

Carmen Di Amore-Siah (HI 5035)
820 S. Beretania St. Suite 200
Honolulu, HI 96813
Tel: 808-531-2277
Local Counsel for Petitioner/Plaintiff

John M. Bray
911 N. Bishop Ave.
Dallas, TX 75208
Tel: (855) 566-2729
Pro Hac Vice Application Forthcoming

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

JORGE LUIS SILVA-HUETE,

Petitioner,

v.

KRISTI NOEM, in her official capacity as
Secretary of the Department of Homeland
Security;
TODD LYONS, in his official capacity as
Acting Director of U.S. Immigration and
Customs Enforcement;
DAREN K. MARGOLIN, Director, Executive
Office for Immigration Review, in his official
capacity;
ACTING DIRECTOR, Honolulu Field Office
of ICE, Enforcement and Removal Operations;
and
ESTELA DERR, Warden, Honolulu Federal
Detention Center,


Respondents.

Civil Action No.: _____

Immigration No. A 

**PETITIONER'S ORIGINAL
VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS UNDER 28 U.S.C.
§ 2241 AND REQUEST
FOR DECLARATORY AND
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner JORGE LUIS SILVA-HUETE (A# ) is a native and citizen of Nicaragua who has resided in the United States for many years, most recently in the San Francisco Bay Region of California. He remains detained in ICE custody at the Honolulu Federal Detention Center. *See* Ex. A, Proof of Detention in ICE Custody.

2. Mr. Silva-Huete was previously placed into removal proceedings under INA § 240, 8 U.S.C. § 1229a, following his entry into the United States, but most recently, he was arrested by ICE officers near the USCIS Field Office in San Francisco, California. *See* Ex. B, Notice to Appear. As such, he has now been detained for six months.

3. On November 20, 2025, after being transferred to the ICE detention facility in Honolulu, Hawaii, Mr. Silva-Huete was granted an application for a withholding of Removal under INA § 241 (b)(3), by Immigration Judge Clarence Wagner at the Hawaii Immigration Court. EOIR records reflect that this decision is administratively final, as DHS did not appeal this decision. *See* Ex. D, EOIR Automated Case Information System.

4. Despite this posture, Mr. Silva-Huete remains in custody at the ICE Detention Facility in Honolulu, as he was never released following his grant of Withholding of Removal on November 20, 2025. *See* Ex. A,

Proof of Detention in ICE Custody.

5. Because removal is now legally barred under INA § 241(b)(3), ICE lacks statutory authority to detain Petitioner for purposes of removal.

Continued detention is ultra vires and violates both the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

6. Mr. Silva-Huete therefore petitions this Court for habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, and seeks immediate injunctive relief, including a Temporary Restraining Order (“TRO”) directing Respondents to immediately release petitioner, declaratory relief stating that detention is unlawful, an injunction barring removal or transfer absent Court approval, and any other relief the court deems appropriate.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question) and the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201–2202. This Court also has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, which grants federal district courts authority to hear habeas petitions filed by persons held in custody in violation of federal law or the Constitution. This action also invokes the Court’s authority under the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

8. The jurisdiction-stripping provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1252 do not bar this suit.

Petitioner does not challenge a final order of removal, nor seek classwide relief. Detention-based habeas claims are not channeled by Section 1252(b)(9). *See Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 138 S. Ct. 830, 839–42 (2018). Section 1252(g) is narrowly construed and does not foreclose review of unlawful custody or *ultra vires* attempts to switch a non-final INA § 240 case into expedited removal. *See Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 482–83 (1999) (hereinafter also referred to as “*Reno v. AADC*”). Individual injunctive relief is not barred by Section 1252(f)(1). *See Garland v. Aleman Gonzalez*, 142 S. Ct. 2057, 2065–66 (2022).

9. Venue is proper in this District because Petitioner is detained at the Honolulu Federal Detention Center, which lies within this Court’s jurisdiction, whereas Petitioner’s detention is controlled by the Honolulu Field Office of ICE, Enforcement and Removal Operations. *See* Ex. A. Proof of Detention in ICE Custody.

