

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
EL PASO DIVISION**

**RONNY LENIN VEGA DUTAN,
PETITIONER,**

V.

**ERICA ESTRADA, ET. AL.
RESPONDENTS.**

NO. 3:26-CV-00132-KC

**RESPONSE TO HABEAS PETITION AND
COURT'S SHOW CAUSE ORDER ECF DOC. NO. 3**

STATEMENT OF ISSUES

1. Whether Respondents have shown that they have done sufficient steps to effectuate Petitioners removal.

Respondents submit this response directing service and ordering a response. In his petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, Petitioner, seeks release from civil immigration detention, claiming that his detention has become unreasonably prolonged, contrary to statute and the Due Process Clause. *See* ECF No. 1. Petitioner's claims lack merit, and this petition should be denied.

Despite his argument that there is no basis for his continued detention, Petitioner is an Ecuador citizen. Ex. A (ERO Declaration) ¶ 5; *see also* 1231(a)(6); *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 701 (2001). Petitioner argues his continued detention is baseless and violates his substantive and procedural rights under the Constitution's Fifth Amendment. ECF No. 2 at ¶¶31-35. He also claims that removal is not likely. ECF Doc. ¶ 13. These arguments are insufficient reason to believe that removal is unlikely in the foreseeable future, which means the burden of proof does not shift to ICE to show the likelihood of removal. *See Andrade v. Gonzales*, 459 F.3d 538, 543–44 (5th Cir. 2006); *Gonzalez v. Gills*, No. 20-60547, 2022 WL 1056099 at 1 (5th Cir. Apr. 8, 2022). Even if the burden has so shifted, Respondents can show that removal to a third country, in fact, likely in the reasonably foreseeable future. For these reasons, the Court should deny this habeas petition.

I. Facts and Procedural History

Petitioner Ronny Lenin Vega Dutan is a citizen of Ecuador who entered the United States on or about October 17, 2023, without inspection or admission near the Ysleta Port of Entry in El Paso, Texas. Ex. A, ¶¶ 5-6. Border Patrol agents encountered Petitioner after receiving an anonymous report that individuals had crossed unlawfully through the outbound pedestrian area. *Id.* ¶ 7. Petitioner was determined to be unlawfully present and expressed a fear of return to Ecuador. *Id.* ¶¶ 9-12. He was subsequently prosecuted for attempting illegal entry by eluding an

immigration officer, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(2), pleaded guilty, and was sentenced to time served. Petitioner was taken into ICE custody on October 31, 2023. *Id.* ¶ 10.

In removal proceedings, an Immigration Judge denied Petitioner's applications for asylum and withholding of removal but granted deferral of removal under the Convention Against Torture to Ecuador. *Id.* ¶¶ 12-15. The Immigration Judge ordered Petitioner removed from the United States to any country other than Ecuador. *Id.* ¶ 14. The Board of Immigration Appeals upheld the grant of CAT relief on January 31, 2025. *Id.* ¶ 15.

Since entry of the final order, ICE has undertaken continuous and ongoing efforts to effectuate Petitioner's removal, including submitting multiple requests for acceptance to third countries and coordinating with foreign consulates and the Department of State. *Id.* ¶¶ 16-38. Requests for acceptance were submitted to El Salvador, Guatemala, Costa Rica, Mexico, and Chile. *Id.* Several countries denied acceptance or required additional review. *Id.* Petitioner also expressed fear of removal to Mexico, which further delayed removal efforts. *Id.* ¶ 19.

Any delay in Petitioner's removal is attributable to the legal restrictions imposed by the CAT order and the practical necessity of securing third-country acceptance, not a lack of diligence by ICE. *Id.* ¶¶ 16-38. ICE remains actively engaged in efforts to remove Petitioner in compliance with the governing removal order and applicable law. *Id.*

II. Detention Is Lawful Under 8 U.S.C. §1231(a)(6).

Petitioner's detention is lawful. The authority to detain aliens after the entry of a final order of removal is set forth in 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a). That statute affords ICE a 90-day mandatory detention period within which to remove the alien from the United States following the entry of the final order. 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(2). The 90-day removal period begins on the latest of three dates: the

date (1) the order becomes “administratively final,” (2) a court issues a final order in a stay of removal, or (3) the alien is released from non-immigration custody. 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(1)(B).

