

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
JACKSONVILLE DIVISION

SOLBEY LORENA GALLARDO CARDENAS,

Petitioner,

v.

CASE NO. 3:26-cv-00363

KRISTI NOEM,  
in her official capacity as  
Secretary of the Department  
of Homeland Security,

PAMELA JO BONDI,  
in her official capacity as Attorney General,

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT (“ICE”),

ICE FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, JACKSONVILLE FIELD OFFICE,

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY (“DHS”),

RICK STALY,  
in his official  
capacity as the Sheriff of Flagler County  
and manager and overseer  
of Flagler County Jail,

Respondents.

---

**PETITIONER’S EMERGENCY MOTION FOR TEMPORARY  
RESTRAINING ORDER AND FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Petitioner, Solbey Lorena Gallardo Cardenas, by and through the undersigned counsel, hereby respectfully moves, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 65 and 28 U.S.C. § 2243, for an emergency Temporary Restraining Order (“TRO”) and/or

Preliminary Injunction prohibiting Respondents from transferring Petitioner from the Flagler County Jail or otherwise continuing her unlawful detention pending a final adjudication of her separately filed petition for writ of habeas corpus. In support thereof, Petitioner states as follows:

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Petitioner Solbey Lorena Gallardo Cardenas (“Petitioner”) is a 31-year-old citizen of Colombia who arrived in this country on or about November 13, 2023, at the Eagle Pass, Texas point of entry. Doc. 1. A signed sworn verification by Petitioner is being filed simultaneously with this motion. Doc. 1-2. Petitioner subsequently filed a petition for asylum, which is pending. Doc. 1. Petitioner has resided at  West Park, Florida since at least July of 2024. *Id.* ICE issued Petitioner a permit to work in the United States and she obtained a Florida driver’s license. *Id.*

On November 19, 2025, Petitioner was arrested by local law enforcement in Broward County, Florida regarding a domestic dispute. Although Petitioner was arrested for aggravated assault with a weapon, the State dropped the case on January 9, 2026, after its review. *See* Doc. 1; Doc. 1-4.

Despite the State’s no information notice, ICE took custody of the Petitioner on January 9, 2026. Doc. 1. Since January 9, 2026, Petitioner has been unlawfully detained by ICE at local jails, including the Orange County Jail, the Baker County Jail, and now the Flagler County Jail, where she remains in custody. *Id.* Thus,

since at least January 9, 2026, Petitioner has been unlawfully detained by Respondents without criminal charges, without a judicial warrant authorizing her arrest and detention, and without lawful authority. *Id.* Petitioner has been held on an ICE immigration detainer, an administrative request that does not authorize detention. *Id.* Petitioner has not received a bond hearing. *Id.* Instead, Petitioner has been subjected to continued and prolonged detention without due process. *Id.*

Respondents have also unlawfully transferred Petitioner from the Orange County Jail to the Baker County Jail, and then to the Flagler County Jail. *Id.* Respondents have also threatened or attempted to transfer Petitioner to ICE custody, which would irreparably deprive her of liberty and risk frustrating this Court's habeas jurisdiction. *Id.* In that regard, on February 11, 2026, the Petitioner received a Notice of an Internet Master Calendar Hearing to be held on February 13, 2026. *Id.* Another hearing has been set in her case for February 27, 2026. *Id.*

On February 18, 2026, Petitioner initiated this action by filing a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging her ongoing and unlawful detention at the Flagler County Jail in Bunnell, Florida. *Id.*

## **II. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

Petitioner was initially detained by local law enforcement in Broward County on November 19, 2025. *Id.* Thereafter, Petitioner was taken into custody by ICE on January 9, 2026, and placed at the ICE-ERO Center in Miramar, Florida. *Id.* Petitioner was then relocated to a second ICE facility, the Broward Transitional

Center in Pompano Beach, Florida on January 13, 2026. *Id.* Petitioner was relocated again to Orange County Jail in Orlando, Florida on January 14, 2026, where she remained until February 3, 2026. *Id.* To effectuate her prolonged detention at the Orange County Jail, ICE would periodically remove her from the jail and then rebook her at the jail that same day. *Id.*