III. PARTIES

10. Petitioner, JORGE LUIS SILVA-HUETE (“Mr. Silva-Huete”), is a citizen and national of Nicaragua who has lived in the United States for more than four years. He was transferred to the Honolulu Federal Detention Center, where he remains detained, following his arrest by ICE near the USCIS Field Office in San Francisco, California, despite a recent immigration grant of order granting withholding of removal under INA §

241(b)(3). Prior to being granted relief from removal, Petitioner appeared in removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a [INA § 240], after he was arrested by ICE near the USCIS Field Office in San Francisco, California. Following this, Petitioner won his immigration case. At the conclusion of his hearing in § 240 proceedings on November 20, 2025, at the 300 Ala Moana Blvd, Rm 8-112, Honolulu, HI 96850, Immigration Judge Clarence Wagner granted his application for withholding of removal, conferring the right to stay in this country. *See* Ex. D, EOIR Automated Case Information System.

11. Respondent KRISTI NOEM is the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”). She is sued in her official capacity.

12. Respondent TODD LYONS is the Acting Director of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”), an executive branch agency within the Department of Homeland Security. He is sued in his official capacity.

13. Respondent DAREN K. MARGOLIN is the Director of the Executive Office for Immigration Review (“EOIR”), the component of the Department of Justice responsible for immigration court adjudications, including bond hearings for noncitizens in removal proceedings. He is sued in his official capacity because EOIR, through its Immigration Judges, exercises exclusive authority over the conduct and scheduling of bond hearings, and EOIR’s refusal to provide Petitioner with a constitutionally

adequate bond hearing is an underlying basis of the unlawful detention challenged in this habeas petition.

14. Respondent ACTING DIRECTOR is the Director of the Honolulu Field Office of ICE, Enforcement and Removal Operations (“ERO”), and therefore, he has jurisdiction over Petitioner. He is sued in his official capacity as Petitioner’s local custodian and DHS’s local decisionmaker.

15. Respondent, ESTELA DERR, is the Warden of the Honolulu Federal Detention Center. As such, she is responsible for housing noncitizens from various regions of Hawaii in ICE custody pending the completion of their removal proceedings. The Honolulu Federal Detention Center is located at 351 Elliott St., Honolulu, Hawai’i 96819. Respondent is sued in her official capacity as Petitioner’s immediate physical custodian as of the filing of this petition.

16. Respondents Noem, Lyons, and Margolin who represent DHS, ICE, and EOIR are properly included herein as the executives of federal agencies within the meaning of the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”).

IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

17. Petitioner JORGE LUIS SILVA-HUETE is a thirty-three-year-old citizen of Nicaragua who has significant ties to the United States. His initial entry into the United States occurred on or about December 2018, via Houston, Texas. Between 2018 and 2021, Mr. Silva-Huete’s presence in the

United States was intermittent. He last entered the United States in November 2021, at which point he began residing continuously in this country, where he has since made his home.

18. Until his recent transfer into a remote immigration facility in Honolulu Hawaii, Mr. Silva-Huete lived and worked in the Palo Alto Region of California for over seven years, where he resides near his mother who is a lawful permanent resident, sisters who are United States Citizens, and has developed close ties to his community. He had a pending lawful asylum application that resulted in a grant of Withholding of Removal under INA § 241(b)(3), no criminal history, no history of violence, maintains steady and regular employment, has no disqualifying convictions that would justify treating him as a danger to society, has not been shown to be a flight risk, and has been compliant with all requirements imposed by ICE. *See Ex. B, Documentation of Immigration History.*

19. On or about July 24, 2025, despite his lengthy history of residence in the United States, and compliance with required ICE check-ins and a lack of disqualifying criminal background, ICE apprehended Mr. Silva-Huete at near the USCIS Field Office in San Francisco, California, after which the agency transferred him to a detention facility in Honolulu, HI. Following this, Mr. Silva-Huete, again attempted to avail himself of legally compliant

available means and was granted his application for withholding by a judge at the Hawaii Immigration Court on November 20, 2025, after a hearing on the merits of his I-589 application. *See* Ex. A. However, despite having a lawful order barring his removal issued two months ago, Petitioner still has not been released from custody in ICE detention. *See* Ex. B.

