

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

Jose Orlando MENA HUEZO,

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,

David Easterwood, Acting Director, St.  
Paul Field Office Immigration and  
Customs Enforcement, and

Warden, Camp East Montana Detention  
Facility, El Paso County, Texas.

Respondents.

Case No. 0:26-cv-1592

**VERIFIED PETITION  
FOR WRIT OF  
HABEAS CORPUS**

Expedited Handling Requested

**INTRODUCTION**

1. Petitioner, Mr. Jose Orlando Mena Huevo ("Mr. Mena Huevo"), by and through the undersigned attorney, hereby files this petition for a writ of habeas corpus and a complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") to release Mr. Mena Huevo from ICE detention, or in the alternative to enjoin Petitioner's transfer to a facility outside of Minnesota and to provide a bond hearing pending the completion of any immigration proceedings.

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2. 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).

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

4. 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).

5. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), (e)(1) because Mr. Mena Huezo resided in Minnesota prior to his detention. Mr. Mena Huezo was quickly transferred out of Minnesota and is currently detained in El Paso, Texas. Nevertheless, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), (e)(1) allows for habeas actions in may “be brought in any judicial district in which A) the defendant resides, (B) a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated, or (C) the plaintiff resides if no real property is involved in the action. In this case, Mr. Mena Huezo resided in Saint Paul, Minnesota prior to detention, was in custody of the Minnesota ICE field office,

was detained in Minnesota as part of Operation Metro Surge, has family in Minnesota, and counsel in Minnesota. Furthermore, Respondents can easily be served in accordance with *Braden v. 30<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493 (1973) (“So long as the custodian can be reached by service of process, the court can issue a writ "within its jurisdiction" requiring that the prisoner be brought before the court for a hearing on his claim, or requiring that he be released outright from custody, even if the prisoner himself is confined outside the court's territorial jurisdiction”).

6. This Court has found in similar cases that jurisdiction and venue in Minnesota despite transfer outside of Minnesota, as Respondents routinely do within hours of detention because the “immediate custodian rule is not automatic, and the venue for habeas petitions allow for equitable concerns such as convenience and appropriateness of the district,” *Jose A. v. Noem*, No. 26-cv-480 (JMB/ECW), 2026 WL 172524 (D. Minn. Jan. 22, 2026) (citing *Luis N. v. Trump*, No. 26-cv-0171 (MJD/SGE) Doc. No. 8 at \*3 (D. Minn. Jan. 16, 2026) (citing *Braden v. 30<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493 (1973))). In this case, Respondent was detained in Minnesota and has extensive ties to Minnesota. The only connection to Texas in this case is due to the Respondents’ decision to transfer the Petitioner out of Minnesota within hours of his arrest and continue his unlawful detention there. To deny venue in Minnesota would allow Respondents to forum shop by making near immediate decisions to transfer detainees out of custody in Minnesota, a decision that is wholly out of the control of the Petitioner.

7. 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**

8. Petitioner is a citizen of Honduras and a resident of Saint Paul, Minnesota, who is currently being held at the East Montana Detention Center in El Paso, Texas. Petitioner is under the direct control of the respondents and has no scheduled release date.

9. 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. Mena Huevo.

10. 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. Mena Huevo.


11. 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.

12. 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. Mena Huezo. The address for the Fort Snelling Field Office is 1 Federal Drive, Fort Snelling, Minnesota 55111.

13. Respondent Warden is being sued in his official capacity as the Sheriff responsible for the Camp East Montana detention facility. Because Petitioner is detained in the Camp East Montana facility, Warden has immediate day-to-day control over Petitioner.

**FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

14. Petitioner is a resident of Saint Paul and a citizen of Honduras and has lived in the United States since 2014.

15. Mr. Mena Huezo has not yet filed any relief before the Immigration Court but is eligible to do so. Mr. Mena Huezo is prima facie eligible for cancellation of removal before the Court. Mr. Mena Huezo meets the elements of Cancellation of Removal because he has accrued more than ten years of continuous physical presence in the United States prior to receiving a Notice to Appear, he is a man of good moral character as evidenced by his lack of any criminal history, and the extreme and unusual hardship his five month old U.S. citizen son,  would suffer if Mr. Mena Huezo is not allowed to remain in the United States. Mr. Mena Huezo did enter the country without authorization in 2014, but he was not

apprehended by immigration authorities and does not have a final order of removal. Thus, he is prima facie eligible to file relief before the Immigration Court.

