permissible reason. He was not returned to custody because of a conditions violation. Exh. A at ¶ 3. And there are no changed circumstances that justify re-detaining him. Mr. Hagos received withholding of removal to Eritrea 15 years ago. *Id.* at ¶ 2. ICE proved unable to remove him to a third country, hence why they released him. *Id.* Absent any evidence for "why obtaining a travel document is more likely this time around[,] Respondents' intent to eventually complete a travel document request for

---

[2] Courts in other districts have done the same. *Ceesay v. Kurzdorfer*, 781 F. Supp. 3d 137, 166 (W.D.N.Y. 2025); *You v. Nielsen*, 321 F. Supp. 3d 451, 463 (S.D.N.Y. 2018); *Rombot v. Souza*, 296 F. Supp. 3fd 383, 387 (D. Mass. 2017); *Zhu v. Genalo*, No. 1:25-CV-06523 (JLR), 2025 WL 2452352, at *7–9 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 26, 2025); *M.S.L. v. Bostock*, No. 6:25-CV-01204-AA, 2025 WL 2430267, at *10–12 (D. Or. Aug. 21, 2025); *Escalante v. Noem*, No. 9:25-CV-00182-MJT, 2025 WL 2491782, at *2–3 (E.D. Tex. July 18, 2025); *Hoac v. Becerra*, No. 2:25-cv-01740-DC-JDP, 2025 WL 1993771, at *4 (E.D. Cal. July 16, 2025); *Liu*, 2025 WL 1696526, at *2; *M.Q. v. United States*, 2025 WL 965810, at *3, *5 n.1 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2025).

[3] Some of these violations also constitute § 241.4(*l*) violations, but because § 241.13(i) is more comprehensive, Mr. Hagos focuses his arguments on that regulation.

Petitioner does not constitute a changed circumstance." *Hoac v. Becerra*, No. 2:25-CV-01740-DC-JDP, 2025 WL 1993771, at *4 (E.D. Cal. July 16, 2025) (citing *Liu v. Carter*, No. 25-3036-JWL, 2025 WL 1696526, at *2 (D. Kan. June 17, 2025)).

"[B]ecause officials did not properly revoke petitioner's release pursuant to the applicable regulations, that revocation has no effect, and [Mr. Hagos] is entitled to his release (subject to the same Order of Supervision that governed his most recent release)." *Liu*, 2025 WL 1696526, at *3.

II. Count 2: Mr. Hagos's detention violates *Zadvydas* and 8 U.S.C. § 1231.

A. Legal background

Mr. Hagos's indefinite detention also violates the statute authorizing detention, 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6). In *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001), the Supreme Court considered a problem affecting people like Mr. Hagos. Federal law requires ICE to detain an immigrant during the "removal period," which typically spans the first 90 days after the immigrant is ordered removed. 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(1)-(2). After that 90-day removal period expires, detention becomes discretionary—ICE may detain the migrant while continuing to try to remove them. *Id.* § 1231(a)(6). Ordinarily, this scheme would not lead to excessive detention, as removal happens within days or weeks. But some detainees cannot be removed quickly. Perhaps their removal "simply require[s] more time for processing," or they are "ordered removed to countries with whom the United States does not have a repatriation agreement," or their countries "refuse to take them," or they are "effectively 'stateless' because of their race and/or place of birth." *Kim Ho Ma v. Ashcroft*, 257 F.3d 1095, 1104 (9th Cir. 2001). In these and other circumstances, detained immigrants can find themselves trapped in detention for months, years, decades, or even the rest of their lives.

If federal law were understood to allow for "indefinite, perhaps permanent, detention," it would pose "a serious constitutional threat." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 699. In *Zadvydas*, the Supreme Court avoided the constitutional concern by

interpreting § 1231(a)(6) to incorporate implicit limits. *Id.* at 689.

As an initial matter, *Zadvydas* held that detention is "presumptively reasonable" for at least six months. *Id.* at 701. This acts as a kind of grace period for effectuating removals.

