

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Sandra Elizabeth Chasipanta Llangari,

Petitioner,

v.

Pamela Bondi, Attorney General,

Kristi Noem, Secretary, U.S. Department
of Homeland Security,

Todd M. Lyons, Acting Director of
Immigration and Customs Enforcement,
and

David Easterwood, Acting Director, St.
Paul Field Office Immigration and
Customs Enforcement.

Respondents.

Case No. 26-cv-283

**VERIFIED PETITION
FOR WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS**

Expedited Handling Requested

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner, Ms. Sandra Elizabeth CHASIPANTA LLANGARI, ("Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI"), by and through her attorney, hereby files this petition for a writ of habeas corpus and a complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") to release Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI from ICE detention, or in the alternative to enjoin their

transfer to a facility outside of Minnesota and to provide a bond hearing pending the completion of any immigration proceedings.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question); 28 U.S.C. § 1361 (federal employee mandamus action); 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act); 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus); Art. I, § 9, c. 2 of the U.S. Constitution ("Suspension Clause"); 5 U.S.C. § 702 (waiver of sovereign immunity); and 28 U.S.C. § 2201 (Declaratory Judgment Act).

3. Federal question jurisdiction exists because Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI seeks to challenge her custody as a violation of the Constitution and the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101 et seq.

4. Federal district courts have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 to hear habeas petitions by noncitizens challenging the lawfulness or constitutionality of their detention by the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS"). *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510 516-17 (2003); *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 138 S. Ct. 830, 839-41 (2018); and *Nielsen v. Preap*, 139 S. Ct. 954, 961-63 (2019).

5. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), (e)(1)(B), and 2241(d) because Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI is detained within the District of Minnesota.

6. Venue is also proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e)(1)(A), because Respondents are operating in this district.

PARTIES

7. Petitioner is a citizen of Ecuador and a resident of Richfield, Hennepin County, Minnesota. She was arrested by ICE mere hours before the filing of this petition and, upon information and belief, is currently in ICE custody within the State of Minnesota.

8. Respondent Pamela Bondi is being sued in her official capacity as the Attorney General of the United States and the head of the Department of Justice. Attorney General Bondi shares responsibility for implementation and enforcement of the immigration detention statutes, along with Respondent Noem. Attorney General Bondi is a legal custodian of Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI.

9. Respondent Kristi Noem is being sued in her official capacity as the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. In this capacity, Secretary Noem is responsible for the administration of the immigration laws pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a), routinely transacts business in the District of Minnesota, supervises the Fort Snelling ICE Field Office, and is legally responsible for pursuing Petitioner's detention and removal. As such, Respondent Noem is a legal custodian of Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI.

10. Respondent Todd M. Lyons is the Acting Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and is sued in his official capacity. Defendant Lyons is responsible for Petitioner's detention.

11. Respondent David Easterwood is being sued in his official capacity as the Acting Field Office Director for the Fort Snelling Field Office for ICE within DHS. In

that capacity, Field Director Easterwood has supervisory authority over the ICE agents responsible for detaining Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI. The address for the Fort Snelling Field Office is 1 Federal Drive, Fort Snelling, Minnesota 55111.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

12. Petitioner is a resident of Richfield, Minnesota, and has lived in the United States for more than twenty years.

13. Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI entered the United States without inspection more than two years ago. She has applied for permanent residence, and, according to an attorney who has previously helped Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI, she has applied for status pursuant to the Violence Against Women Act.

14. Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI is married and has 3 kids, ages two, twelve, and fifteen. The family lives together in Richfield, Minnesota. The older two children attend local schools. She is a very active and attentive mother and takes her older kids to play sports and participate in other extracurricular activities. Further, she is the primary caretaker for her two year old child. Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI attends church at Santo Cristo and has a large community of friends.

15. Based on a public search of the Minnesota Court Records Online, Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI has a spotless criminal record, aside from a minor traffic violation in 2014.

16. Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI was arrested in Minneapolis, MN near the intersection of Fremont and 36th Avenue on January 14, 2026. She was a passenger in a car that was pulled over by ICE agents. The ICE agents threatened to

break the car's windows and then forced themselves into the vehicle to physically take Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI out of the car. The ICE agents did not show or provide a judicial warrant. She was detained with two other people.

17. Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI complied, and was taken into federal custody.

18. This arrest is part of an operation in Hennepin and Ramsey counties called "Operation Metro Surge." This operation has involved hundreds of masked, unidentified individuals in unmarked vehicles (many with illegally covered or mismatched license plates) holding themselves out as ICE agents but largely refusing to identify themselves by name or to present warrants, physically assaulting pedestrians, pepper spraying and arresting citizen observers, hitting passersby with vehicles, and generally attempting to take as many immigrants as possible into custody regardless of the constitutionality of their actions. *See, e.g., Compl., Tincher et. al. v. Noem*, No. 0:25-cv-04669. (D. Minn. 12/17/2025).

19. Since the operation began on December 1, 2025, the number of immigration officials in the twin city metro area has increased fourfold, and with them these new agents have brought a similarly massive increase in unconstitutional, unlawful, and downright violent behavior towards citizens and non-citizens alike. The people of Minnesota—of all races, nationalities, and citizenship status—are united in their shock and fear at the events of the past six weeks, and are begging for the attacks on their community to stop.

20. Given the massive volume of perceived non-citizens being taken off the streets, Respondents are running out of physical space to continue detaining people. Detainees are being held in cramped quarters at the federal building, before being quickly sent to remote locations across Minnesota or to facilities as far away as El Paso, Texas.

21. In Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI's case, Petitioner has been brought into ICE custody though her exact whereabouts are unknown as they have been detained within hours of this filing.

22. Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI poses no risk to society and has strong connections to his community in Hennepin County, including a husband, children, and close friends.

23. Detaining Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI is an expensive and pointless endeavor. Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI respectfully seeks the opportunity to return home and to continue following the legal processes set up by Congress and DHS for immigrants to seek status in this country.

24. Pending the adjudication of this Petition, Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI further seeks an order restraining the Respondents from transferring her to a location outside of the State of Minnesota, so that she may remain within the jurisdiction of this Court and accessible to her legal counsel and family support networks.

STANDARD OF LAW

25. Courts have long recognized the significance of the habeas statute in protecting individuals from unlawful detention. The "Great Writ" has been referred to

by US Courts as “perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law of England, affording as it does a swift and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or confinement.” *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963) (emphasis added). A petitioner may seek a writ of habeas corpus when their custody violates the US Constitution or a federal law. 28 U.S.C. § 22441(c)(3), which should be granted if the petitioner meets their burden of proof—a preponderance of evidence. *Aditya W. H. v. Trump*, 782 F. Supp. 3d 691, 703 (D. Minn. 2025).

26. The Court must grant a petition for writ of habeas corpus or issue an order to show cause to the respondents “forthwith,” unless the petitioner is not entitled to relief. 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If an order to show cause is issued, the Court must require respondents to file a return “within three days unless for good cause additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is allowed.” *Id.*

27. Detained immigrants petitioning under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 face no statutory exhaustion requirements. *Jose J.O.E. v. Bondi*, 797 F. Supp. 3d 957, 965 (D. Minn. 2025). Nor is a judicially imposed prudential exhaustion requirement appropriate where, as here: time is of the essence, facts are largely undisputed, and the parties’ disagreement is based on a legal conclusion. *Id.* at 967-68.

28. Other courts in the Eighth Circuit have similarly declined to require prudential exhaustion when evaluating a detained immigrant’s habeas corpus petition under similar circumstances—to address a question of statutory interpretation that does not require developing a factual record, and where the agency is demonstrably

unlikely to reverse its course. *Giron Reyes v. Lyons*, 2025 WL 2712427 at *3 (N.D. Iowa Sept. 23, 2025).