16. Mr. Mena Huezo is the sole economic provider for his son and long-time domestic partner, Vilma Melara. Mr. Mena Huezo pays for all of the living and medical expenses for I [REDACTED] and Vilma. Currently, Vilma is not employed. This is largely due to I [REDACTED]'s need for constant care and the prohibitive cost of childcare.

17. Respondent ICE arrested Mr. Mena Huezo on February 5, 2026, as he returned home from work. ICE arrested Mr. Mena Huezo without showing a warrant. Mr. Mena Huezo reports that the detention was needlessly aggressive and violent.

18. 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).

19. Since the operation began on December 1, 2025, the number of immigration officials in the twin city metro area has increased fourfold and fluctuated since that time. 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 six weeks, and are begging for the attacks on their community to stop.

20. 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 remote locations across Minnesota or to facilities as far away as El Paso, Texas.

21. In Mr. Mena Huevo's case, Petitioner has been transferred from the Bishop Henry Whipple Federal building to the East Montana Detention Center, over 1,300 miles from his home and his son.

22. Detaining Mr. Mena Huevo is an expensive and pointless endeavor. Mr. Mena Huevo 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.

23. Pending the adjudication of this Petition, Mr. Mena Huevo further seeks an order restraining the Respondents from transferring Petitioner to a location outside of the State of Minnesota, so that the jurisdiction of this Court is not impeded, and so that Petitioner remains accessible to legal counsel and loved ones.

### **STANDARD OF LAW**

24. 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).

25. 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.

26. 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).

27. “[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).

28. 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. It is worth noting, the *Yajure Hurtado* decision was recently vacated in February 2026 by a federal judge in the Central District of California.

29. 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).

30. Here, Petitioner was apprehended within the United States, not at a border while seeking entry. Petitioner was apprehended over eleven years after entering the United States.

31. Respondents wrongly assert 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2) as a basis for detaining Mr. Mena Huezo 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.*

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

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

34. 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.

35. Here, all three factors favor the petitioner.

36. First, Mr. Mena Huezo 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. Mena Huezo is wrongfully confined, a direct attack on Petitioner’s liberty interests.

37. Second, Mr. Mena Huezo will continue to be deprived of this interest if the current procedure (detaining Mr. Mena Huezo without a legal basis) is followed. There is no rational explanation for detaining Mr. Mena Huezo. 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).

38. Lastly, the Government has no legitimate interest in refusing to follow its own rules. Mr. Mena Huevo 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.

39. The placement of Mr. Mena Huevo in detention pending the resolution of ongoing immigration proceedings violates Mr. Mena Huevo'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*

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

41. 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."

42. Mr. Mena Huevo is detained, notwithstanding his now pending proceedings in immigration court, without being afforded an opportunity to advocate for release as the law requires.

## 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*

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

44. 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).

45. 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).

46. 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.

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

48. 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.

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

### **REMEDY**

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

51. 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.

52. Since Section 1225 does not apply to noncitizens who are in Petitioner's situation—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).

53. 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").

54. 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.

55. 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 Chafra 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.

56. Here, where detention is unlawfully based on 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2), which does not apply to Petitioner, release is an appropriate remedy.

**REQUEST FOR ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

57. 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.

58. The Undersigned Attorney Patrick F. Hellier, on behalf of Petitioner, respectfully requests that the Court issue an Order to Show Cause directing Respondents to file a return within three days of the Court’s order, showing cause, if any, why a writ of habeas corpus should not be granted.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that this Court grant the following relief;

- (1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- (2) Enjoin Respondents from transferring Petitioner out of the District of Minnesota pending the duration of these proceedings;
- (3) Issue an Order requiring Respondents to show cause as to why Petitioner should not be released immediately, or in the alternative afforded a bond hearing;
- (4) 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;

(5) Include in the Order that all the Petitioner's belongings must be released with him;

and,

(6) Grant any other and further relief that this Court may deem just and proper.

Date: February 23, 2026

/s/ Patrick F. Hellier  
Patrick F. Hellier, Esq.  
*Attorney for Petitioner*  
Attorney Reg: 0401816  
Zimmer Law Group  
155 Wabasha St. S. Suite 100  
St. Paul, MN 55107  
phellier@zimmigration.com  
(612) 500-4327

**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 and friends, 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: February 23, 2026

/s/ Patrick F. Hellier  
Patrick F. Hellier, Esq.