Following the six-month grace period, courts must use a burden-shifting framework to decide whether detention remains authorized. First, the petitioner must make a prima facie case for relief: He must prove that there is "good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future." *Id.*

If he does so, the burden shifts to "the Government [to] respond with evidence sufficient to rebut that showing." *Id.* Ultimately, then, the burden of proof rests with the government: The government must prove that there is a "significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future," or the immigrant must be released. *Id.*

A. The six-month grace period expired in 2012.

As an initial matter, the six-month grace period has long since ended. The *Zadvydas* grace period lasts for "*six months* after a final order of removal—that is, *three months* after the statutory removal period has ended." *Kim Ho Ma v. Ashcroft*, 257 F.3d 1095, 1102 n.5 (9th Cir. 2001). Here, Mr. Hagos was ordered removed on June 25, 2010. Exh. A at ¶ 2. Accordingly, his 90-day removal period began then. 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(1)(B). The *Zadvydas* grace period thus expired six months after the removal period began, in December 2012. The threshold requirement is therefore met. Even if it somehow were not met, Mr. Hagos would still be able to rebut the presumption that his detention remains reasonable, given that ICE has tried without success to remove him for over 15 years. *See Zavvar v. Scott*, No. CV 25-2104-TDC, 2025 WL 2592543, at *4 (D. Md. Sept. 8, 2025) (collecting cases). Either way, Mr. Hagos can proceed with his *Zadvydas* claim.

B. There is good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood of Mr. Hagos removal in the reasonably foreseeable future.

Because the six-month grace period has passed, this Court must evaluate Mr. Hagos's *Zadvydas* claim using the burden-shifting framework. At the first stage of the framework, there must be "good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 701. This standard can be broken down into three parts.

"Good reason to believe." The "good reason to believe" standard is a relatively forgiving one. "A petitioner need not establish that there exists no possibility of removal." *Freeman v. Watkins*, No. CV B:09-160, 2009 WL 10714999, at *3 (S.D. Tex. Dec. 22, 2009). Nor does "'[g]ood reason to believe' . . . place a burden upon the detainee to demonstrate no reasonably foreseeable, significant likelihood of removal or show that his detention is indefinite; it is something less than that." *Rual v. Barr*, No. 6:20-CV-06215 EAW, 2020 WL 3972319, at *3 (W.D.N.Y. July 14, 2020) (quoting *Senor v. Barr*, 401 F. Supp. 3d 420, 430 (W.D.N.Y. 2019)). In short, the standard means what it says: Petitioners need only give a "good reason"—not prove anything to a certainty.

"No significant likelihood of removal." This component focuses on whether Mr. Hagos will likely be removed: Continued detention is permissible only if it is "significant[ly] like[ly]" that ICE will be able to remove him. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 701. This inquiry targets "not only the *existence* of untapped possibilities, but also [the] probability of *success* in such possibilities." *Elashi v. Sabol*, 714 F. Supp. 2d 502, 506 (M.D. Pa. 2010) (second emphasis added). In other words, even if "there remains *some* possibility of removal," a petitioner can still meet its burden if there is good reason to believe that successful removal is not significantly likely. *Kacanic v. Elwood*, No. CIV.A. 02-8019, 2002 WL 31520362, at *4 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 8, 2002) (emphasis added).

"In the reasonably foreseeable future." This component of the test focuses on when Mr. Hagos will likely be removed: Continued detention is permissible only if removal is likely to happen "in the reasonably foreseeable future." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 701. This inquiry places a time limit on ICE's removal efforts. If the Court has "no idea of when it might reasonably expect [Petitioner] to be repatriated, this Court certainly cannot conclude that his removal is likely to occur—or even that it might occur—in the reasonably foreseeable future." *Palma v. Gillis*, No. 5:19-CV-112-DCB-MTP, 2020 WL 4880158, at *3 (S.D. Miss. July 7, 2020), *report and recommendation adopted*, 2020 WL 4876859 (S.D. Miss. Aug. 19, 2020) (quoting *Singh v. Whitaker*, 362 F. Supp. 3d 93, 102 (W.D.N.Y. 2019)). Thus, even if this Court concludes that Mr. Hagos "would *eventually* receive" a travel document, he can still meet his burden by giving good reason to anticipate sufficiently lengthy delays. *Younes v. Lynch*, 2016 WL 6679830, at *2 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 14, 2016).

Mr. Hagos readily satisfies the above standards for two reasons. *First*, ICE has not been able to remove him for the last 15 years. That track record strongly suggests that ICE will not be able to remove him now.

Second, there is an obvious explanation for ICE's inability to remove him: The IJ's order prohibits Mr. Hagos's removal to his home country of Eritrea, "which is the only country to which he has a claim to citizenship or legal immigration status." *Villanueva*, 2025 WL 2774610, at *10. "This substantially increases the difficulty of removing him." *Munoz-Saucedo*, 789 F. Supp. 3d at 398.

