UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
FORT MYERS DIVISION

ROLAND PENA QUESADA,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, et al. (all official capacity),

Respondents.
_____/

Case No. 2:26-cv-505-KCD-DNF
A No. 088-519-286
Cuba

Response to Habeas Petition

Petitioner Roland Pena Quesada challenges his detention by U.S. Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") and Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") as unreasonably prolonged. The Federal Respondents disagree.

The Court lacks jurisdiction. Apart from that, ICE properly exercised its discretion to revoke Pena Quesada's OSUP—a decision on which the Court is statutorily prohibited from reviewing. And detention during this period is reasonable. So the Court should deny the Petition.

Background

Pena Quesada is a citizen and national of Cuba. (Ex. 1 at 2). In 2007, he entered the United States and received legal status. (Ex. 1 at 2). He was later convicted of a felony. (Ex. 1 at 3).

Pena Quesada was placed in removal proceedings. (Ex. 2 at 1). In 2011, an IJ

ordered him removed. (Ex. 3 at 1). Pena Quesada waived his right to appeal—making that order final. (Ex. 3 at 1). In May 2012, ICE released on an OSUP. (Ex. 4 at 1).

On November 30, 2025, ICE revoked the OSUP and took Pena Quesada into custody. (Exs. 1 at 3; 5 at 1). That day, ICE provided Pena Quesada with an informal interview to contest revocation and detention. (Exs. 1 at 3; 5 at 3). In January and early February, ICE attempted to remove Pena Quesada to Mexico. (Ex. 1 at 3). He was transferred to Texas to execute that removal. (Ex. 1 at 3). But on the day of removal, Pena Quesada apparently refused to get dressed and get on the bus. (Ex. 1 at 3). So he was transferred back to Florida. (Ex. 1 at 3).

After returning to Florida, ICE issued another OSUP revocation and conducted an informal interview. (Ex. 6). ICE plans to continue efforts to remove to Mexico. (Ex. 1 at 3). Pena Quesada has been in ICE detention since November 30. (Ex. 1 at 3). This challenge followed.

Certified Habeas Return

The Court has power to grants writs of habeas corpus where (among other instances) petitioner "is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3). Petitioners bear the burden to prove custody violates federal law. *Whitfield v. U.S. Sec'y of State*, 853 F. App'x 327, 329 (11th Cir. 2021).

An IJ ordered Pena Quesada removed. Pena Quesada is now removable from the United States. The Attorney General (through her delegates) has a statutory obligation to execute that removal. 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(1)(A), (a)(3).

ICE is detaining Pena Quesada under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6) pending his removal. It is working towards executing removal to Mexico.

The period of Pena Quesada's detention is still well within the presumptively reasonable limits established in *Zadvydas*. Even if he were able to challenge detention before then, Pena Quesada cannot show there is no SLRRFF.

Discussion

Pena Quesada challenges his detention under various theories. These claims fail. As described below, the Court has no jurisdiction. Even if it did, detention has not extended to a length creating constitutional questions; nor did ICE violate any law in proceeding with removal.

A. Lack of Jurisdiction

While Respondents believe the Court lacks jurisdiction, the undersigned realizes it will fail here. Plus, jurisdiction is a nonwaivable matter should Respondents choose to appeal. So for the brief purpose of preservation, Respondents contend 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g), (b)(9) strip jurisdiction.

B. Constitutionally Lawful Detention

Even if the Court disagrees with the above, it must still deny the writ. Pena Quesada cannot make a claim for unlawfully prolonged detention at this time. And regardless of any dispute, his failure to cooperate in securing travel documentation tolls any *Zadvydas* time. Nor can he litigate SLRRFF prematurely.

1. Zadvydas *Challenge Premature*

After a final removal order, an alien must be removed within ninety days—i.e., the removal period. 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(1); *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 683 (2001). During the removal period, the alien must be detained. 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(2); *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 683. An alien, however, can be detained beyond that removal period. 8 U.S.C. §§ 1231(a)(1)(C), (a)(6); *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 683. This is called a "post-removal" period. *Johnson v. Guzman Chavez*, 594 U.S. 523, 529 (2021).

There is no statutory limit on how long ICE can detain an alien during the post-removal period. *Johnson v. Arteaga-Martinez*, 596 U.S. 573, 579 (2022). Yet indefinite detention would present obvious constitutional concerns. *Id.* So the Supremes interpret this post-removal period to allow extended detention for "a period reasonably necessary to bring about that alien's removal from the United States." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 689. In all, a reasonable length of detention "is presumptively six months." *Guzman Chavez*, 594 U.S. at 529; *see also Akinwale v. Ashcroft*, 287 F.3d 1050, 1052 (11th Cir. 2002) (stating six-month period is inclusive of any ninety-day removal period).