29. “[T]he Due Process Clause applies to all ‘persons’ within the United States, including [immigrants], whether their presence here is lawful, unlawful, temporary, or permanent.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001).

30. In July of 2025, Respondent DHS began ignoring the decades-long consensus of how 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) should be interpreted, which the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) articulated in a subsequent ruling. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA Sept. 5, 2025). Respondents suddenly claim that individuals who have been residing within the United States for more than two years are somehow “seeking admission,” simply because they may have pending claims for asylum or other forms of status.

31. However, this Court and the majority around the country have made clear that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) only authorizes detention for noncitizens who are at the border seeking physical entry at the time of detention, not those who have lived within the United States for more than two years, and whose detention is discretionary and governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). *Eliseo A.A. v. Olson*, Civ. No. 25-3381 (JWB/DJF), 2025 WL 2886729 (D. Minn. Oct. 8, 2025); *Mayamu K. v. Bondi*, Civ. No. 25-3035 (JWB/LIB), 2025 WL 3641819 (D. Minn. Oct. 20, 2025); *Khalid B.Q. v. Bondi*, Civ. No. 25-4584 (JWB/DJF), Doc. No. 10 (D. Minn. Dec. 18, 2025); *Xuseen A. v. Bondi*, Civ. No. 25-4514 (JWB/DJF), Doc. No. 16 (D. Minn. Dec. 19, 2025);

Vedat C. v. Bondi, Civ. No. 25-4642 (JWB/DJF), Doc. No. 9 (D. Minn. Dec. 19, 2025).

32. Only under certain circumstances are immigrants subject to ongoing detention without a bond hearing. *See, e.g.*, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c) (individuals with certain criminal convictions may be detained without a bond hearing for the pendency of removal proceedings¹) and 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(iii)(IV) (authorizing mandatory detention of immigrants in expedited removal proceedings).

33. Otherwise, the “default rule” is that detention of immigrants already present in the United States and subject to pending removal proceedings is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and its implementing regulations. *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 303 (2018).

34. Under this default rule, detained immigrants are constitutionally entitled to a bond hearing. *R.E. v. Bondi*, No. 25-CV-3946 (NEB/DLM), 2025 WL 3146312 (D. Minn. Nov. 4, 2025). *See also Mayamu K. v. Bondi*, No. 25-3035 (JWB/LIB), 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 260661 (D. Minn. Oct. 20, 2025) (holding that an immigrant detained after entry while in asylum proceedings should be held pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), and that the recent DHS policy attempting to reclassify interior arrests

¹ Even when detained under 1226(c), immigrants retain due process rights and are entitled to a hearing if the period of detention becomes unreasonable. *See, e.g., Pedro O v. Garland*, 543 F.Supp.3d 733 (D. Minn. 2021) (finding a year-long mandatory detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c) without an individualized hearing to violate an immigrant’s due process rights).

under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) so as to hold asylum seekers without a bond hearing is unlawful and unconstitutional).

35. Petitioner has no disqualifying criminal record, has been in the United States for well over two years, and was apprehended within the United States, not at a border while seeking entry. Respondents wrongly assert 8 U.S.C. 1225(b) as a basis for detaining Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI without a hearing, when instead her detention could only be pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1226.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT ONE

Fifth Amendment Due Process

Petitioner is being deprived of an adequate and meaningful process to challenge his ongoing confinement.

36. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained above.

37. Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI has due process rights as a resident of the United States. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001).

38. Federal courts use the three-part test in *Mathews v. Eldridge* to determine whether civil detention violates a detainee's due process rights. 424 U.S. 319 (1976). The elements of this test are: (1) the private interest that the official action affects; (2) the risk that the procedures used will result in an erroneous deprivation of the private interest, and the probable value, if any, of additional or substitute procedural safeguards; and (3) the Government's interest in following the existing procedures,

both in achieving their objectives and in the potential burdens of an alternate procedure. *Id.* at 335.

