



1 appear remotely via Zoom. Respondents oppose submission of the motion on the papers  
2 without oral argument, but are amenable to oral argument proceeding remotely.  
3 Respondents propose filing a status report on February 4, 2026, at 12:00 p.m. Alaska time;  
4  
5 Petitioner accepts that deadline for the status report and requests the limited protections  
6 described below if material new information arises after the status report is filed.

7 This motion is made pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 78(b), Fed. R. Civ. P. 43(a), Local  
8 Civil Rule 7.3(i), Local Civil Rule 7.1(f), and the Court's inherent authority to manage its  
9 proceedings.  
10

#### 11 **I. RELIEF REQUESTED**

- 12  
13 1. Permit Petitioner's counsel to appear by video conference (Zoom) at the February 5,  
14 2026 preliminary injunction hearing pursuant to Local Civil Rule 7.3(i) and Fed. R. Civ.  
15 P. 43(a);
- 16  
17 2. Alternatively, if the Court determines oral argument is unnecessary, decide the pending  
18 preliminary-injunction motion on the papers pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 78(b) and Local  
19 Civil Rule 7.1(f);
- 20  
21 3. Order Respondents to file and serve a short written status report (supported by  
22 declaration if appropriate) by February 4, 2026, at 12:00 p.m. Alaska time, limited to the  
23 items listed in Section IV.C; and
- 24  
25 4. Provide that if Respondents intend to rely at the February 5 hearing on material evidence  
26 or developments not disclosed in the February 4 status report, the Court will either: (i)  
27 grant Petitioner leave to file a short supplemental response (e.g., up to two pages) within  
28 24 hours of the new disclosure; or (ii) continue the hearing to permit orderly briefing.

1 **II. BACKGROUND**

2  
3 On January 27, 2026, the Court entered a temporary restraining order preserving the  
4 status quo and set a preliminary injunction hearing for February 5, 2026, at 3:15 p.m. in  
5 Anchorage. Petitioner seeks to proceed on the Court's schedule without delay.

6 Undersigned counsel has a previously scheduled, in-person master calendar hearing  
7 at the Seattle Immigration Court on February 4, 2026. Because of the timing and distance,  
8 counsel cannot reasonably complete the Seattle appearance and then travel to Anchorage for  
9 an in-person hearing the following day. Remote participation will allow the Court to  
10 maintain its schedule without prejudice to Respondents.  
11

12  
13 Petitioner also requests a brief pre-hearing status report concerning the current  
14 posture of any travel-document request and removal-planning steps. These issues are central  
15 to the preliminary injunction analysis and can evolve quickly. A date-certain written update  
16 will assist the Court and reduce the risk of last-minute factual disputes at the hearing.  
17

18 **III. LEGAL STANDARD**

19  
20 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 78(b) authorizes courts to provide for submitting and  
21 determining motions on briefs without oral hearings. Local Civil Rule 7.1(f) likewise  
22 provides that oral argument is discretionary. Local Civil Rule 7.3(i) provides a mechanism  
23 for requesting telephonic or video participation, and Fed. R. Civ. P. 43(a) permits testimony  
24 or participation by contemporaneous transmission for good cause in compelling  
25 circumstances.  
26

27 District courts also possess inherent authority to manage their dockets and  
28 proceedings to ensure fair and efficient adjudication, including by entering limited case-

1 management orders that prevent unfair surprise and allow the parties to address material  
2 developments in an orderly manner.

3  
4 **IV. ARGUMENT**

5 **A. Remote appearance is warranted and will avoid unnecessary delay.**

6 Good cause exists to permit counsel to appear remotely. Counsel's unavoidable, in-  
7 person Seattle Immigration Court hearing on February 4, 2026 makes next-day travel to  
8 Anchorage impracticable. Remote appearance will conserve judicial resources, avoid delay,  
9 and allow the Court to proceed on the hearing date it has already set.

10  
11 Respondents do not oppose Petitioner's request to proceed by Zoom. Remote  
12 participation will not prejudice Respondents, who will have the same opportunity to present  
13 argument and respond to the Court's questions.

14  
15 **B. Alternatively, the Court may decide the motion on the papers under Rule 78(b).**

16 If the Court determines that oral argument is unnecessary, Petitioner respectfully  
17 requests, in the alternative, that the Court decide the pending preliminary injunction motion  
18 on the papers pursuant to Rule 78(b). Under Local Civil Rule 7.1(f), oral argument is  
19 discretionary, and the Court may resolve the motion on the existing record and briefing or  
20 request any supplemental information it deems necessary.

21  
22  
23 **C. A limited, pre-hearing status report will preserve a fair and current PI record.**

24 A narrow status report requirement is appropriate because developments relating to  
25 travel-document requests and removal logistics are central to the preliminary injunction  
26 issues, including likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future and irreparable  
27 harm. A date-certain written update will provide the Court with an accurate snapshot and  
28

1 reduce the risk that either party is forced to litigate material new facts for the first time at  
2 oral argument.

3 Petitioner therefore requests that Respondents file and serve a short status report by  
4 February 4, 2026, at 12:00 p.m. Alaska time, addressing only the following:  
5

- 6 • Whether any request for Vietnamese travel documents has been submitted on Petitioner's  
7 behalf; if so, the date of submission and the channel/method used;
- 8 • The current status of that request (e.g., pending, additional information requested, travel  
9 document issued), including the date of any response or request for additional  
10 information, if any;
- 11 • Any concrete removal-planning steps currently scheduled (e.g., whether transport or  
12 flights have been scheduled), without disclosure of sensitive security details; and  
13
- 14 • Whether Respondents contend removal is significantly likely in the reasonably  
15 foreseeable future, and the factual basis for that contention as of the date of the report.  
16

17 Finally, to avoid unfair surprise, if material new developments arise after the  
18 February 4 status report (or if Respondents intend to rely on material information not  
19 disclosed in that report), Petitioner requests that the Court either allow Petitioner to file a  
20 short supplemental response within 24 hours of disclosure or continue the hearing as needed  
21 to permit orderly briefing. This request is narrowly tailored to preserve the integrity of the  
22 preliminary injunction record and does not seek merits-based relief or expanded discovery.  
23  
24

## 25 **V. CONCLUSION**

26 For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner respectfully requests that the Court grant the relief set  
27 forth above.  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

DATED: January 30, 2026

Respectfully submitted,  
*/s/ Daniel M Huynh*  
Daniel M Huynh, Esq.  
Counsel for Petitioner

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on January 30, 2026, I caused the foregoing motion to be filed with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notice of electronic filing to all counsel of record.

Respectfully submitted,  
*/s/ Daniel M Huynh*  
Daniel M Huynh, Esq.  
Counsel for Petitioner