That's because "alternative-country removal is rare." *Johnson v. Guzman-Chavez*, 594 U.S. 523, 537 (2021). Between 2020 and 2023, data apparently show that "ICE removed . . . only *five* non-citizens granted withholding or CAT relief to alternative countries." *Munoz-Saucedo v. Pittman*, 789 F. Supp. 3d 387, 398 (D.N.J. 2025) (emphasis original). In fiscal year 2017, there were at most 21 people of the thousands with withholding of removal deported to *any* country; that number

includes dual citizens who only received withholding from one of their two other countries of origin. *See* American Immigration Council & National Immigrant Justice Center, *The Difference Between Asylum and Withholding of Removal*, 7 (Oct. 2020)[4] (cited in *Guzman-Chavez*, 594 U.S. at 537). That means that "less than two percent of those granted withholding of removal were deported to a third country." *Puertas-Mendoza*, 2025 WL 3142089 at *3 (citing American Immigration Council & National Immigrant Justice Center, *supra*).

"[T]hat is not simply a matter of United States policy—foreign governments 'routinely deny' requests to receive people who lack a connection to the would-be receiving country." *Puertas-Mendoza*, 2025 WL 3142089 at *3. "The reason so few people are deported to third countries is because," while "customary international law holds that a country has a duty to accept the return of its nationals," usually, "countries have no incentive to accept non-citizens." American Immigration Council & National Immigrant Justice Center, *supra*, at 7.

Because third country removal is exceedingly rare, and ICE has not been able to remove Mr. Hagos to a third country for the last 15 years, Mr. Hagos has met his initial burden. Thus, unless the government can prove a "significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future," Mr. Hagos must be released. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 701.

III. Count 3: ICE may not remove Mr. Hagos to a third country without adequate notice and an opportunity to be heard.

There is therefore no current likelihood that Mr. Hagos will be removed to a third country. But ICE presumably detained Mr. Hagos to try to do just that, and in this rapidly evolving removal landscape, something unforeseen could suddenly change to make that feasible. ICE's "credible threat of enforcement" of this third-

[4]Available at https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/the_difference_between_asylum_and_withholding_of_removal.pdf

country removal plan is sufficient to make this claim justiciable, even ICE does not have any current feasible plan to remove Mr. Hagos to a third country. *See Susan B. Anthony List v. Driehaus*, 573 U.S. 149, 156–57, 161 (2014) (finding standing, even though the politician seeking enforcement of an unconstitutional law was no longer running for office). And if ICE did suddenly prove able to remove Mr. Hagos to a third country, it would do so under a policy that violates the Fifth Amendment, the Convention Against Torture, and implementing regulations.

A. Legal background

U.S. law enshrines protections against dangerous and life-threatening removal decisions. By statute, the government is prohibited from removing an immigrant to any third country where they may be persecuted or tortured, a form of protection known as withholding of removal. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(3)(A). The government "may not remove [a noncitizen] to a country if the Attorney General decides that the [noncitizen's] life or freedom would be threatened in that country because of the [noncitizen's] race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion." *Id.*; *see also* 8 C.F.R. §§ 208.16, 1208.16. Withholding of removal is a mandatory protection.

Similarly, Congress codified protections enshrined in the CAT prohibiting the government from removing a person to a country where they would be tortured. *See* FARRA 2681-822 (codified as 8 U.S.C. § 1231 note) ("It shall be the policy of the United States not to expel, extradite, or otherwise effect the involuntary return of any person to a country in which there are substantial grounds for believing the person would be in danger of being subjected to torture, regardless of whether the person is physically present in the United States."); 28 C.F.R. § 200.1; *id.* §§ 208.16-208.18, 1208.16-1208.18. CAT protection is also mandatory.

To comport with the requirements of due process, the government must provide notice of the third country removal and an opportunity to respond. Due

process requires "written notice of the country being designated" and "the statutory basis for the designation, i.e., the applicable subsection of § 1231(b)(2)." *Aden v. Nielsen*, 409 F. Supp. 3d 998, 1019 (W.D. Wash. 2019); *accord D.V.D. v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, No. 25-cv-10676-BEM, 2025 WL 1453640, at *1 (D. Mass. May 21, 2025); *Andriasian v. INS*, 180 F.3d 1033, 1041 (9th Cir. 1999).

The government must also "ask the noncitizen whether he or she fears persecution or harm upon removal to the designated country and memorialize in writing the noncitizen's response. This requirement ensures DHS will obtain the necessary information from the noncitizen to comply with section 1231(b)(3) and avoids [a dispute about what was said]." *Aden*, 409 F. Supp. 3d at 1019. "Failing to notify individuals who are subject to deportation that they have the right to apply for asylum in the United States and for withholding of deportation to the country to which they will be deported violates both INS regulations and the constitutional right to due process." *Andriasian*, 180 F.3d at 1041.