On February 3, 2026, ICE moved Petitioner out of the jurisdiction of Orlando Division of the Federal District Court to the Baker County Detention Center, another ICE facility, in Macclenny, Florida. *Id.* Thereafter, on February 6, 2026, Petitioner was transported to the Flagler County Jail in Bunnell, Florida, where she remains as of this filing. *Id.* Thus, Petitioner is “in custody” for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

No criminal charges are pending against Petitioner. Doc. 1. No probable cause affidavit or judicial warrants exist justifying her current detention. *Id.* Instead, Petitioner is being detained on the stated basis that she was allegedly “undocumented.” *Id.* Upon information and belief, the sole basis for Petitioner’s confinement is an ICE immigration detainer, which only permits a criminal justice agency to “maintain custody of [an] alien for a period not to exceed 48 hours, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays in order to permit assumption of custody” by the ICE. 8 C.F.R. § 287.7(d).

Petitioner has remained in the United States pursuant to her pending asylum application. Doc. 1. She possesses a U.S. Employment Authorization

Document valid through February 24, 2030, and has an immigration court hearing scheduled for February 27, 2026. *Id.*

Respondents have indicated an intent to transfer Petitioner to ICE custody before this Court can adjudicate the legality of her prolonged detention. *Id.* Indeed, Respondents have already relocated Petitioner multiple times, as noted above. Petitioner will return to her residence in West Park, Florida upon her release. *Id.*

Thus, Petitioner faces the possibility of imminent transfer outside of this judicial district and removal from the United States. *Id.*

Based on the foregoing, no adequate or available administrative remedy exists to challenge a local jail's detention based solely on an ICE detainer. Exhaustion is not required and would be futile.

### **III. MEMORANDUM OF LAW AND GROUNDS FOR RELIEF SOUGHT**

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65 authorizes this Court to issue a TRO without notice to the adverse party when (a) "specific facts in an affidavit or a verified complaint clearly show that immediate and irreparable injury . . . will result to the movant before the adverse party can be heard in opposition," and (b) "the movant's attorney certifies in writing any efforts made to give notice and the reasons why it should not be required."

If the movant establishes that she is justified in seeking ex parte relief, she then must show that injunctive relief is warranted. To do so, the movant must

demonstrate "(1) a substantial likelihood of success on the merits; (2) that irreparable injury will be suffered if the relief is not granted; (3) that the threatened injury outweighs the harm the relief would inflict on the nonmovant; and (4) that the entry of the relief would serve the public interest." *Schiavo ex. rel Schindler v. Schiavo*, 403 F.3d 1223, 1225-26 (11th Cir. 2005). "The balance-of-the-harms and public-interest elements merge when the government is the party opposing the injunctive relief." *Melendez v. Sec'y, Fla. Dep't of Corr.*, No. 21-13455, 2022 U.S. App. LEXIS 10263, 2022 WL 1124753, at \*17 (11th Cir. Apr. 15, 2022) (citing *Swain v. Junior*, 961 F.3d 1276, 1293 (11th Cir. 2020)).

**a. Likelihood of Success on the Merits**

"It is well-settled that courts have habeas jurisdiction to consider 'challenges to the lawfulness of immigration-related detention.'" *Gimenez Rivero v. Mina*, No. 6:26-cv-66, 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13724, at \*5 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 26, 2026) (Dalton, J.) (quoting *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 687 (2001)). "Noncitizens present in the United States are entitled to due process under the Fifth Amendment." *Mejia v. Noem*, No. 2:25-CV-981-SPC-NPM, 2025 WL 3078656, at \*2 (M.D. Fla. Nov. 4, 2025) (citing *Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 306 (1993)). This includes protection against deprivations of liberty, such as immigration detention, without due process of law. *Id.* (citing *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690 for the proposition that "[f]reedom from imprisonment— from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that Clause protects.").

