


January 28, 2026

MOTION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2241
AND MOTION TO EXPEDITE CONSIDERATION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA
WILLIAMSPORT DIVISION

Domingo Beato-Estrella


FCI Allenwood
Federal Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 1000
White Deer, PA 17887

Petitioner,

v. Civil No. _____

G. Swaney, Warden
FCI Allenwood

Respondent.

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Domingo Beato-Estrella respectfully moves this Court for habeas relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and for expedited consideration. Petitioner challenges the execution of his custody arising from the Bureau of Prisons' reliance on an ICE immigration detainer that is unlawfully barring him from Residential Reentry Center placement and other pre-release custody determinations.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 because Petitioner challenges the execution of his custody. Venue is proper in the Middle District of Pennsylvania because Petitioner is confined at FCI Allenwood within this District and Respondent exercises immediate custody over him. See *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426 2004.

FILED
WILLIAMSPORT
FEB 03 2026
PER NR
DEPUTY CLERK

Section 2241 is the proper vehicle to challenge the execution of a federal sentence, including custody classifications and collateral restraints imposed by the Bureau of Prisons. The Third Circuit has repeatedly held that § 2241 jurisdiction exists where a petitioner challenges the manner in which a sentence is being carried out. See *Woodall v. Federal Bureau of Prisons*, 432 F.3d 235, 241–44 (3d Cir. 2005) (holding that challenges to halfway house placement and community confinement decisions are properly brought under § 2241).

Applying these principles, courts in this District have recognized that immigration detainees may produce concrete restraints on liberty sufficient to invoke § 2241 jurisdiction when the detainee is treated as a categorical bar to Residential Reentry Center placement or other statutory benefits. See *Santos v. Warden Allenwood FCI*, No. 1:17-CV-02116, 2018 WL 1178251 (M.D. Pa. Mar. 6, 2018). In *Santos*, the court acknowledged that although an ICE detainee does not itself place an inmate in ICE custody, habeas relief is appropriate where the detainee alters the execution of the sentence within BOP custody.

Similarly, in *Rodriguez v. Ebbert*, No. 3:14-CV-02404, 2015 WL 1810315 (M.D. Pa. Apr. 21, 2015), the court held that reliance on an ICE detainee to deny program eligibility and pre-release consideration presents a cognizable § 2241 claim. These holdings are consistent with the Third Circuit's decision in *Galarza v. Szalczyk*, 745 F.3d 634, 645–46 (3d Cir. 2014), which makes clear that immigration detainees are non-mandatory requests and do not confer custody or authorize additional restraints.

Allenwood-specific cases further underscore this principle. In *Santos v. Warden Allenwood FCI* and related Allenwood habeas cases, courts have rejected the Bureau of Prisons' practice of treating ICE detainees as dispositive for custody classification. See also *Cruz v. United States*, No. 1:16-CV-01034, 2016 WL 8732312 (M.D. Pa. Dec. 16, 2016) (recognizing § 2241 jurisdiction where an ICE detainee affected custody conditions at FCI Allenwood). The continued reliance on such detainees to foreclose individualized placement determinations violates both statutory mandates and due process.

Accordingly, under *Woodall*, *Galarza*, and consistent Middle District of Pennsylvania precedent, this Court has jurisdiction and authority under § 2241 to order Respondent to cease reliance on the ICE detainee and to require lawful, individualized consideration of Petitioner's eligibility for RRC placement and First Step Act benefits.

VII. EMERGENCY AND EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION

Independent of the immigration consequences, the continued reliance on the ICE detainee unlawfully deprives Petitioner of statutory benefits under the First Step Act of 2018, including eligibility for earned time credits, meaningful consideration for Residential Reentry Center placement, and transfer to community custody under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3621(b) and 3624(c). The Bureau of Prisons may not categorically exclude an inmate from these benefits based solely on an administrative detainee absent a final order of removal. This

deprivation constitutes an unlawful restraint on the execution of Petitioner's sentence and warrants immediate habeas relief.

Decisions regarding Residential Reentry Center placement are made months in advance of release. Continued reliance on an unsupported detainer threatens irreparable harm by foreclosing timely community placement and rendering habeas relief moot. Expedited review is therefore warranted.

VIII. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court grant habeas relief, order Respondent to cease reliance on the ICE detainer for custody classification purposes, expedite consideration of this motion, and grant such other relief as justice requires.


EXHIBIT LIST

- Exhibit A - Mother's Sworn Affidavit
- Exhibit B - Mother's Naturalization Papers
- Exhibit C - Petitioner's Birth Certificate
- Exhibit D - Sworn Affidavit of Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this date a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion was served by U.S. Mail upon:

Peter J. Welsh, Clerk of Courts
United States District Court
Middle District of Pennsylvania
Herman T. Schneebeli Federal Bldg. & U.S. Courthouse
240 West Third Street, Suite 218
Williamsport, PA 17701

Respectfully submitted,

Domingo Beato-Estrella
Petitioner, Pro Se