Not all removals can be accomplished in 90 days, and certain aliens may be detained beyond the 90-day removal period. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 701. Under §1231, the removal period can be extended in a least three circumstances. *See Glushchenko v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, 566 F.Supp.3d 693, 703 (W.D. Tex. 2021). Extension is warranted, for example, if the alien presents a flight risk or other risk to the community. *Id.*; *see also* 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(1)(C); (a)(6). An alien may be held in confinement until there is “no significant likelihood of removal in a reasonably foreseeable future.” *Zadvydas*, at 533 U.S. at 680.

a. There Is No Good Reason to Believe That Removal is Unlikely in the Reasonably Foreseeable Future.

Petitioner cannot show “good reason” to believe that removal to a third country is unlikely in the reasonably foreseeable future. In *Zadvydas*, the U.S. Supreme Court held that § 1231(a)(6) “read in light of the Constitution’s demands, limits an alien’s post-removal-period detention to a period reasonably necessary to bring about that alien’s removal from the United States” but “does not permit indefinite detention.” 533 U.S. at 689. “[O]nce removal is no longer reasonably foreseeable, continued detention is no longer authorized by the statute.” *Id.* at 699. The Court designated six months as a presumptively reasonable period of post-order detention but made clear that the presumption “does not mean that every alien not removed must be released after six months.” *Id.* at 701.

Once the alien establishes that he has been in post-order custody for more than six months at the time the habeas petition is filed, the alien must provide a “good reason” to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future. *See Andrade v. Gonzales*, 459 F.3d 538, 543–44 (5th Cir. 2006); *Gonzalez v. Gills*, No. 20–60547, 2022 WL

1056099 at *1 (5th Cir. Apr. 8, 2022). Unless the alien establishes the requisite “good reason,” the burden will not shift to the government to prove otherwise. *Id.*

The “reasonably foreseeable future” is not a static concept; it is fluid and country-specific, depending in large part on country conditions and diplomatic relations. *Ali v. Johnson*, No. 3:21-CV-00050-M, 2021 WL 4897659 at *3 (N.D. Tex. Sept. 24, 2021). Additionally, a lack of visible progress in the removal process does not satisfy the petitioner’s burden of showing that there is no significant likelihood of removal. *Id.* at *2 (collecting cases); *see also Idowu v. Ridge*, No. 3:03-CV-1293-R, 2003 WL 21805198, at *4 (N.D. Tex. Aug. 4, 2003). Conclusory allegations are also insufficient to meet the alien’s burden of proof. *Nagib v. Gonzales*, No. 3:06-CV-0294-G, 2006 WL 1499682, at *3 (N.D. Tex. May 31, 2006) (citing *Gonzalez v. Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement*, No. 1:03-CV-178-C, 2004 WL 839654 (N.D. Tex. Apr. 20, 2004)). One court explained:

To carry his burden, [the] petitioner must present something beyond speculation and conjecture. To shift the burden to the government, [the] petitioner must demonstrate that “the circumstances of his status” or the existence of “particular individual barriers to his repatriation” to his country of origin are such that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future.

Idowu, 2003 WL 21805198, at *4 (citation omitted).

Petitioner’s removal order has been final since January 31, 2025. Exh. A at ¶ 15; *see* 8 C.F.R. § 241.1; 1241.1(a). Petitioner, nonetheless, urges this Court to order that his continued detention pending removal is contrary to his substantive and procedural rights. Beyond these conclusory allegations, Petitioner fails to allege any reason, much less a “good reason,” to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the foreseeable future. These claims are wholly insufficient under *Zadvydas*. *See Nogales v. Dept. of Homeland Sec.*, No. 21-10236, 2022 WL 851738 at *1 (5th Cir. Mar. 22, 2022) (citing *Rice v. Gonzalez*, 985 F.3d 1069, 1070 (5th Cir.

2021)); *Akbar v. Barr*, SA-20-CV-01132-FB, 2021 WL 1345530 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 5, 2021); *see also Andrade*, 459 F.3d at 543–44; *Boroky v. Holder*, No. 3:14-CV-2040-L-BK, 2014 WL 6809180, at *3 (N.D. Tex. Dec. 3, 2014).

