

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

M.S.V.I., a minor child, by and through his
parent and next friend J.M.V.M.,

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. 0:26-cv-419

**MOTION FOR ORDER
TO SHOW CAUSE**

Expedited Handling Requested

Petitioner is a minor child who was taken without a warrant or legal justification by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) at approximately 5:30 P.M. on Friday, January 16, 2026, while he was on his way to pick up dinner for his family, and whom has been detained at an undisclosed location since. *See* Verified Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (“Habeas Pet.”), Dkt. No. 1.

Despite pending claims in Immigration Court and having lived in the U.S. for more than two years and being encountered internally, while not seeking admission, ICE arrested

Petitioner with no notice or opportunity to be heard and no identifiable lawful reason, in violation of law. ICE further has taken Petitioner to an unknown detention facility where, upon information and belief, he has not been able to communicate with his counsel or family.

In this action, Petitioner accordingly challenges this detention as violative of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) and its implementing regulations, and the Administrative Procedures Act. *See generally* Habeas Pet., Dkt. No. 1. In This petition, Petitioners respectfully request that this Court order Respondents to immediately release Petitioner from custody. Petitioner further seeks injunctive relief against removal outside of the District of Minnesota or the United States without the process required by the U.S. Constitution, the INA and implementing regulations, and the FARRA and its implementing regulations. *Id.*

In the instant motion, Petitioner now respectfully moves the Court for expeditious resolution of his habeas petition to ensure that Respondents do not continue violating their constitutional, statutory, and regulatory rights.

First, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2243, Petitioner requests that the Court immediately issue an Order to Show Cause directing Respondents to file a return by a date certain of the Court’s order, showing cause, if any, why the writ of habeas corpus should not be granted. Petitioner respectfully requests that the time for Respondent’s return required by this Court not exceed three days.

Expeditious resolution is consistent with the purpose of habeas petitions. Habeas “is a swift and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or confinement.” *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963), *overruled on other grounds by Wainwright v. Sykes*, 433 U.S. 72 (1977). The requirement for an expeditious remedy is codified by statute. The federal habeas corpus statute provides that “[a] court, justice or judge entertaining 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.

Furthermore, expeditious consideration is particularly appropriate here because many federal opinions in this District have already addressed the legality of Respondents’ similar actions in other cases, finding that Respondents had or likely violated constitutional due process guarantees as well as statutory and regulatory requirements. *Ahmed A v. Bondi*, Case No. 25-4776 (JWB/DJF) (January 6, 2026); *Maldonado v. Olson*, 795 F. Supp. 3d 1134, 1142–48, 1150–52 (D. Minn. 2025); *Jose J.O.E. v. Bondi*, 797 F. Supp. 3d 957, 968–970 (D. Minn. 2025); *Mayamu K. v. Bondi*, Civ. No. 25-3035 (JWB/LIB), 2025 WL 3641819, at *7–8 (D. Minn. Oct. 20, 2025). This case presents similar considerations and is thus one that the Court can address on an expedited basis.

Second, consistent with this Court’s past practice in prior cases, Petitioners respectfully request that this Court enter an immediate order preventing their removal or transfer from the United States and the District of Minnesota while the petition is considered, to preserve this Court’s jurisdiction over their habeas claims. *See, e.g., Carmona-Lorenzo v. Trump et al.*, 25-cv-03172-JFB-RCC, Dkt. 3 (D. Neb. Aug. 19, 2025);

Lorenzo Perez v. Kramer, et al., No. 25-cv-03179-JFB-RCC, Dkt. 13 (D. Neb. Aug. 27, 2025); *Duenas Arce v. Trump, et al.*, No. 25-cv-00520-SMB-RCC, Dkt. 3 (D. Neb. Aug. 27, 2025).

Finally, minor child Petitioner requests an Order from this Court directing Respondents to immediately disclose to counsel the location of Petitioner's detention and promptly facilitate Petitioner's communication with counsel and his family, including his parent and next friend J.M.V.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 18, 2026

_____/s//Claire Nicole Glenn_____

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

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I certify that this motion contains 697 words in compliance with the Local Rules. I further certify that no generative artificial intelligence program was used in drafting this document.

Date: January 18, 2026

_____/s//Claire Nicole Glenn_____

Claire Nicole Glenn