

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
JACKSONVILLE DIVISION**

CASE No. 3:26-cv-00070-JEP-LLL

NORLAND RIVERA-AMADOR,

Petitioner/Plaintiff,

v.

**Scotty Rhoden**, Sheriff of Baker County;  
**Kristi Noem**, Secretary of the Department  
of Homeland Security; **Pamela Bondi**,  
Attorney General of the U.S.; **Todd M.  
Lyons**, Acting Director U.S. Immigration  
and Customs Enforcement; **Connie Nolan**,  
Director of USCIS Vermont Service Center;  
and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration  
Services (“USCIS”);

Respondents/Defendants.

---

**PETITIONER/PLAINTIFF’S EMERGENCY MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION  
AND/OR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER**

**CERTIFICATION OF EMERGENCY PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 3.01(f)**

Pursuant to Local Rule 3.01(f) of the Middle District of Florida, undersigned counsel hereby certifies that this Motion is filed as a true emergency. Specifically:

1. As a member of the Bar of this Court, I have carefully examined this matter, and it is a true emergency, and that the urgency has not been caused by my or the party’s own dilatory conduct;
2. Immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result to Plaintiff if the requested relief is not granted as soon as possible;
3. The emergency nature of this motion arises from recent developments, including Petitioner/Plaintiff’s detention at the Baker Detention Facility, nicknamed and the Defendants’

intention to execute his removal order and remove him from the United States despite his pending U-1A visa application, which has granted him deferred action status;

4. This emergency could not have been avoided through earlier action because Plaintiff was detained and came into Defendant's custody on November 14, 2025;
5. Notice has been provided to the U.S. Attorney, via email on January 15, 2026;
6. This Motion is not being filed for the purpose of delay.
7. After reviewing the facts and researching applicable legal principles, I certify that this Motion in fact presents a true emergency (as opposed to a matter that may need only expedited treatment) and requires an immediate ruling because the Court would not be able to provide meaningful relief to a critical, non-routine issue after the expiration of seven days. I understand that an unwarranted certification may lead to sanctions.
8. I further certify that I have made a bona fide effort to resolve this matter without the necessity of emergency action.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Alexandra Friz-Garcia  
Alexandra Friz-Garcia, Esq.  
Florida Bar Number: 0111496  
afriz@visadoctors.com  
Fonte Friz-Garcia Immigration  
901 Ponce de Leon Blvd. #402  
Coral Gables, Florida 33134  
Telephone: 305-446-1151  
*Attorney for Plaintiff*

**PETITIONER/PLAINTIFF'S EMERGENCY MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AND/OR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER**

COMES NOW the Petitioner/Plaintiff, by and through undersigned counsel, and hereby files the instant Emergency Motion and respectfully states as follows:

1. The Petitioner/Plaintiff incorporates by reference the facts and procedural history as set forth in his Verified Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief. *See* D.E. 1.

2. The Petitioner/Plaintiff seek to “preserve the status quo during the course of litigation in order to prevent irreparable injury to the moving party and in order to preserve the ability of the court to render complete relief.” *Federal Leasing, Inc. v. Underwriters at Lloyds*, 487 F. Supp. 1248, 1259 (D. Md. 1980), *aff'd*, 650 F.2d 495 (4th Cir. 1981).

3. A temporary restraining order and/or a preliminary injunction is warranted where, as here, the plaintiffs establish: (1) a substantial likelihood that they will prevail on the merits; (2) a substantial threat of irreparable injury in the injunction is not granted; (3) greater injustice to the plaintiffs if the injunction is denied than harm caused by granting the injunction; and (4) no substantial disservice to the public interest. *Osmose, Inc. v. Viance, LLC*, 612 F.3d 1298, 1307 (11th Cir. 2010); *Scott v. Roberts*, 612 F.3d 1279, 1290 (11th Cir. 2010); *see Fed. R. Civ. P. 65*.

4. This standard is not rigidly applied by assigning a fixed quantitative value to each of the four factors. Rather, a flexible scale – which balances each consideration and arrives at the most equitable result, given the particular circumstances of each case – is used. *Texas v. Seatrain International, S.A.*, 518 F.2d 785, 787 (5th Cir. 1975) ~~(encl.)~~.

5. The Petitioner/Plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits because the Respondents/Defendants are detaining the Petitioner/Plaintiff to execute his deportation despite his grant of deferred action following a bona fide determination of eligibility for U

Nonimmigrant status. *See* D.E. 1 at Exh. No. 2 (Copy of Bona Fide Determination, granting deferred action).

6. The Petitioner/Plaintiff will likely suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief from deportation. *See, e.g., Padilla v. Kentucky*, 559 U.S. 356, 364 (2010) (“deportation is a particularly ‘severe’ penalty” (citation omitted)). In addition, Petitioner/Plaintiff suffers from high blood pressure (hypertension) requiring ongoing medical monitoring and treatment.

7. The Petitioner/Plaintiff has complied with Fed. R. Civ. Pro. Rule 65 requirements for purposes of granting a Temporary Restraining Order. Pursuant to this Rule, the Court may issue a temporary restraining order without written or oral notice to the adverse party, but only if (a) specific facts in an affidavit clearly show that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result to the movant before the adverse party can be heard in opposition; and (b) the movant’s attorney certifies in writing any efforts made to give notice and the reasons why it should not be required.

8. As undersigned counsel has set forth in her supporting Affidavit, undersigned counsel has provided via email provided the U.S. Attorney’s office with a copy of the instant motion and a copy of the instant motion with a copy of the Petition/Complaint and Exhibits.

