

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

Floriberto Sebastian Rodriguez,

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. _____

**VERIFIED PETITION
FOR WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS**

Expedited Handling Requested

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner Floriberto Sebastian Rodriguez, (“Mr. Rodriguez” or “Petitioner”), is a citizen of Mexico, a resident of Minneapolis, and a married, law-abiding father of five children who holds a valid work authorization good through 2030 and has had an asylum application pending for more than two years. Petitioner was arrested by ICE and remains in ICE’s custody.

2. In his last communication from ICE detention, Mr. Rodriguez stated that he had a high fever, vomiting, and that ICE was denying him medical care/medication. There has been no communication from Mr. Rodriguez almost a week.

3. Given that Mr. Rodriguez's health may be in dire condition, Petitioner respectfully requests that the Court order Petitioners to update the Court and counsel about Petitioner's medical status and to provide Petitioner medical care.

4. If the Court sees fit to order release, Petitioner respectfully requests specific relief to ensure a safe return home, including release: 1) in Minnesota; 2) at a safe place/time communicated in advance to counsel given subzero outdoor temperatures; 3) with all of his personal effects, such as driver's license, work authorization, passport, immigration documents, keys, and cell phone; and 4) without conditions such as worn GPS tracking devices, telephonic tracking, or use of the SmartLINK app.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question); 28 U.S.C. § 1361 (federal employee mandamus action); 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act); 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus); Art. I, § 9, c. 2 of the U.S. Constitution ("Suspension Clause"); 5 U.S.C. § 702 (waiver of sovereign immunity); and 28 U.S.C. § 2201 (Declaratory Judgment Act).

6. Federal question jurisdiction exists because Mr. Rodriguez seeks to challenge this custody as a violation of the Constitution and the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101 et seq.

7. Federal district courts have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 to hear habeas petitions by noncitizens challenging the lawfulness or constitutionality of their detention by the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS"). *Demore v. Kim*, 538

U.S. 510 516-17 (2003); *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 138 S. Ct. 830, 839-41 (2018); and *Nielsen v. Preap*, 139 S. Ct. 954, 961-63 (2019).

8. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), (e)(1)(B), and 2241(d) because Mr. Rodriguez was detained within the District of Minnesota. *See, e.g., Sue H. v. Donald J. Trump, et al.*, Civ. No. 26-CV-0416 (MJD/ECW) (Ordering that “habeas jurisdiction attached at the time of Petitioner’s apprehension in this District” and “jurisdiction is not defeated by any subsequent decision by Respondents to transfer Petitioner to another state.”).

9. Venue is also proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e)(1)(A), because Respondents are operating in this district.

PARTIES

10. Petitioner is a citizen of Mexico and a resident of Minneapolis, Minnesota who was detained in Maplewood, Minnesota, while driving to work. Petitioner is under the direct control of the Respondents and has no scheduled release date.

11. Respondent Pamela Bondi is being sued in her official capacity as the Attorney General of the United States and the head of the Department of Justice. Attorney General Bondi shares responsibility for implementation and enforcement of the immigration detention statutes, along with Respondent Noem. Attorney General Bondi is a legal custodian of Mr. Rodriguez.

12. Respondent Kristi Noem is being sued in her official capacity as the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. In this capacity, Secretary Noem is responsible for the administration of the immigration laws pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §

1103(a), routinely transacts business in the District of Minnesota, supervises the Fort Snelling ICE Field Office, and is legally responsible for pursuing Petitioner's detention and removal. As such, Respondent Noem is a legal custodian of Mr. Rodriguez.

13. Respondent Todd M. Lyons is the Acting Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and is sued in his official capacity. Defendant Lyons is responsible for Petitioner's detention.

14. Respondent David Easterwood is being sued in his official capacity as the Acting Field Office Director for the Fort Snelling Field Office for ICE within DHS. In that capacity, Field Director Easterwood has supervisory authority over the ICE agents responsible for detaining Mr. Rodriguez. The address for the Fort Snelling Field Office is 1 Federal Drive, Fort Snelling, Minnesota 55111.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

15. Petitioner is a resident of Minneapolis and a citizen of Mexico and has lived in the United States since December 2009. He is not subject to a final order of removal.

16. Petitioner has five children, some of which are U.S Citizens. His wife also has a pending asylum application. They live together with their children and are an incredibly close-knit family, attend church regularly together on Sundays and enjoy family game nights together.