20. Mr. Silva-Huete’s continued detention, for each day following the grant of his withholding order, violates both laws under the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) and his Constitutional Fifth Amendment Protections, and is therefore unlawful. As a result of this, Mr. Silva-Huete is entitled to the full panoply of due process guaranteed by both the INA and the Fifth Amendment, including an immediate grant of release from custody, and order declaring his detention unlawful, and an injunction barring his removal or transfer absent Court approval.

21. Currently, instead of having been released after receiving court granted relief, Mr. Silva-Huete finds himself locked away at the Honolulu Federal Detention Center, a remote facility thousands of miles from his family and community in Palo Alto, which is in the San Francisco Bay area. *See* Ex. A. He is held under conditions indistinguishable from those reserved for dangerous criminals, despite the absence of any lawful basis for his continued detention under Section 241(b)(3) of the INA. Each day of confinement exacerbates the harm—

separating him from family and community support, impeding his ability to consult with counsel, and inflicting the psychological strain that prolonged and unnecessary detention inevitably produces.

22. In sum, Mr. Silva-Huete has deep roots in the United States, strong claims for humanitarian protection, and no disqualifying criminal record. He has been thrust into prolonged civil detention solely because of the government's failure to abide by its own regulations when Immigration Judge Wagner granted him relief in accordance with INA § 241(b)(3). Petitioner's continued detention, after the granting of the prior withholding order, is unlawful, arbitrary, and profoundly unjust.

V. LEGAL FRAMEWORK

A. Statutory Framework for Immigration Custody Determinations.

23. Immigration detention is governed primarily by two provisions of the INA: Section 235(b) [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)] and Section 236(a) [8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)]. Whereas Section 236(a) of the INA authorizes the Attorney General to release noncitizens on bond pending removal proceedings, in contrast, Section 235(b) applies to certain categories of "arriving aliens" and mandates detention pending completion of expedited or threshold screening.

24. A noncitizen granted withholding of removal under INA § 241(b)(3) remains subject to an order of removal but may not be removed to the

protected country. Where removal to the designated country is legally barred and no alternative country of removal is realistically available, continued detention is governed by the constitutional and statutory limitations articulated in *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001).

25. Under *Zadvydas*, immigration detention is lawful only so long as it is reasonably related to the government's purpose of effectuating removal. When removal is not reasonably foreseeable, continued detention exceeds statutory authority under INA § 241(a), 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a), and violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 699–701.

26. Under the facts currently before the court, the prior withholding of removal, by the immigration judge should, result in the release of Petitioner from ICE detention. Under, 8 USCS § 1537. If an immigration judge decides that an alien should not be removed, the alien “shall be released from custody” unless the government appeals the decision and the appeal is pending. 8 USCS § 1537.

27. The prior withholding of removal removes the legal basis for detention under, 8 USCS § 1226. which governs detention pending removal proceedings. Since removal proceedings are effectively resolved in Mr. Silva-Huete's favor, detention under this provision is no longer applicable. *Id.*

28. Continued detention violates Mr. Silva-Huete's rights under, 28 USCS § 2241, because he is no longer "in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." *See, e.g., Sandeen v. Barr*, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 225485; *Opunui v. Barr*, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 225506; *Cook v. Barr*, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 225487.

VI. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

Count I – Unlawful Detention in Violation of INA § 241(b)(3), 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(3)

29. Petitioner incorporates by reference the above factual allegations and re-asserts them as though stated fully herein.

30. Respondents' refusal to release Petitioner following the Immigration Judge's order granting withholding under INA § 241(b)(3) contravenes the INA and decisions from the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. *See, e.g., Salad v. Dep't of Corr.*, 769 F. Supp. 3d 913 (D. Alaska Mar 7, 2025) (granted habeas where removal was unlikely to occur in reasonably foreseeable future).