9. Under the circumstances of this case, the movant should not need to post a security pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 65(c) because the Respondents/Defendants will incur no costs or damages from being wrongfully enjoined or restrained.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing, the Petitioner/Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter the following orders:

A. The Petitioner/Plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits of the pending

Petition/Complaint;

- B. The Petitioner/Plaintiff will suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, the balance of equities tips in the Petitioner/Plaintiff's favor, and an injunction would serve the public interest;
- C. Enjoin the Respondents/Defendants from detaining and deporting the Plaintiff/Petitioner while he is the beneficiary of a grant of deferred action;
- D. Enjoin Respondent, ICE, from communicating with other Respondent, USCIS, for the purpose of requesting expedited adjudication of Petitioner's Form I-918A or removal from the Bona Fide Determination list, pending resolution of this habeas petition.
- E. The Petitioner/Plaintiff is entitled to an award of attorney's fees and costs incurred as a result of bringing this action pursuant to the Equal Access to Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2412.
- F. Grant the Petitioner/Plaintiff any other relief the Court deems necessary and proper.

Respectfully submitted this 15<sup>th</sup> day of January 2026,

By: /s/ Alexandra Friz-Garcia

Alexandra Friz-Garcia, Esq.

Florida Bar No. 0111496

Fonte Friz-Garcia Immigration Firm

Attorney for Petitioner/Plaintiff

901 Ponce De Leon Blvd, Suite 402

Miami, FL 33134

Telephone: (305) 446-1151

afriz@visadoctors.com

#### **VERIFICATION**

Undersigned counsel certifies under penalty of perjury that I am submitting this verification because I am the Petitioner/Plaintiff's attorney, and I have discussed the facts within this Motion with the Petitioner/Plaintiff's counsel in stay of removal proceedings before Respondents/Defendants. Pursuant to these discussions, I have reviewed the foregoing Motion and that, to the best of my knowledge, the facts therein are true and accurate.

Respectfully submitted this 15<sup>th</sup> day of January 2026,

Alexandra Friz-Garcia, Esq.  
Attorney for Petitioner/Plaintiff  
901 Ponce De Leon Blvd, Suite 402  
Miami, FL 33134  
Telephone: (305) 446-1151

By: /s/ Alexandra Friz-Garcia  
Alexandra Friz-Garcia, Esq.  
Florida Bar No. 0111496  
afriz@visadoctors.com

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Court Clerk and to the best of my knowledge a true and correct copy of the foregoing, along with a Notice of Electronic Filing, will be served through the Court's ECF system to all counsel of record this 15<sup>th</sup> day of January 2026. As no attorney from the U.S. Attorney's Office has entered an appearance yet in the instant matter, I provided a copy of the foregoing to the U.S. Attorney, Rick L. Lasseter, via email at [Richard.lasseter@usdoj.gov](mailto:Richard.lasseter@usdoj.gov).

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Alexandra Friz-Garcia  
Alexandra Friz-Garcia, Esq.  
Florida Bar No. 0111496  
Fonte Friz-Garcia Immigration Firm  
Attorney for Petitioner/Plaintiff  
901 Ponce De Leon Blvd, 402  
Miami, FL 33134  
Telephone: (305) 446-1151  
[afriz@visadoctors](mailto:afriz@visadoctors)

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

NORLAND RIVERA-AMADOR,

Petitioner/Plaintiff,

v.

Scotty Rhoden, Sheriff of Baker County;  
Kristi Noem, Secretary of the Department  
of Homeland Security; Pamela Bondi,  
Attorney General of the U.S.; Todd M.  
Lyons, Acting Director U.S. Immigration  
and Customs Enforcement; Connie Nolan,  
Director of USCIS Vermont Service Center;  
and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration  
Services (“USCIS”);  
Respondents/Defendants.

---

**AFFIDAVIT OF ALEXANDRA PAOLA FRIZ-GARCIA,  
COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER/PLAINTIFF**

1. My full name is Alexandra Paola Friz-Garcia, and I am the attorney of record in the above-captioned matter.
2. I am a member of The Florida Bar (Florida Bar No. 0111496), and I am admitted to practice in the U.S. District Courts for the Southern District of Florida, Middle District of Florida.
3. On January 15, 2026, I notified the U.S. Attorney for the Middle District of Florida, the U.S. Attorney, Rick L. Lasseter, via email at Richard.lasseter@usdoj.gov, that I intended to file the Petitioner/Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction and/or Temporary Restraining Order and I attached copies of the proposed Motion with this Affidavit and the Petition and Complaint with Exhibits at D.E. 1.

4. The purpose of this Affidavit is to comply with Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 65, which states that the Court may only issue a temporary restraining order without written or oral notice to the adverse party if specific facts in an affidavit clearly show that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result to the movant before the adverse party can be heard in opposition and the movant's attorney certifies in writing any efforts made to give notice and the reasons why it should not be required.
5. The Petitioner/Plaintiff is under imminent threat of deportation despite the Petitioner/Plaintiff's pending I-918A Petition with bona fide determination granting him deferred action. The Plaintiff has two U.S. citizen children and deportation would forcibly separate the Petitioner from his family until he could return with a U-nonimmigrant visa, and the backlogs in I-918 and I-918A Application adjudications outlined in the Petition/Complaint could make this separation interminable.
6. Again, I certify that I have made proper efforts to give notice to the Respondents/Defendants' counsel of the Petitioner/Plaintiff's Motion.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746.

Date: January 15, 2026

*Alexandra Friz-Garcia*

Signature of Counsel