17. Petitioner has had a pending asylum application for more than two years, and he regularly attends appointments related to his asylum application.

18. Petitioner holds a valid work authorization that is good through March 2030.

19. Petitioner has never been convicted of any crimes.

20. Respondent ICE arrested Petitioner on January 13, 2026, during his commute into work. Masked agents detained him and left his vehicle unattended on the side of the road and proceeded to take him into ICE custody in St. Paul Minnesota even after Mr. Rodriguez informed them of his work authorization and asylum application.

21. ICE agents never presented Mr. Rodriguez with a warrant at the time of his arrest and Mr. Rodriguez has no criminal record. It appears he was stopped by ICE exclusively as the result of racial profiling. Upon information and belief, Respondents did not have a warrant.

22. This arrest is part of an operation in Hennepin and Ramsey counties called "Operation Metro Surge." This operation has involved hundreds of masked, unidentified individuals in unmarked vehicles (many with illegally covered or mismatched license plates) holding themselves out as ICE agents but largely refusing to identify themselves by name or to present warrants, physically assaulting pedestrians, pepper spraying and arresting citizen observers, hitting passersby with vehicles, and generally attempting to take as many immigrants as possible into custody regardless of the constitutionality of their actions. *See, e.g., Compl., Tincher et. al. v. Noem*, No. 0:25-cv-04669. (D. Minn. 12/17/2025).

23. Since the operation began on December 1, 2025, the number of immigration officials in the twin city metro area has increased fourfold, and with them these new agents have brought a similarly massive increase in unconstitutional, unlawful, and downright violent behavior towards citizens and non-citizens alike. The people of Minnesota—of all races, nationalities, and citizenship status—are united in their shock and fear at the events of the past eight weeks, and are begging for the attacks on their community to stop.

24. Given the massive volume of perceived non-citizens being taken off the streets, Respondents are running out of physical space to continue detaining people. Detainees are being held in cramped quarters at the federal building, before being quickly sent to detention centers across the country, reportedly before processing paperwork is complete, and detainees are being held in conditions that are being broadly reported as inhumane.

25. Mr. Rodriguez has been transferred to an ICE detention center in El Paso, Texas. On January 25, 2026, Mr. Rodriguez contacted his wife and informed her that he had a high fever, that he was vomiting, and that ICE was denying him medical care and withholding medication.

26. Detaining Mr. Rodriguez is both an expensive and cruel endeavor that is completely unjustified considering he has dutifully followed the asylum process and was legally working in the United States pursuant to a valid work authorization.

27. Mr. Rodriguez respectfully seeks the opportunity to return home and to continue following the legal processes set up by Congress and DHS for immigrants to

seek status in this country and to continue working legally pursuant to his valid work authorization.

28. Pending the adjudication of this Petition, Mr. Rodriguez seeks injunctive relief ordering that ICE immediately provide Mr. Rodriguez with appropriate medical care. Petitioner further seeks an order directing Respondents to return him to Minnesota pending disposition of his habeas corpus petition, so that the jurisdiction of this Court is not impeded, so that Petitioner becomes accessible to legal counsel and loved ones.

STANDARD OF LAW

29. Courts have long recognized the significance of the habeas statute in protecting individuals from unlawful detention. The “Great Writ” has been referred to by US Courts as “perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law of England, affording as it does a swift and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or confinement.” *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963) (emphasis added). A petitioner may seek a writ of habeas corpus when their custody violates the US Constitution or a federal law. 28 U.S.C. § 22441(c)(3), which should be granted if the petitioner meets their burden of proof—a preponderance of evidence. *Aditya W. H. v. Trump*, 782 F. Supp. 3d 691, 703 (D. Minn. 2025).

30. Detained immigrants petitioning under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 face no statutory exhaustion requirements. *Jose J.O.E. v. Bondi*, 797 F. Supp. 3d 957, 965 (D. Minn. 2025). Nor is a judicially imposed prudential exhaustion requirement appropriate

where, as here: time is of the essence, facts are largely undisputed, and the parties' disagreement is based on a legal conclusion. *Id.* at 967-68.

31. Other courts in the Eighth Circuit have similarly declined to require prudential exhaustion when evaluating a detained immigrant's habeas corpus petition under similar circumstances—to address a question of statutory interpretation that does not require developing a factual record, and where the agency is demonstrably unlikely to reverse its course. *Giron Reyes v. Lyons*, 2025 WL 2712427 at *3 (N.D. Iowa Sept. 23, 2025).

