

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

FILED

MAR 20 2026

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BY _____
DEPUTY CLERK

ISIDRO CAMPOS PADILLA,

A-Number: 

Petitioner,

v.

WARDEN OF THE SOUTH TEXAS ICE PROCESSING CENTER;
FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR,
ENFORCEMENT AND REMOVAL OPERATIONS,
SAN ANTONIO FIELD OFFICE,
U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT;
SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY;
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY;
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES;
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW,

Respondents.

Civil Action No. 5:26-CV-000105-FB

**PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION AND IMMEDIATE
RULING**

Petitioner, Isidro Campos Padilla, respectfully moves this Court for expedited consideration and for immediate ruling on his pending Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2241 and 28 U.S.C. §2243, and in support thereof states as follows:

1. Petitioner is currently detained at the South Texas ICE Processing Center in Pearsall, Texas, where he remains in immigration custody under a contested statutory classification.
2. Petitioner filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus challenging the legality of his continued detention under the Constitution and laws of the United States.
3. The Petition raises purely legal questions regarding statutory authority, constitutional limitations on detention, and the availability of habeas relief.
4. Respondents were provided a full and fair opportunity to respond to the Petition.
5. The Court granted Respondents thirty (30) days to file their response.
6. Respondents elected to utilize the entirety of that period and filed their response on the final day permitted by the Court.
7. Accordingly, Respondents had more than sufficient time to investigate, develop, and present any factual or legal basis supporting Petitioner's continued detention.
8. Despite that opportunity, Respondents failed to produce any evidence establishing that Petitioner was apprehended at or near the border.
9. Respondents did not provide any **record of entry, inspection documentation, biometric evidence, or other proof** demonstrating that Petitioner was processed as an arriving alien.
10. Respondents' submission consists primarily of legal conclusions and unsupported assertions regarding statutory classification.
11. The absence of evidentiary support confirms that Respondents failed to meet their burden to justify detention under **8 U.S.C. §1225(b)**.
12. No material facts are in dispute.
13. The issues before the Court are purely legal and fully briefed.
14. The record is now complete.
15. There is no need for additional briefing, supplemental filings, or further response from Respondents.
16. Any further delay would not aid the Court in resolving the issues presented.
17. Instead, delay would only prolong Petitioner's unlawful detention.

18. The Supreme Court has long recognized that habeas corpus is intended to provide a **swift and imperative remedy** in cases of unlawful confinement. See **Fay v. Noia, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963)**.
19. Under **28 U.S.C. §2243**, this Court is directed to **summarily hear and determine the facts and dispose of the matter as law and justice require**.
20. The statutory command of §2243 reflects Congress's intent that habeas petitions be resolved without unnecessary delay.
21. Petitioner has now been detained for **183 days**, from September 16, 2025, to March 18, 2026.
22. This period of detention has already **far exceeded the bounds of brief or initial detention** and constitutes **prolonged detention as a matter of law**.
23. Petitioner's confinement has now extended beyond six months and is approaching seven months without any meaningful review of the legality of his detention.
24. Continued detention under these circumstances raises serious constitutional concerns under the **Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment**.
25. Continued delay by the Court would further extend an already prolonged and unlawful deprivation of liberty.
26. Because Respondents have already presented their position and failed to meet their burden, there is no procedural justification for withholding a ruling.
27. This case is ripe for immediate adjudication.
28. Courts routinely resolve habeas petitions without further proceedings where the material facts are undisputed and only legal questions remain.
29. Immediate adjudication is particularly appropriate where, as here, the government has already had a full opportunity to respond and has failed to provide evidentiary support for continued detention.
30. Petitioner respectfully submits that further delay would constitute an unnecessary extension of an unlawful deprivation of liberty.
31. Accordingly, expedited consideration and immediate ruling are warranted.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court:

- a. Grant expedited consideration of the pending Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus;
- b. Determine that the record is complete and that no further briefing is necessary;
- c. Issue an immediate ruling on the merits of the Petition; and
- d. Grant such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

VERIFICATION

I, Isidro Campos Padilla, hereby declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1746 that I am the Petitioner in the above-entitled action, that I have read the foregoing Petitioner's Reply in Support of Habeas Corpus and Request for Immediate Adjudication, and that the facts stated therein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Executed on this 18 day of March, 2026.

Isidro Campos P
Isidro Campos Padilla
A-Number: 

South Texas ICE Processing Center
566 Veterans Drive
Pearsall, Texas 78061