31. Following Immigration Judge Wagner's grant of withholding of removal, Petitioner's removal to Nicaragua is legally barred and removal is not reasonably foreseeable. ICE's continued detention of Petitioner therefore lacks statutory authorization under INA § 241(a) and violates the limitations recognized in *Zadvydas*.

32. Detention is lawful only where tethered to a valid removal objective. Because removal to Nicaragua is barred and no lawful alternative country has been designated, ICE lacks authority to detain Petitioner. Continued custody violates 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and principles articulated in *Zadvydas*.

33. A grant of withholding of removal conclusively establishes that the government may not remove Petitioner to his country of nationality and that removal is not reasonably foreseeable. ICE's continued detention of Petitioner is therefore no longer reasonably related to the statutory purpose of effectuating removal and violates both the Immigration and Nationality Act and the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. Petitioner seeks immediate release from custody under appropriate conditions of supervision.

34. Even if the government were to appeal the withholding of removal decision, which no facts before the Court currently indicate, and Mr. Silva-Huete could in theory remain in custody pending the outcome of the appeal under 8 U.S.C. § 1537(a)(2). Thus, Petitioner argues that prolonged detention during the appeal process (in addition to the two months already since the withholding was granted) would be unreasonable and violative of due process, particularly if the appeal were not resolved expeditiously and that he would be entitled to bond under those circumstances. If Petitioner were to remain in custody pending an appeal of the withholding grant, the case would then be in

appeal related to removal proceedings under Section 240 of the INA [8 U.S.C. § 1229a], and his case would be placed on the detained docket of the Hawaii Immigration Court, being detained in the context of ongoing removal proceedings would put his squarely under the governance of INA § 236(a), not § 235(b), allowing him an opportunity for a bond.

35. By adopting a policy refusing to provide Petitioner with release or an individualized bond hearing, Respondents would be acting contrary to statutory authority requiring consideration of such bond application. This policy supports the conclusion that the filing of a bond application with the immigration courts is currently a futile endeavor. Petitioner's continued detention without access to an individualized custody redetermination violates the INA and must be corrected through habeas relief.

36. Accordingly, this Court should grant the writ and order that Petitioner be immediately released based on his prior order of withholding under INA § 241(b)(3), as repeatedly recognized by the majority of federal district courts in this Circuit.

Count II – Fifth Amendment Due Process Violation

37. Petitioner incorporates by reference the above factual allegations and re-asserts them as though stated fully herein.

38. Petitioner's continued detention without any reasonable basis for

detention, violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

Prolonged detention without legal basis is arbitrary, punitive, and unconstitutional.

39. The Supreme Court has long recognized that “[f]reedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty” protected by the Due Process Clause. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001). Immigration detention is civil in nature, but it nonetheless implicates this fundamental liberty interest.

40. Because Petitioner is detained by ICE at the HONOLULU FEDERAL DETENTION CENTER, he is categorically denied the relief granted by his prior order of withholding. Notwithstanding that grant of protection, ICE has continued to detain Petitioner without lawful authority.

41. Unlike noncitizens subject to mandatory detention for serious criminal offenses under Section 236(c) [8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)], Petitioner has no qualifying convictions that justify a categorical denial of release. The government has no legitimate basis keep petitioner in detention or to insist that Petitioner’s detention be mandatory, yet he remains confined with no opportunity for release or meaningful communication with legal counsel.

42. Denying Petitioner release based on the protection provided him by his prior withholding order, deprives him of procedural protections guaranteed

by the Due Process Clause. Moreover, prolonged detention without meaningful review violates the substantive limits of due process, as articulated in *Zadvydas* and *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510 (2003).

43. Petitioner is a long-time resident of the United States, with over seven years of continuous presence. He has strong family and community ties in Palo Alto, California. On November 20, 2025, he was granted withholding from removal by an immigration judge pursuant to INA § 241(b)(3). His continued detention is not tethered to any lawful purpose, as there has been no finding that he was a danger to the community or a flight risk. Yet, for no apparent reason—he has been categorically denied the process and relief to which he is entitled. This amounts to an arbitrary deprivation of liberty in violation of the Fifth Amendment.