If the noncitizen claims fear, measures must be taken to ensure that the noncitizen can seek asylum, withholding, and relief under CAT before an immigration judge in reopened removal proceedings. The amount and type of notice must be "sufficient" to ensure that "given [a noncitizen's] capacities and circumstances, he would have a reasonable opportunity to raise and pursue his claim for withholding of deportation." *Aden*, 409 F. Supp. 3d at 1009 (citing *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 349 (1976) and *Kossov v. I.N.S.*, 132 F.3d 405, 408 (7th Cir. 1998)); *cf. D.V.D.*, 2025 WL 1453640, at *1 (requiring the government to move to reopen the noncitizen's immigration proceedings if the individual demonstrates "reasonable fear" and to provide "a meaningful opportunity, and a minimum of fifteen days, for the non-citizen to seek reopening of their immigration proceedings" if the noncitizen is found to not have demonstrated "reasonable fear"); *Aden*, 409 F. Supp. 3d at 1019 (requiring notice and time for a respondent to file a motion to reopen and seek relief).

"[L]ast minute" notice of the country of removal will not suffice, *Andriasian*, 180 F.3d at 1041; *accord Najjar v. Lunch*, 630 Fed. App'x 724 (9th Cir. 2016), and for good reason: To have a meaningful opportunity to apply for fear-based protection from removal, immigrants must have time to prepare and present relevant arguments and evidence. Merely telling a person where they may be sent, without giving them a chance to look into country conditions, does not give them a meaningful chance to determine whether and why they have a credible fear.

B. The June 6, 2025 memo's removal policies violate the Fifth Amendment, 8 U.S.C. § 1231, the Conviction Against Torture, and Implementing Regulations.

The policies in the June 6, 2025 memo do not adhere to these requirements. First, under the policy, ICE need not give immigrants *any* notice or hearing before removing them to a country that—in the State Department's estimation—has provided "credible" "assurances" against persecution and torture. Exh. B. By depriving immigrants of any chance to challenge the State Department's view, this policy violates "[t]he essence of due process," "the requirement that a person in jeopardy of serious loss be given notice of the case against him and opportunity to meet it." *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 348 (1976) (cleaned up).

Second, even when the government has obtained no credible assurances against persecution and torture, the government can still remove the person with between 6 and 24 hours' notice, depending on the circumstances. Exh. B. Practically speaking, there is not nearly enough time for a detained person to assess their risk in the third country and martial evidence to support any credible fear—let alone a chance to file a motion to reopen with an IJ. An immigrant may know nothing about a third country, like Eswatini or South Sudan, when they are scheduled for removal there. Yet if given the opportunity to investigate conditions, immigrants would find credible reasons to fear persecution or torture—like patterns of keeping deportees indefinitely and without charge in solitary confinement or

extreme instability raising a high likelihood of death—in many of the third countries that have agreed to removal thus far. Due process requires an adequate chance to identify and raise these threats to health and life. This Court must prohibit the government from removing Mr. Hagos without these due process safeguards.

IV. This Court must hold an evidentiary hearing on any disputed facts.

Resolution of a prolonged-detention habeas petition may require an evidentiary hearing. *Owino v. Napolitano*, 575 F.3d 952, 956 (9th Cir. 2009). Mr. Hagos hereby requests such a hearing on any material, disputed facts.

V. Prayer for relief

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court:

1. Order Respondents to immediately release Petitioner from custody;
2. Enjoin Respondents from re-detaining Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6) unless and until Respondents obtain a travel document for his removal;
3. Enjoin Respondents from removing Petitioner unless they provide the following process, *see D.V.D. v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, No. CV 25-10676-BEM, 2025 WL 1453640, at *1 (D. Mass. May 21, 2025):
    a. written notice to both Petitioner and Petitioner's counsel in a language Petitioner can understand;
    b. a meaningful opportunity, and a minimum of ten days, to raise a fear-based claim for CAT protection prior to removal;
    c. if Petitioner is found to have demonstrated "reasonable fear" of removal to the country, Respondents must move to reopen Petitioner's immigration proceedings;
    d. if Petitioner is not found to have demonstrated a "reasonable fear" of removal to the country, a meaningful opportunity, and a minimum of fifteen days, for the Petitioner to seek reopening of his immigration proceedings.

4. Order all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 12, 2026

s/ Katie Hurrelbrink

KATIE HURRELBRINK
Federal Defenders of San Diego, Inc.
Email: Katie_Hurrelbrink@fd.org

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, will cause the attached Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus to be emailed to the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of California at USACAS.Habeas2241@usdoj.gov when I receive the court-stamped copy.

Date: January 12, 2026

/s/ *Katie Hurrelbrink*
Katie Hurrelbrink