Petitioner, a non-citizen who has been residing in the United States, and has an application for asylum pending, is not subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). *See, e.g., Gimenez Rivero*, 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13724 at \*10 (joining “the many, many others to conclude that mandatory detention under § 1225 does not apply to noncitizens who are already present in this country” and concluding that the “Government’s detention of Gimenez Rivero under § 1225 is unlawful, and he is entitled to habeas relief.”); *Reyes v. Rose*, No. CV 25-7138, 2026 WL 75816, at \*1 n.1 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 9, 2026) (concluding the petitioner was detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and entitled to habeas relief by virtue of a bond hearing and noting that “[a]s of January 5, 2026, ‘308 judges have ruled against the [Government’s] mass detention policy — ordering release or bond hearings in more than 1,600 cases — [while] just 14 judges . . . have sided with the [Government’s] position.”).

Petitioner falls into the class of individuals entitled to a bond hearing in immigration court under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). *Delgado Garcia v. Quinones et al*, No. 6:26-cv-181-GAP-DCI, Doc. 7, (M.D. Fla. Jan. 26, 2026) (Presnell, J.); *Guaquire v. Quinones*, No. 6:26-cv-169-RBD-RMN, 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21745, at \*18-19 (“Mandatory detainer applies to noncitizens “seeking admission” at the border. Section 1226, and the protection of a bond hearing, applies to noncitizens already present within our borders.”); *see also De Souza v. Soto*, No. CV 25-18734 (JXN), 2026 WL 102946, at \*2 (D.N.J. Jan. 14, 2026) (recognizing that the

petitioner who overstayed his B2 tourist visa and was arrested was detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and entitled to a bond hearing with an immigration judge); cf. *Lopez v. Dir. of Enft & Removal Operations*, No. 3:25-cv-1313, 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22613 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 26, 2026) (Pratt, J.); *Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi*, No. 25-20496 CONSOLIDATED WITH No. 25-40701, 2026 U.S. App. LEXIS 3899 (5th Cir. Feb. 6, 2026) (mandate not yet issued).

An ICE immigration detainer would only permit Petitioner's detention by a criminal justice agency for not more than 48 hours. 8 C.F.R. § 287.7(d). Petitioner's detention has far exceeded this time period. In an effort to trump the 48 hour rule, Respondents have unlawfully moved Petitioner from jail to jail. However, Petitioner has remained unlawfully detained without a bond hearing, as Petitioner is entitled to under the laws of the United States. Respondents' prolonged and unlawful detention of Petitioner is also a violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, as Petitioner has been deprived of her liberty and freedom without notice, hearing, or lawful process. In conclusion, Petitioner's prolonged detention is unlawful and she is entitled to habeas relief, including her immediate release.

Based on the allegations set forth herein, Petitioner is entitled to a bond hearing and due process of law, which Respondent has denied her. Therefore, Respondent's detention without a bond hearing and due process is unlawful and Petitioner has demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits.

**b. Irreparable Harm**

Petitioner has demonstrated that without an injunction she will suffer irreparable injury, which is an injury that "cannot be undone through monetary remedies." *Scott v. Roberts*, 612 F.3d 1279, 1295 (11th Cir. 2010) (quoting *Cunningham v. Adams*, 808 F.2d 815, 821 (11th Cir. 1987)). "It is well established that the deprivation of constitutional rights 'unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury.'" *Mejia*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 217352, 2025 WL 3078656, at \*3 (quoting *Gayle v. Meade*, 614 F. Supp. 3d 1175, 1205 (S.D. Fla. 2020)). Under the same or similar circumstances, courts have found irreparable harm where noncitizens, such as Petitioner, were detained without bond hearings. *See e.g. Anzola v. Warden, Orange Cnty. Jail*, No. 6:26-cv-00180-GAP-NWH, 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14747 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 27, 2026) (Presnell, J.); *Perez v. Quinones*, No. 6:26-cv-00228-GAP-DCI, 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17033 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 28, 2026) (Presnell, J.).