32. “[T]he Due Process Clause applies to all ‘persons’ within the United States, including [immigrants], whether their presence here is lawful, unlawful, temporary, or permanent.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001).

33. In July of 2025, Respondent DHS began ignoring the decades-long consensus of how 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) should be interpreted, which the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) articulated in a subsequent ruling. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA Sept. 5, 2025). Respondents suddenly claim that individuals who have been residing within the United States for more than two years are somehow metaphorically “seeking admission,” simply because they may have pending claims for asylum or other forms of status.

34. However, this Court and the majority around the country have made clear that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) only authorizes detention for noncitizens who are at the border seeking physical entry at the time of detention, not those whose detention is discretionary and governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). *Eliseo A.A. v. Olson*, Civ. No. 25-

3381 (JWB/DJF), 2025 WL 2886729 (D. Minn. Oct. 8, 2025); *Mayamu K. v. Bondi*, Civ. No. 25-3035 (JWB/LIB), 2025 WL 3641819 (D. Minn. Oct. 20, 2025); *Khalid B.Q. v. Bondi*, Civ. No. 25-4584 (JWB/DJF), Doc. No. 10 (D. Minn. Dec. 18, 2025); *Xuseen A. v. Bondi*, Civ. No. 25-4514 (JWB/DJF), Doc. No. 16 (D. Minn. Dec. 19, 2025); *Vedat C. v. Bondi*, Civ. No. 25-4642 (JWB/DJF), Doc. No. 9 (D. Minn. Dec. 19, 2025).

35. Here, Petitioner was apprehended within the United States, not at a border while seeking entry. Respondents wrongly assert 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2) as a basis for detaining Mr. Rodriguez without a hearing, when instead any detention could only be pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1226(a), which would also require a warrant and which here the Respondents are not purporting to invoke.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT ONE

Fifth Amendment Due Process

Respondents are Confining Petitioner without A Valid Legal Basis or any Semblance of Due Process.

36. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained above.

37. Mr. Rodriguez has due process rights as a resident of the United States. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001).

38. Federal courts use the three-part test in *Mathews v. Eldridge* to determine whether civil detention violates a detainee's due process rights. 424 U.S. 319 (1976). The elements of this test are: (1) the private interest that the official action affects; (2)

the risk that the procedures used will result in an erroneous deprivation of the private interest, and the probable value, if any, of additional or substitute procedural safeguards; and (3) the Government's interest in following the existing procedures, both in achieving their objectives and in the potential burdens of an alternate procedure. *Id.* at 335.

39. Here, all three factors favor the petitioner.

40. First, Mr. Rodriguez has a significant private interest at stake. A person's interest in freedom from physical detention is “the most elemental of liberty interests.” *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507, 529, 124 S.Ct. 2633, 159 L.Ed.2d 578 (2004); see also *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690, 121 S.Ct. 2491 (“Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that [the Due Process] Clause protects.”). Mr. Rodriguez is wrongfully confined, a direct attack on Petitioner’s liberty interests.

41. Second, Mr. Rodriguez will continue to be deprived of this interest if the current procedure (detaining Mr. Rodriguez without a legal basis) is followed. There is no rational explanation for detaining Mr. Rodriguez. Respondents’ purported basis for detaining Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2) has been rejected time and time again in this court. *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); *R.E. v. Bondi*, No. 0:25-cv-3946-NEB, 2025 WL 3146312 (D.

Minn. Nov. 4, 2025); *Herrera Avila v. Bondi*, No. 0:25-cv-3741 (JRT), 2025 WL 2976539 (D. Minn. Oct. 21, 2025).

42. Lastly, the Government has no legitimate interest in refusing to follow its own rules. Mr. Rodriguez poses no safety threats to the community. Releasing Petitioner, or at a minimum holding a bond hearing, would in fact *save* the government the resources and expense of continued imprisonment.

43. The placement of Mr. Rodriguez in detention pending the resolution of ongoing immigration proceedings violates Mr. Rodriguez's constitutional rights to due process guaranteed in the Fifth Amendment.

COUNT TWO

Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)

Petitioner's Ongoing Detention Pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) is Unlawful because Petitioner is not Seeking Admission and therefore cannot be held under that Authority

44. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above.