If the presumptively reasonable period expires without removal, then a burden-shifting framework comes into play regarding SLRRFF. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 689. But before that six-month period expires, any habeas challenge to the detention itself is premature. *E.g.*, *Akinwale*, 287 F.3d at 1051-52; *Guo Xing Song v. U.S. Attorney General*, 516 F. App'x 894, 899 (11th Cir. 2013); *Gozo v. Napolitano*, 309 F. App'x 344,

346 (11th Cir. 2009).[1] At bottom, "This presumptively reasonable six month period must have expired at the time of the filing of a petition." *E.g.*, *Jiang v. Mukasey*, No. 2:08-cv-773-FtM-29DNF, 2009 WL 260378, at *2 (M.D. Fla. Feb. 3, 2009) (Steele, J.); *Noel v. Glades Cnty. Sheriff*, No. 2:11-cv-698-FtM-29SPC, 2011 WL 6412425, at *2 (M.D. Fla. Dec. 21, 2011) (Steele, J.).

Pena Quesada has been in detention for 108 days. He was first detained on November 30 and sued on February 23. At that point, Pena Quesada had been detained for eighty-six days. Either timeline is well under the 180-day period that is presumptively reasonable. That is fatal to jurisdiction. *Akinwale*, 287 F.3d at 1051-52.

To contend ICE cannot detain him for the purpose of removal, as Pena Quesada does, would effectively eliminate ICE's ability to ever remove an alien unless it does so within the presumptively reasonable timeframe. *Chun Yat Ma v. Asher*, No. C11-1797 MJP, 2012 WL 1432229, at *3 (Apr. 25, 2012). *Zadvydas* doesn't sweep that broad. It goes without saying an alien must be detained (or otherwise in custody) to effect removal unless the alien leaves voluntarily. Pena Quesada has not left voluntarily, and ICE is attempting to remove him. If the Court accepts his position, it is unclear how ICE would be able to remove Pena Quesada—which ICE is actively working toward. *But see Wong Wing v. United States*, 163 U.S. 228, 235 (1896) ("We

[1] Some districts disagree. *Cesar v. Achim*, 542 F. Supp. 2d 897, 902 (E.D. Wis. 2008). Of course, *Akinwale* binds the Court. Even if it didn't, *Cesar* and any progeny are wrong. *Zadvydas* recognized the presumptive six-month period for the specific "sake of uniform administration in the federal courts." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 701. That was not an invitation to make up exceptions to this ripeness doctrine—like *Cesar* did.

think it clear that detention or temporary confinement, as part of the means necessary to give effect to the provisions for the exclusion or expulsion of aliens, would be valid. Proceedings to exclude or expel would be vain if those accused could not be held in custody . . . while arrangements were being made for their deportation.").

Because Pena Quesada was first detained on November 30, any *Zadvydas* challenge fails. *E.g.*, *Jiang*, 2009 WL 260378, at *2 ("This presumptively reasonable six month period must have expired at the time of the filing of a petition.").

ICE recognizes that Judges Chappell and Steele have held the *Zadvydas* period is coterminous with the statutory removal and post-removal periods, meaning it can run while an alien is outside detention. *Beltran v. ICE*, No. 2:25-cv-01174-SPC-NPM, 2026 WL 21252 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 5, 2026) (Chappell, J.); *Godinez Perez v. Noem*, No. 2:25-cv-00429-JES-NPM, 2025 WL 2806557, at *2 (M.D. Fla. Oct. 2, 2025) (Steele, J.). This Court, however, disagrees and correctly holds that the *Zadvydas* period runs from actual detention—not a statutory period that may have expired decades ago. *Khalil al Ellary v. Noem*, No. 2:26-cv-112-KCD-DNF, at *3-4 (M.D. Fla. Feb. 27, 2026); *Lageyre-Ravelo v. ICE*, No. 2:25-cv-1171-KCD-DNF, at *14-16 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 2, 2026).

Notably, Judge Pratt issued a recent decision adopting ICE's general interpretation of this question. *Da Wu v. ICE*, No. 3:25-cv-1254-JEP-MCR (M.D. Fla. Feb. 3, 2026). Judge Berger just agreed. *Gonzalez Barrera v. U.S. Att'y General*, No. 3:26-cv-282-WWB-SJH, 2026 WL 472340, at *1-2 (M.D. Fla. Feb. 19, 2026). So too did three Southern District cases—agreeing that this period begins at the start of an alien's

actual detention and begins again when ICE makes a renewed effort to remove after failing long ago. *Barrios v. Ripa*, No. 1:25-cv-22644-GAYLES, 2025 WL 2280485 (S.D. Fla. Aug. 8, 2025) (holding claim premature and rejecting argument that aggregate prior detentions considered for *Zadvydas* purposes); *Guerra-Castro v. Parra*, No. 1:25-cv-22487-GAYLES, 2025 WL 1984300 (S.D. Fla. July 17, 2025) (holding claim premature when removal period ended in 2014); *Grigorian v. Bondi*, No. 25-CV-22914-RAR, 2025 WL 1895479, at *7-8 (S.D. Fla. July 8, 2025) (same for 2011). Other courts agree. *Ghamelian v. Baker*, No. SAG-25-02106, 2025 WL 2049981, at *4 (D. Md. July 22, 2025) ("The government is entitled to its six-month presumptive period before Petitioner's continued § 1231(a)(6) [re-]detention poses a constitutional issue.").