To allow Petitioner, who appears to be entitled to a bond hearing regarding her continued detention, to be transferred from the Flagler County Jail to an ICE holding facility outside this Court's jurisdiction would frustrate the speedy resolution of this case. Further, if Petitioner is smuggled away to ICE holding facilities, neither the Court nor Petitioner's counsel, family, or loved ones will have success locating, much less communicating with her. *See, e.g., Delgado Garcia v. Quinones et al*, No. 6:26-cv-181-GAP-DCI, Doc. 7, ¶ 5-6 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 26, 2026).

Indeed, the filing of this Petition was delayed because of the movement of Petitioner between jails, which made it difficult for Petitioner's counsel to locate her and finalize said Petition.

Accordingly, Petitioner, has shown irreparable harm will occur if this Court does not prohibit Petitioner's transfer from the Flagler County Jail until such time that the Court can adjudicate the case.

**c. Balance of Equities and Public Interest**

Petitioner's rights to due process and liberty are at issue. "Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty [the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause] protects." *Mejia*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 217352, 2025 WL 3078656, at \*3 (quoting *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690). "There is no identifiable legitimate public interest served by Petitioner's likely unlawful detention without a bond hearing." *Anzola*, 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14747 at \*6; *Perez*, 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17033 at \*6. Instead, "the public is better served by the faithful execution of immigration laws." *Id.* Accordingly, Petitioner has demonstrated that the balance of equities and the public interest justify the entry of a TRO prohibiting her further transfer from the Flagler County Jail until further order of the Court.

**d. Notice Requirement of Rule 65 and Certification of Counsel**

A Temporary Restraining order may be issued without notice to the adverse party or its attorney if:

(A) specific facts in an affidavit or a verified complaint clearly show that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result to the movant before the adverse party can be heard in opposition; and

(B) the movant's attorney certifies in writing any efforts made to give notice and the reasons why it should not be required.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b). Here, both prongs have been satisfied. Petitioner has filed a verified complaint with an affidavit attached demonstrating the immediate and irreparable harm that will result before the Respondent can be heard in opposition. Docs. 1, 1-2. As set forth in the verified complaint, Petitioner has been in custody for a prolonged period of time and has not received due process from Respondents. Further, Respondents have already relocated Petitioner multiple times. Most recently, Petitioner was given Notice of an Internet Master Calendar Hearing to be held on February 13, 2026 and a subsequent hearing to be held on February 27, 2026. Petitioner believes that without the entry of a TRO to maintain the status quo, she could be moved outside the Middle District of Florida, thereby jeopardizing the Court's ability to adjudicate this case. Further, there is a risk that if the ultimate relief that Petitioner seeks is granted, she could incur costs and potentially face difficulties in returning home.

Second, Petitioners certify herein the following efforts they have made to give notice to Respondents: On February 19, 2026, the undersigned emailed the verified petition seeking the writ of habeas corpus to Respondents at the following addresses: DEngert@flaglersheriff.com and JLeMaster@flaglersheriff.com

(Flagler County Jail); Miami.Outreach@ice.dhs.gov (DHS and ICE), Orlando.DutyAtty@ice.dhs.gov (DHS and ICE). A copy of this electronic service is attached hereto as *Exhibit A*. On this same date, the undersigned emailed copies of the verified petition and the first TRO motion to the Civil Division of the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Middle District of Florida at USAFLM.JAX.Civil.NewCases@usdoj.gov. A copy of this electronic service is also attached hereto as *Exhibit B*. As noted in *Exhibit A* and *Exhibit B*, some of the Respondents are demanding physical service of the Petition. However, the undersigned hereby certify that efforts have been made to give all of the Respondents notice.

In an analogous case involving an immigration detainee, a Court in the Middle District of Florida found that “[t]h exigency of [Petitioner’s] potential unlawful detention and removal from this District necessitates entry of this temporary restraining order without notice to Respondents.” *Saint Remy v. Bondi*, No. 3:26-cv-28-MMH-SJH, 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5322, at \*3 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 12, 2026) (Howard, J.). Similarly, here, based on the urgency of the situation and Respondents prior actions with respect to Petitioner’s custody and her movements, the undersigned certify that no further notice should be required by this Court.