44. Accordingly, the Court should grant habeas relief on constitutional grounds and order that Petitioner be afforded immediate release, an order declaring his continued detention unlawful, and order an injunction barring his removal absent Court Approval.

Count III – Unlawful Agency Action (APA)

45. Petitioner incorporates by reference the above factual allegations and re-asserts them as though stated fully herein.

46. Petitioner is detained by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) in Hawai‘i despite an Immigration Judge’s final order granting

withholding of removal to Nicaragua on November 20, 2025. EOIR records reflect no appeal by the DHS. Because removal to Nicaragua is legally barred under INA § 241(b)(3), ICE lacks statutory authority to detain Petitioner for purposes of removal. Continued detention is *ultra vires* and violates the Constitution and laws of the United States.

47. A noncitizen granted withholding of removal under INA § 241(b)(3) remains subject to an order of removal but may not be removed to the protected country. Where removal to the designated country is legally barred and no alternative country of removal is realistically available, continued detention is governed by the constitutional and statutory limitations articulated in *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001).

48. Under *Zadvydas*, immigration detention is lawful only so long as it is reasonably related to the government's purpose of effectuating removal. When removal is not reasonably foreseeable, continued detention exceeds statutory authority under INA § 241(a), 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a), and the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"), 5 U.S.C. §§ 701–706. ICE's failure to implement the IJ's withholding order and terminate custody constitutes agency action not in accordance with law under 5 U.S.C. § 706(2).

49. In support of Mr. Silva-Huete's claim under the APA for the alleged violation stemming from ICE's failure to release him from ICE custody following the immigration court's order granting withholding of

removal, the following case precedents from the U.S. District Court in Hawaii are relevant:

- *Longhua Wang v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Security*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 127279 (D. Haw. July 3, 2025). (Discussing the application of the APA in the context of agency delays and failures to act and finding that under the APA, courts may compel agency action that is unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed); The court in this case emphasized that while certain statutory provisions, such as those under, 8 USCS § 1158, may preclude private rights of action, the APA provides a mechanism to challenge agency inaction or unreasonable delay. Specifically, the court noted that even where some discretion exists, the agency has a "specific, unequivocal command" to act, and failure to do so may be challenged under the APA. *Id.* Using this principal Petitioner argues that ICE's failure to release him following over two months in detention and over two months since the November 20, 2025, grant of withholding in the Hawaii Immigration Court; constitutes an unreasonable delay and/or unlawful withholding of action under. 5 USCS § 706;
- *Ringgold v. Johnson*, 40 F. Supp. 3d 1331 (D. Mont. 2014). (Agency action must be set aside if it fails to consider relevant factors, relies

on improper considerations, or lacks a rational connection between the facts found and the decision made.); ICE's continued detention of Mr. Silva-Huete without accounting for the Immigration Court's grant of withholding, lacks a rational connection to any of the current operative legal facts, rendering the detention arbitrary and capricious under § 706(2)(A); and

- *Purcell v. Kennedy*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 220687 (D. Haw. July 3, 2025). (Agencies must articulate a satisfactory explanation for their actions, including a rational connection between the facts and the decision made). ICE's failure to provide any explanation—or a legally sufficient one—for continued detention after withholding violates the APA's requirement of reasoned decision-making.

50. The APA requires agencies to engage in reasoned decision-making and prohibits arbitrary or capricious action. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). Courts reviewing agency conduct under the APA must set aside action that is arbitrary, capricious, or unsupported by a rational connection between the facts and the decision made. *Ringgold v. Johnson*, 40 F. Supp. 3d 1331, 1342 (D. Mont. 2014). The APA further requires agencies to articulate a satisfactory explanation for their actions grounded in the administrative record. *Purcell v. Kennedy*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 220687. Where, as here, ICE continues to detain a noncitizen despite a final grant of withholding of removal—without

explanation or consideration of the immigration court's order—its conduct constitutes agency action unlawfully withheld or, alternatively, arbitrary and capricious in violation of 5 U.S.C. § 706(1) and § 706(2)(A).