As such, even applying the prior interpretation of the detention authority at issue here, Petitioner cannot meet his burden to establish no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future. *See Thanh v. Johnson*, No. EP-15-CV-403-PRM, 2016 WL 5171779, at *4 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 11, 2016) (denying habeas relief where government was taking affirmative steps to obtain Vietnamese travel documents). The burden of proof, therefore, does not shift to Respondents to prove that removal is likely.

Even if the burden did shift to ICE in this analysis, ICE could show that removal is likely in the foreseeable future. *See* Exh. A at ¶¶ 36-37.

As such, removal is likely in the reasonably foreseeable future, and his continued detention is lawful. Petitioner's substantive due process claim fails and should be denied.

b. ICE Has Afforded Petitioner Procedural Due Process.

To establish a procedural due process violation, Petitioner must show that he was deprived of liberty without adequate safeguards. *See Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 332 (1976); *Daniels v. Williams*, 474 U.S. 327, 331 (1986). The Fifth Circuit has not provided guidance to lower courts, post-*Arteaga-Martinez*, on the appropriate standard for reviewing a procedural due process claim alleged by an alien detained under § 1231, but the Fourth Circuit, post-*Arteaga-Martinez*, used the *Zadvydas* framework to analyze a post-order-custody alien's due process claims. *See Linares v. Collins*, 1:25-CV-00584-RP-DH, ECF No. 14 at 10–14 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 12, 2025) (discussing *Johnson v. Arteaga-Martinez*, 596 U.S. 573 (2022) and *Castaneda v. Perry*, 95 F.4th 750, 760 (4th Cir. 2024)). To the extent this Court finds that any additional analysis is

required beyond the constitutional analysis outlined in *Jennings* and *Thuraiissigiam*, *supra*, this Court may look to *Zadvydas* to review the procedural claim at issue here. *Id.*

Additionally, the Fifth Circuit finds no procedural due process violation where the constitutional minima of due process is otherwise met. *Murphy v. Collins*, 26 F.3d 541, 543 (5th Cir. 1994). Even if the Court were to find a procedural due process violation here, the remedy is substitute process. *Mohammad v. Lynch*, No. EP-16-CV-28-PRM, 2016 WL 8674354, at *6 n.6 (W.D. Tex. May 24, 2016) (finding no merit to petitioner's procedural due process claim where the evidence demonstrated that the review had already occurred, thereby redressing any delay in the provision of the 90-day and 180-day custody reviews). Even in the criminal context, failure to comply with statutory or regulatory time limits does not mandate release of a person who should otherwise be detained. *U.S. v. Montalvo-Murillo*, 495 U.S. 711, 722 (1990).

As an applicant for admission, Petitioner has received the maximum process afforded by Congress under the statutes, to include placement in “removal proceedings before an immigration judge. Such process included notice and an opportunity to be heard, including judicial review through the appellate court. This process addresses constitutional concerns that were identified in *Zadvydas*, allowing the alien notice and opportunity to be heard regarding continued detention pending removal. *See, e.g.*, 8 C.F.R. § 241.13. This process comports with Petitioner’s limited due process rights as an applicant for admission subject to a final order of removal. Petitioner’s procedural due process claim, like his substantive one, should be denied.

III. Conclusion

Petitioner’s continued detention is mandatory under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6), detention here would be considered lawful. Petitioner fails to show good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal to a third country in the reasonably foreseeable future. As such,

the burden has not shifted to ICE to show the opposite. Even if the burden had shifted, ICE could establish that removal is foreseeable. Additionally, ICE has afforded Petitioner procedural due process through his mandatory detention, including post-order custody reviews. Petitioner's continued detention, therefore, is comports with the law and with due process. It is not unreasonably prolonged, nor is it in violation of the INA or the Constitution. Accordingly, the Court should deny this petition.

Respectfully submitted,

JUSTIN R. SIMMONS
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

By: /s/ Adrian Acosta
ADRIAN ACOSTA
Assistant U.S. Attorney
Texas Bar #24097275
700 E. San Antonio, Suite 200
El Paso, Texas 79901
(915) 534-6884