**e. Rule 65(c) bond requirement**

The Local Rules and Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c) typically require that a

TRO motion "include . . . a precise and verified explanation of the amount and form of the required security." Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(c); accord M.D. Fla. R. 6.01(a)(4). However, this Court has "discretion to waive [the security] requirement imposed by Rule 65(c)." *Disability Rts. Fla., Inc. v. Jacobs*, 473 F. Supp. 3d 1335, 1340 (M.D. Fla. 2019) (citing *Baldree v. Cargill, Inc.*, 758 F. Supp. 704, 707-08 (M.D. Fla. 1990), *aff'd*, 925 F.2d 1474 (11th Cir. 1991)); *see also Ajugwe v. Noem*, No. 8:25-CV-982-MSS-AEP, 2025 WL 1370212, at \*10 (M.D. Fla. May 12, 2025) (exercising "discretion to waive the bond requirement in Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(c)"). Indeed, in *Saint Remy* the Court found that "because there is no realistic likelihood of prejudice to Respondents from the issuance of this limited restraint, the Court exercises its discretion to dispense with the requirement that Saint Remy provide security under Rule 65(c)." 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5322, at \*3. Petitioner asks the Court to make the same finding here and waive the requirement that she post a security bond.

**f. Proposed Order**

Attached hereto as *Exhibit C* is a proposed order granting the TRO.

**IV. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court: (1) enter a TRO and/or preliminary injunction prohibiting Respondents and those in privity with them from transferring Petitioner from Flagler County until further order from the Court; (2) order expedited proceedings under 28 U.S.C. § 2243; and

(3) grant any other such relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted this 19<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2026.

/s/ Fritz Scheller

Fritz Scheller, Esquire  
Florida Bar No.: 0183113  
Fritz Scheller, P.L.  
200 East Robinson St., Ste 1150  
Orlando, Florida 32801  
PH: (407) 792-1285  
FAX: (407) 649-1657  
fscheller@flusalaw.com

/s/ Andrew C. Searle

Andrew C. Searle, Esquire  
Florida Bar No. 0116461  
Searle Law P.A.  
200 East Robinson St., Ste 1150  
Orlando, Florida 32801  
Telephone: 407-952-0642  
andrew@searle-law.com

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on February 19, 2026, I electronically served a copy of the foregoing on the Flagler County Jail, 1002 Justice Lane, Bunnell, FL 32110 via email to JLeMaster@flaglersheriff.com, and ICE-Jacksonville Field Office via email to Miami.Outreach@ice.dhs.gov, and Orlando.DutyAtty@ice.dhs.gov.

/s/ Fritz Scheller

Fritz Scheller, Esquire  
Florida Bar No.: 0183113  
Fritz Scheller, P.L.  
200 East Robinson St., Ste 1150  
Orlando, Florida 32801  
PH: (407) 792-1285  
FAX: (407) 649-1657  
fscheller@flusalaw.com

/s/ Andrew C. Searle

Andrew C. Searle, Esquire  
Florida Bar No. 0116461  
Searle Law P.A.  
200 East Robinson St., Ste 1150  
Orlando, Florida 32801  
Telephone: 407-952-0642  
andrew@searle-law.com

# Exhibit C

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
JACKSONVILLE DIVISION

SOLBEY LORENA GALLARDO CARDENAS,

Petitioner,

v.

Case No. 3:26-cv-00363

KRISTI NOEM, et al.,

Respondents.

---

**ORDER GRANTING TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER**

THIS CAUSE is before the Court for consideration on Petitioner's Emergency Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction (Doc. 2). As discussed below, the Court will grant a temporary restraining order ("TRO") in this matter.

Petitioner Solbey Lorena Gallardo Cardenas, an immigration detainee at the Flagler County Jail, initiated this action through counsel by filing a Verified Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and Complaint for Emergency Declaratory and Injunctive Relief (Doc. 1; Petition). Cardenas, a citizen of Columbia, entered the United States at the Eagle Pass, Texas point of entry on November 13, 2023. *Id.* at 2. Cardenas subsequently filed a petition for asylum, which is pending. *Id.* Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") issued Cardenas a permit to work in the United States and she obtained a

Florida driver's license. Id.