51. Accordingly, Respondents' refusal to release Petitioner from custody constitutes unlawful agency action under the APA, and this Court should grant habeas relief to remedy the violation.

VII. REQUEST FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

52. Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court grant injunctive relief directing Respondents to release him under reasonable conditions of supervision. Petitioner will also request preliminary injunctive relief and a Temporary Restraining Order in a separate filing, which is forthcoming.

53. There is no evidence that Petitioner poses a danger to the community or presents a risk of flight. To the contrary, Petitioner has affirmatively complied with DHS requirements by initiating and maintaining a lawful proceeding before the immigration court and subsequently received an order of withholding and consistently appeared for required ICE check-ins prior to detention. He has lived and worked lawfully in his community, taken concrete steps to regularize his residence here, has no history of violence or criminal activities, and remained in full compliance with immigration authorities.

54. Again, Petitioner intends to file a separate motion for a TRO under Rule 65 to prevent removal or transfer while this habeas petition is

adjudicated, his likelihood of success on the merits are high; given that the final withholding of removal to Nicaragua, with no appeal, eliminates statutory detention authority.

55. Ongoing unlawful detention, risk of refoulement, and loss of habeas jurisdiction through transfer or removal would tip the balance of equities & public interest in favor of enforcing immigration court orders that granted Petitioner's application for withholding and providing constitutional limits on executive detention.

56. Granting Petitioner's request for release pursuant to the recent grant of withholding, promotes confidence in the integrity of the immigration system, reinforces respect for the rule of law, and prevents the arbitrary deprivation of liberty. Protecting fundamental due process rights is not just in Petitioner's interest, but in the interest of the public at large.

57. For these reasons, this Court should grant injunctive relief, requiring Respondents to release Mr. Silva-Huete.

VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

58. For the above and foregoing reasons, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court take the following actions:

- a. Issue a writ of habeas corpus ordering Respondents to provide Petitioner with an individualized bond hearing under INA § 236(a), 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven (7) days of the Court's order;
- b. Petitioner respectfully requests that the Court grant a TRO and preliminary injunction granting Petitioner's immediate release;
- c. Issue a declaration that DHS may not initiate or pursue expedited removal against Mr. Silva-Huete while his § 240 removal proceedings remain non-final and while he seeks relief from removal before an Immigration Judge;
- d. Issue a declaration that the plain language of INA § 241(b)(3), 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(3), under these circumstances, prohibits continued detention of Petitioner after the grant of withholding has been ordered;
- e. Grant permanent injunctive relief as appropriate;
- f. Award Petitioner reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to the Equal Access to Justice Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(E), and any other applicable provision of law; and
- g. Grant such other relief as this Court deems just and proper.

DATE: January 30, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

Law Office of Carmen DiAmore-Siah &
Assoc. 820 S Beretania St. Suite 200
Honolulu, HI 96813
Tel: (808) 531-2277
Email: carmen@immigrateus.com

By: /s/ Carmen DiAmore-Siah
CARMEN DI AMORE-SIAH
Hawaii Bar No. HI5035
LOCAL COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER

THE LAW OFFICE OF JOHN M. BRAY, PLLC
911 N. Bishop Ave.
Dallas, TX 75208
Tel: (855) 566-2729
Fax: (214) 960-4164
Email: john@jmblawfirm.com

By: /s/ John M. Bray
JOHN M. BRAY
Texas Bar No. 24081360
LEAD COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER
**Pro Hac Vice Application Forthcoming*

VERIFICATION

My name is Paola Silva Ibarra (“Declarant”), and I am Petitioner’s sister. I am above the age of twenty-one (21) years of age, am of sound mind, and am in all ways competent to make this verification. I hereby declare, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, that I have knowledge of the substance of the foregoing document, that I have personal knowledge of the facts contained in it, and that the factual statements contained in it are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.



PAOLA SILVA IBARRA
Declarant

DATE: 11/8/2026