39. Here, all three factors favor the petitioner.

40. First, Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI has a significant private interest at stake. A person's interest in freedom from physical detention is "the most elemental of liberty interests." *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507, 529, 124 S.Ct. 2633, 159 L.Ed.2d 578 (2004); see also *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690, 121 S.Ct. 2491 ("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."). Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI currently experiences the gambit of deprivations that come with physical detention, including separation from her family and her community, and inhibitions to participate fully in his pending immigration proceedings.

41. Second, Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI will continue to be deprived of this interest if the current procedure (detaining Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI without a legal basis) is followed. With her negligible criminal record there is no rational explanation for detaining Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI. Even if she were detained properly under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), he has a strong likelihood of meeting the criteria for being released on bond. 8 CFR §§236.1(c)(8), 1236.1(c)(8) (2020); *In re Adeniji*, 22 I. & N. Dec. 1102, 1113 (BIA 1999).

42. Lastly, the Government has no legitimate interest in refusing to follow its own rules. Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI poses no safety threats to the

community. Releasing her, or holding a hearing to release her on bond, would in fact *save* the government the resources and expense of continuing to imprison her.

43. The placement of Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI in detention pending the resolution of her immigration proceedings violates Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI's constitutional rights to due process guaranteed in the Fifth Amendment.

COUNT TWO

Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1226

Petitioner's Ongoing Detention, without the Opportunity for a Bond Hearing, Violates her Statutory Right to a Hearing as Guaranteed by 8 U.S.C. § 1226

44. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above.

45. Respondents violate the Immigration and Nationality Act by attempting to apply mandatory detention through 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), to Petitioner.

46. Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI is detained, notwithstanding her continuous presence in the United States for far more than the last two years without being afforded an opportunity to advocate for his release back into her community as the law requires.

COUNT THREE

Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 706

Detaining Petitioner Pursuant to an Unlawful Interpretation of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) violates the Administrative Procedure Act

47. Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI re-alleges and incorporates by reference each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.

48. The APA provides that a “reviewing court shall . . . hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be . . . arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

49. The APA provides that a “reviewing court shall . . . hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be . . . without observance of procedure required by law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(D).

50. The mandatory detention provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to all noncitizens residing in the United States who are subject to the grounds of inadmissibility. As relevant here, it does not apply to those who previously entered the country and have been residing in the United States prior to being apprehended and placed in removal proceedings by Respondents. Such noncitizens could properly be detained under § 1226(a), but would then be eligible for release on bond unless they are subject to § 1225(b)(1), § 1226(c), or § 1231.

51. Nonetheless, the Board has adopted a policy and practice of applying § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner and others in the same position.

52. Respondents through its recent administrative decision failed to articulate any reasoned explanations for new interpretation of the Act. The Board’s decision represents a change in the agencies’ policies and positions that negates the plain language of the Act, the will of Congress, and decades of administrative precedent.

53. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI is arbitrary, capricious, and not in accordance with law, and as such, it violates the APA. See 5 U.S.C. § 706(2).

REMEDY

54. An available remedy for Respondents' unlawful conduct as outlined in this complaint is for Petitioner to be released.

55. Immigration detention is civil in nature, and as a result Congress must have expressly authorized it by statute, and the detention must be reasonably related to its statutory purpose. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 687, 690 (2001) (quoting *Jackson v. Indiana*, 406 U.S. 715, 738 (1972)).

56. A noncitizen seeking only to challenge the legality of their detention, not the substance of their removal proceedings in immigration court, may properly ask a federal court to find jurisdiction over such a request pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. See, e.g., *Mohammed H. v. Trump*, 786 F. Supp. 3d 1149, 1154–55 (D. Minn. 2025).