On November 19, 2025, Cardenas was arrested by local law enforcement in Broward County, Florida regarding a domestic dispute. Id. Although Cardenas was arrested for aggravated assault with a weapon, the State dropped the case on January 9, 2026, after its review. See Doc. 1; Doc. 1-4. Despite the State's no information notice, ICE took custody of Cardenas on January 9, 2026. Doc. 1 at 2. Cardenas asserts that since January 9, 2026, Cardenas has been unlawfully detained by ICE on immigration detainer(s) at local jails, including the Orange County Jail, the Baker County Jail, and now the Flagler County Jail, where she remains in custody. Id. Cardenas argues that she is not subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) and is entitled to a bond hearing. Id. at 6–9. Cardenas further contends that her prolonged detention without a bond hearing violates her right to due process. Id.

Along with her Petition, Cardenas has filed an Emergency Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and for Preliminary Injunction (Doc. 2; Motion). In the Motion, Cardenas asks the Court to enter an order enjoining Respondents from transferring her from the Flagler County Jail until further order of the

Court.

Upon review of the allegations in the Motion and Petition, the Court finds that the TRO is necessary to maintain the status quo and that the exigency of Cardenas's potential unlawful detention and removal from this District necessitates entry of this TRO without notice to Respondents. Moreover, because there is no realistic likelihood of prejudice to Respondents from the issuance of this limited restraint, the Court exercises its discretion to dispense with the requirement that Cardenas provide security under Rule 65(c), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (Rule(s)). See Ajugwe v. Noem, No. 8:25-CV-982-MSS-AEP, 2025 WL 1370212, at \*10 (M.D. Fla. May 12, 2025) (exercising "discretion to waive the bond requirement in Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(c)").

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

1. Cardenas's Emergency Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction (Doc. 2) is GRANTED to the extent that Respondents and any officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and persons in active concert or participation with Respondents who receive actual notice of this Order, are enjoined from removing Cardenas from the Middle District of Florida until further Order of the Court. The security required by

Rule 65(c) is waived.

2. The Clerk of Court shall send a copy of the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. 1), the Motion (Doc. 2), and this Order by mail and email to the United States Attorney for the Middle District of Florida (USAFLM.JAX.Civil.NewCases@usdoj.gov); and by certified mail to the Director of Enforcement and Removal Operations, Miami Field Office, 865 S.W. 78th Avenue, Suite 101, Plantation, FL 33324; the Attorney General of the United States, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20530; Warden, Flagler County Inmate Facility, 1002 Justice Lane, Bunnell, FL 32110; and The Flagler County Sheriff Judicial Process and Fugitive Section, 1769 E. Moody Blvd Bldg. 1, Bunnell, FL 32110. All costs of service shall be advanced by the United States.

3. Cardenas's counsel shall also immediately serve via e-mail a copy of this Order, the Motion (Doc. 2), and Petition (Doc. 1) on the appropriate U.S. Customs and Immigration Enforcement officials. See Local Rule 6.01(c).

4. Counsel for Respondents shall file a notice of appearance within one business day from the entry of this Order.

5. The Court will conduct a status conference on \_\_\_\_\_, at

\_\_\_\_\_ to discuss a briefing schedule. The Courtroom Deputy Clerk will separately send participants an Outlook invitation with the link, meeting ID, and password.

Participants should dress in appropriate court attire and appear in front of an appropriate professional background. All persons are hereby reminded that pursuant to Local Rule 5.01, United States District Court, Middle District of Florida, "[n]o one may broadcast, televise, record, or photograph a judicial proceeding, including a proceeding by telephone or video." Violation of these prohibitions may result in sanctions, including removal of court issued media credentials, restricted entry to future hearings, denial of entry to future hearings, or any other sanctions deemed necessary by the Court.

**DONE AND ORDERED** at Jacksonville, Florida this \_\_\_ day of February, 2026.

---

**United States District Judge**

c: Counsel of record