

2. Petitioner was seized without a judicial warrant, without probable cause, and without lawful detention authority.
3. ICE asserts mandatory detention under INA §1225, relying on *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* to label Petitioner an “applicant for admission.”
4. That theory is statutorily incorrect, constitutionally infirm, and non-binding on this Court and the Fifth Circuit.
5. Because the arrest itself was unlawful, Petitioner seeks immediate injunctive relief and issuance of the writ.

II. JURISDICTION AND AUTHORITY

6. Jurisdiction lies under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
7. The Fifth Circuit recognizes habeas jurisdiction over challenges to the fact and legality of immigration detention, including constitutional claims. *See Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001); *Pierre v. United States*, 525 F.2d 933 (5th Cir. 1976).
8. This Court has authority to issue a TRO to halt ongoing constitutional violations. *See Opulent Life Church v. City of Holly Springs*, 697 F.3d 279, 295 (5th Cir. 2012).

III. STATEMENT OF FACTS

9. Petitioner is a thirty-six year old native of Tajikistan. He entered the U.S. on January 7, 2025 through Yuma, Arizona. He applied for asylum and withholding of removal in 2025 and his case is currently pending. He was living openly in the United States, complying with supervision, and pursuing pending asylum relief before USCIS.
10. Petitioner was released on an Order on Release on Recognizance, further proving that he is not an applicant for admission.
11. Petitioner was taken into custody by police on January 12, 2026 at 601 Brakke dr, Hudson, Wisconsin 54016 at the TA Travel Center then transferred to ICE custody
12. ICE arrested Petitioner without a judicial warrant and without alleging danger or flight risk.
13. Petitioner has no criminal history in the U.S., nor in Tajikistan. He is not a danger to the community nor a flight risk, given his willing compliance with U.S. immigration laws in having obtained lawful work authorization in the U.S. He also has an immediate family member who is a U.S. citizen, his brother, Sarvar Isokov.
14. ICE asserts detention authority solely under INA §1225 and Matter of Yajure Hurtado.

15. ICE has provided no bond hearing under INA §1226a and no neutral adjudication of detention authority.
16. She was initially detained and sent to Montgomery Processing Center but then transferred to Karnes County Detention Center in Karnes, City, Texas.

IV. LEGAL STANDARD FOR TRO

14. A TRO is warranted where the movant shows:

- likelihood of success on the merits,
- irreparable harm,
- balance of equities in the movant's favor,
- consistency with the public interest.

See Winter v. NRDC, 555 U.S. 7 (2008); *Opulent Life Church*, 697 F.3d at 295.

15. The Fifth Circuit holds that loss of liberty constitutes irreparable harm. *See Texas v. United States*, 809 F.3d 134, 155–56 (5th Cir. 2015).

V. LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS ON THE MERITS

A. Fourth Amendment — Unlawful Seizure

16. The Fourth Amendment applies to civil immigration arrests inside the United States.

17. Warrantless seizures are unreasonable absent probable cause and lawful statutory authority. *See United States v. Brignoni-Ponce*, 422 U.S. 873 (1975); *Melendres v. Arpaio*, 695 F.3d 990, 1000–01 (9th Cir. 2012).
18. The Fifth Circuit recognizes that civil detention unsupported by statutory authority violates the Fourth Amendment. *See Vega v. United States*, 881 F.3d 1146, 1153 (5th Cir. 2018).
19. Because INA §1225 does not apply, ICE lacked lawful authority—rendering the seizure per se unreasonable.

B. INA §1225 Does Not Apply to Interior Residents

20. Section 1225 governs inspection and detention of arriving aliens.
21. Congress separately addressed interior detention under INA §1226, confirming §1225's limited scope.
22. The Fifth Circuit has repeatedly distinguished arriving aliens from those already present in the United States. *See Gisbert v. U.S. Attorney General*, 988 F.2d 1437, 1441–42 (5th Cir. 1993).
23. Petitioner was not seeking admission and therefore cannot be detained under §1225.

C. Matter of Yajure Hurtado Is Not Binding

- 24. Yajure Hurtado is a BIA decision.
- 25. The Fifth Circuit holds that agency interpretations do not bind Article III courts, particularly where constitutional rights are implicated. *See Texas v. United States*, 787 F.3d 733, 749–50 (5th Cir. 2015).
- 26. No Fifth Circuit precedent adopts Yajure’s expansion of §1225 to interior arrests.
- 27. ICE cannot rely on a non-binding agency opinion to justify warrantless detention.

D. Fifth Amendment — Procedural and Substantive Due Process

- 28. Civil detention must be accompanied by meaningful process. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690; *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 138 S. Ct. 830 (2018).
- 29. The Fifth Circuit recognizes that prolonged detention without a hearing raises serious due-process concerns. *See Hernandez v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 42, 42–43 (5th Cir. 2005).
- 30. Detention based on an incorrect statutory classification is arbitrary and punitive, violating substantive due process.

VI. IRREPARABLE HARM

31. Each day of unlawful detention inflicts irreparable constitutional injury.
32. The Fifth Circuit recognizes that constitutional deprivations cannot be remedied by money damages. *See Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347, 373 (1976).

VII. BALANCE OF EQUITIES & PUBLIC INTEREST

33. The government has no legitimate interest in unlawful detention.
34. The Fifth Circuit holds that the public interest favors constitutional compliance. *See Jackson Women's Health Org. v. Currier*, 760 F.3d 448, 458 (5th Cir. 2014).

VIII. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

Petitioner respectfully requests that the Court:

- A. Grant a Temporary Restraining Order ordering immediate release;
- B. Enjoin Respondents from enforcing INA §1225 against Petitioner;
- C. Alternatively, order a bond hearing under INA §1226a within 7 days;
- D. Issue the writ of habeas corpus;
- E. Grant all other just relief.

VII. VERIFICATION

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Matthew Mendez

Matthew Mendez

Attorney for Petitioner

State Bar No. 24098092

6300 Gulfion Street

Houston, Texas 77081

Tel. (346) 205-4343

mat@mendezlawoffice.com

Attorney for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On January 26, 2026, Counsel for Plaintiff served a copy of the attached Petition via USPS Mail, in compliance with Rule 4 of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, upon the Respondent, Warden of the ERO EL PASO CAMP EAST MONTANTA, at the Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") 6920 Digital Road, El Paso, TX 79936.

/s/ Matthew Mendez

Matthew Mendez

Attorney for Petitioner

January 26, 2026

Date

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On January 26, 2026, Counsel for Plaintiff served a copy of the attached Petition via USPS Mail, in compliance with Rule 4 of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, upon the

Respondent, Mary De Anda-Ybarra, in her Official Capacity as Field Office Director, of ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations El Paso Field Office, and Respondent, Kristi Noem, in her Official Capacity as Director of U.S. Department of Homeland Security, at (1) Office of the Field Office Director, Enforcement and Removal Operations, El Paso Field Office 11541 Montana Ave. Suite E, El Paso, TX 79936

/s/ Matthew Mendez
Matthew Mendez
Attorney for Petitioner

January 26, 2026
Date

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On January 26, 2026, Counsel for Plaintiff served a copy of the attached Petition via email, in compliance with Rule 4 of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, upon the **Respondent, Pam Bondi, in her Official Capacity as Attorney General of the United States.** at usatxw.civil.immigration.notices@usdoj.gov

/s/ Matthew Mendez
Matthew Mendez

January 26, 2026
Date