45. Respondents violate the Immigration and Nationality Act by attempting to apply mandatory detention through 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), to Petitioner. Petitioner was nowhere near the border and was not "seeking admission"

COUNT THREE

Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 706

Detaining Petitioner Pursuant to an Unlawful Interpretation of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) violates the Administrative Procedure Act

46. Mr. Rodriguez re-alleges and incorporates by reference each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.

47. The APA provides that a “reviewing court shall . . . hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be . . . arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

48. The APA provides that a “reviewing court shall . . . hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be . . . without observance of procedure required by law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(D).

49. The mandatory detention provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to all noncitizens residing in the United States who are subject to the grounds of inadmissibility. As relevant here, it does not apply to those who previously entered the country and have been residing in the United States prior to being apprehended and placed in removal proceedings by Respondents. Such noncitizens could properly be detained under § 1226(a), but would then be eligible for release on bond unless they are subject to § 1225(b)(1), § 1226(c), or § 1231.

50. Nonetheless, the Board has adopted a policy and practice of applying § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner and others in the same position.

51. Respondents through its recent administrative decision failed to articulate any reasoned explanations for new interpretation of the Act. The Board’s decision represents a change in the agencies’ policies and positions that negates the plain language of the Act, the will of Congress, and decades of administrative precedent.

52. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Mr. Rodriguez is arbitrary, capricious, and not in accordance with law, and as such, it violates the APA. See 5 U.S.C. § 706(2).

REMEDY

53. An available remedy for Respondents' unlawful conduct as outlined in this complaint is for Petitioner to be released.

54. Immigration detention is civil in nature, and as a result Congress must have expressly authorized it by statute, and the detention must be reasonably related to its statutory purpose. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 687, 690 (2001) (quoting *Jackson v. Indiana*, 406 U.S. 715, 738 (1972)). Detention here serves no statutory purpose, there is no indication that Petitioner's detention was based on any facts that might indicate that Petitioner should be in custody for some reason.

55. Since Section 1225 does not apply to noncitizens who are in Petitioner's situation (i.e., those who have been detained while residing within the United States for more than two years, as opposed to those who are detained while in the process of physically entering the United States) the law that Respondents are using to detain Petitioner simply does not apply so as to authorize Petitioner's detention. See *Eliseo A.A. v. Olson*, Civ. No. 25-3381 (JWB/DJF), 2025 WL 2886729 (D. Minn. Oct. 8, 2025); *Mayamu K. v. Bondi*, Civ. No. 25-3035 (JWB/LIB), 2025 WL 3641819 (D. Minn. Oct. 20, 2025); *Khalid B.Q. v. Bondi*, Civ. No. 25-4584 (JWB/DJF), Doc. No. 10 (D. Minn. Dec. 18, 2025); *Xuseen A. v. Bondi*, Civ. No. 25-4514 (JWB/DJF), Doc.

No. 16 (D. Minn. Dec. 19, 2025); *Vedat C. v. Bondi*, Civ. No. 25-4642 (JWB/DJF), Doc. No. 9 (D. Minn. Dec. 19, 2025).

56. When a habeas petitioner's detention is without legal basis, the typical remedy is release. *Munaf v. Geren*, 553 U.S. 674, 693 (2008) (describing release as the "typical remedy" for "unlawful executive detention").

57. Respondents will no doubt argue, as they have in similar cases before this Court, that if the Court rules that Petitioner should have been detained pursuant to § 1226, instead of § 1225, then the remedy is a bond hearing as opposed to outright release. *See, e.g., Ahmed A.* Civ. No. 25-4776, Doc. No. 9. at 9-10. However, this Court rejected this argument, saying that:

[A] bond hearing presupposes lawful detention authority under § 1226. Where that authority has not been invoked or established, ordering a bond hearing would treat the absence of statutory authority as a mere procedural irregularity rather than a substantive defect ... Where the record shows Respondents have not identified a valid statutory basis for detention in the first place, the remedy is not to supply one through further proceedings.

Id. at Doc. No. 10 at 6.