57. Since Section 1225 does not apply to noncitizens who are in Petitioner's situation—who have been detained while residing within the United States for more than two years, as opposed to those who are detained while in the process of physically entering the United States, the law that Respondents are using to detain Petitioner simply does not apply so as to authorize Petitioner's detention. See *Eliseo A.A. v. Olson*, Civ. No. 25-3381 (JWB/DJF), 2025 WL 2886729 (D. Minn. Oct. 8, 2025); *Mayamu K. v. Bondi*, Civ. No. 25-3035 (JWB/LIB), 2025 WL 3641819 (D.

Minn. Oct. 20, 2025); *Khalid B.Q. v. Bondi*, Civ. No. 25-4584 (JWB/DJF), Doc. No. 10 (D. Minn. Dec. 18, 2025); *Xuseen A. v. Bondi*, Civ. No. 25-4514 (JWB/DJF), Doc. No. 16 (D. Minn. Dec. 19, 2025); *Vedat C. v. Bondi*, Civ. No. 25-4642 (JWB/DJF), Doc. No. 9 (D. Minn. Dec. 19, 2025).

58. When a habeas petitioner's detention is without legal basis, the typical remedy is release. *Munaf v. Geren*, 553 U.S. 674, 693 (2008) (describing release as the "typical remedy" for "unlawful executive detention").

59. Respondents will no doubt argue, as they have in similar cases before this Court, that if the Court rules that Petitioner should have been detained pursuant to § 1226, instead of § 1225, then the remedy is a bond hearing as opposed to outright release. *See, e.g., Ahmed A.* Civ. No. 25-4776, Doc. No. 9, at 9-10. However, this Court rejected this argument, saying that:

[A] bond hearing presupposes lawful detention authority under § 1226. Where that authority has not been invoked or established, ordering a bond hearing would treat the absence of statutory authority as a mere procedural irregularity rather than a substantive defect ... Where the record shows Respondents have not identified a valid statutory basis for detention in the first place, the remedy is not to supply one through further proceedings.

Id. at Doc. No. 10 at 6.

60. Here, where detention is unlawfully based on 8 U.S.C. 1225, which does not apply to Petitioner, release is an appropriate remedy.

REQUEST FOR ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

61. Within three days, unless good cause for a delay is shown, "[a] court, justice or judge entering a writ of habeas corpus shall forthwith award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be

granted, unless it appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled thereto.” 28 U.S.C. § 2243.

62. Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI respectfully requests that the Court issue an Order to Show Cause directing Respondents to file a return within three days of the Court’s order, showing cause, if any, why a writ of habeas corpus should not be granted.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Ms. CHASIPANTA LLANGARI prays that this Court grant the following relief;

- (1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- (2) Enjoin Respondents from transferring Petitioner out of the District of Minnesota pending the duration of these proceedings;
- (3) Issue an Order requiring Respondents to show cause as to why Petitioner should not be released immediately, or in the alternative afforded a bond hearing;
- (4) Alternatively, issue a writ of habeas corpus requiring Respondents to release Petitioner unless they provide a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven days; and
- (5) Grant any other and further relief that this Court may deem just and proper.

Date: January 14, 2026

//s//
Claire Nicole Glenn (she/her)

Staff Attorney
Climate Defense Project
P.O. Box 7040
Minneapolis, MN 55407
651-343-4816
claire@climatedefenseproject.org

~ ~ ~

District of Columbia License No. 888242412
Maryland License No. 1902280002
Minnesota License No. 0402443

Attorney for Petitioner

Verification
Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2242

I am Petitioner's attorney and submit this verification on his behalf. I hereby verify that the factual statements made in the foregoing Verified Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, which knowledge comes from conversations with Petitioner's husband during the preparation of this filing.

Date: January 14, 2026

_____/s/_____
Claire Nicole Glenn (she/her)
Staff Attorney
Climate Defense Project
P.O. Box 7040
Minneapolis, MN 55407
651-343-4816
claire@climatedefenseproject.org

~ ~ ~
District of Columbia License No. 888242412
Maryland License No. 1902280002
Minnesota License No. 0402443

Attorney for Petitioner