58. Nor here would § 1226(a) have supported a lawful detention in the first instance. Detention under § 1226(a) would require a warrant issued by the Attorney General. *Jose J.O.E. v. Bondi*, 797 F. Supp. 3d 957, 961 (D. Minn. 2025). To put this plainly: "absent a warrant a noncitizen may not be arrested and detained under section 1226(a)." *See also Ahmed M. v. Bondi et al.*, 2026 WL 25627, *3 (D. Minn. Jan. 5, 2026) (quoting *Chogllo Chafila v. Scott*, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, No. 2:25-cv-00437-SDN, 2025 WL 2688541, at *11 (D. Me. Sept. 21, 2025)). Upon information and belief, Respondents had no such warrant.

59. The overwhelming majority of judges in the District of Minnesota have ruled that where the Government has no lawful basis for detention and produces no evidence of a warrant, release is the appropriate remedy. *Dwine L. v. Bondi*, 26-cv-627 (KMM/DLM), 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15372, *4 (D. Minn. Jan. 28, 2026); *Carmen M. v. Bondi*, No. 26-cv-582 (ECT/ECW) 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15368, *5 (D. Minn. Jan. 28, 2026); *Luis C. v. Bondi*, 26-cv-0636 (SRN/SGE) 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15371, *6 (D. Minn. Jan. 28, 2026); *Claudio E.A.S. v. Bondi*, 26-583 (DWF/DLM) 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15385, *3 (D. Minn. Jan. 28, 2026); *Jhisvin A.B.V.A. v. Bondi*, No. 26-455 (JRT/EMB) 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13183 at *3 (D. Minn. Jan. 28, 2026); *Francisca G. v. Bondi*, Doc. 6, No. 26-CV-615 (JMB/JFD) (D. Minn. Jan. 27, 2026); *Fabian L.C. v. Bondi*, Doc. 7, No. 26-CV-493 (NEB/DLM) (D. Minn. Jan. 24, 2026); *Maria U.C.G v. Bondi*, Doc. 10, No. 26-439 (JWB/LIB) (D. Minn. Jan. 24, 2026); *Joaquin Q.L. v. Bondi*, No. 26-cv-233 (LMP/DTS) 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10644, *6 (D. Minn. Jan. 21, 2026); *Juan S.R. v. Bondi*, No. 26-CV-0005 (PJS/LIB) Doc. No. 8 (D. Minn. Jan. 12, 2026).

REQUEST FOR ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

60. Within three days, unless good cause for a delay is shown, “[a] court, justice or judge entering 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.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Mr. Rodriguez prays that this Court grant the following relief;

- (1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- (2) Enjoin Respondents from transporting Petitioner outside of Minnesota, or transport Petitioner back to Minnesota if he is moved out of state;
- (3) Order Respondents to update the Court and Petitioner's counsel about Petitioner's health and location;
- (4) Order Respondents to provide Petitioner medical care and medication;
- (5) Order Respondents to show cause as to why Petitioner should not be released immediately, or in the alternative afforded a bond hearing;
- (6) Alternatively, issue a writ of habeas corpus requiring Respondents to release Petitioner unless they provide a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven days;
- (7) If the Court sees fit to order Petitioner's release, specified relief to ensure a safe return home, including release:
 - (a) Inside of Minnesota;
 - (b) At a safe time and place communicated in advance to counsel; and
 - (c) With all of Petitioner's personal effects, such as driver's license, immigration papers, passport, cell phone, and keys.
- (8) Enjoin Respondents from implementing any condition of release, including ICE's "Alternatives to Detention" measures, which include ankle monitors, body-worn GPS, telephonic tracking, or use of the SmartLINK Mobile Application;

- (9) Enjoin Respondents from detaining Respondent again on any legal theory rejected by the Court in adjudicating this Petition; and
- (10) Grant any other and further relief that this Court may deem just and proper.

Date: January 30, 2026

/s/ Alexandra T. Carthew

Alexandra T. Carthew

MN Bar No. 0401783

(310) 780 – 3574

Alexandra@carthewforyou.com

/s/ Taylor J. Volkman

Taylor J. Volkman

MN Bar No. 0505182

PO Box 7040

Tjv00942@proton.me

Attorneys for Petitioner

**Verification by Someone Acting on
Petitioner's Behalf Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2242**

I am submitting this verification on behalf of Petitioner because I am Petitioner's attorney. I have discussed the factual assertions in this petition with Petitioner's family, who are also acting on Petitioner's behalf and who I understand to have personal knowledge of the facts alleged herein. I hereby verify that the statements made in the attached Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, including the statements regarding Petitioner's detention status, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Date: January 30, 2026

/s/ Alexandra T. Carthew

Alexandra T. Carthew