With *Zadvydas*, the "basic question" is "whether the detention in question exceeds a period reasonably necessary to secure removal." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 699. In *Zadvydas*, the Court "used the words 'detain' and 'custody' to refer exclusively to physical confinement and restraint." *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 311 (2018). *Zadvydas* protects against unconstitutionally indefinite detention; it did not interpret starting an imaginary detention clock based on statutory periods divorced from physical restraint. Again, to conclude the detention period started with the statutory removal time requires a corresponding finding that ICE has been unconstitutionally detaining Pena Quesada since his OSUP release. That is a factual impossibility. Yet it also imposes an impossible burden on ICE—requiring it to justify extended detention if the burden shifts. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 701 ("And for detention to remain reasonable, as the period of prior postremoval confinement grows, what counts as the

'reasonably foreseeable future' conversely would have to shrink.").

Akinwale and other courts recognize that calculating time will often begin when detention is required (i.e., start of the removal period). 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(2)(A). But this would only be the case where petitioner challenges detention beginning at that time. If—as here—petitioner gets detained years later, no reasonable interpretation of *Zadvydas*, *Akinwale*, or any other binding law suggests the six-month period can expire before detention occurs. Many cases on this exact issue hold the period begins with actual detention. *E.g.*, *Cheng Ke Chen v. Holder*, 783 F. Supp. 2d 1183, 1192 (N.D. Ala. 2011) (rejecting claim as premature for petitioner who was not detained during removal period because "it defies common sense to suggest that *Zadvydas* time can run while a petitioner is not in custody").[2] Again, *Zadvydas* "exclusively" addressed "physical confinement and restraint." *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 311.

Here, Pena Quesada is in the "post-removal period" under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6). *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 683. It is "presumptively reasonable" for ICE to detain an individual with that status for a total of six months. *Id.* at 701. To this day, Pena Quesada is still within that reasonable detention period.

---

[2] *See also Callender v. Shanahan*, 281 F. Supp. 3d 428, 436 n.7 (S.D.N.Y. 2017); *Rodriguez-Guardado v. Smith*, 271 F. Supp. 3d 331, 335 n.8 (D. Mass. 2017); *Rivera v. Hassell*, No. 4:15-01497-WMA-SGC, 2016 WL 4257692, at *3 (N.D. Ala. July 12, 2016), *R&R adopted*, 2016 WL 4257052 (Aug. 10, 2016); *Chun Yat Ma v. Asher*, No. C11-1797 MJP, 2012 WL 1432229, at *3 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 25, 2012); *Raia v. Aviles*, No. 11-3374 (WJM), 2011 WL 2710275, at *5 & n.9 (D.N.J. July 6, 2011); *Thelemaque v. Barr*, No. 20-20467-CIV-ALTONAGA/Reid, 2020 WL 13551808, at *2 & n.1 (S.D. Fla. Mar. 30, 2020); *Aionesei-Lupu v. Barr*, No. 1:20-cv-22998-BLOOM, 2020 WL 8679783, at *2 (S.D. Fla. July 23, 2020); *Cruz v. Lumpkin*, No. H-23-2224, 2023 WL 4566252, at *1 n.7 (S.D. Tex. July 17, 2023).

A dicta footnote in *Akinwale* does not alter this outcome. 287 F.3d at 1053 n.3. In part, *Akinwale* decided whether the action was premature. *Id.* at 1051-52. There was no doubt it was since petitioner filed four months after he was "taken into custody." *Id.* 1051. In dicta and its related footnote, *Akinwale* stated the six-month term was inclusive of the removal period (i.e., six months in total, not six months on top of the ninety-day removal period). ICE does not dispute that. Instead, *Akinwale*'s express holding is relevant: petitioner "must show post-removal order detention in excess of six months." *Id.* at 1052.

There is no way Pena Quesada can make that showing. It is undisputed he has not been in physical detention for six months. As explained, the constitutional detention period cannot start running without some form of constraint. This case is unripe because *Zadvydas* does not protect against detention that never existed.

Importantly, that six-month period is a bright-line, irrebuttable presumption of constitutionally acceptable detention. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 701; *Akinwale*, 287 F.3d at 1052.[3] It is only "after" this time that SLRRFF and *Zadvydas* burden-shifting comes into play. *Guzman Chavez*, 594 U.S. at 529 (cleaned up); *see also Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 298-99; *Clark v. Martinez*, 543 U.S. 371, 378 (2005); *Jama v. ICE*, 543 U.S. 335, 347-48 (2005). After means "following in time or place or subsequently to the time

[3] *See also Guo Xing Song v. U.S. Attorney General*, 516 F. App'x 894, 899 (11th Cir. 2013); *Gozo v. Napolitano*, 309 F. App'x 344, 346 (11th Cir. 2009); *Vaz v. Skinner*, 634 Fed. App'x 778, 782 (11th Cir. 2015); *Ivantchouk v. U.S. Attorney General*, 417 Fed. App'x 918, 921 (11th Cir. 2011); *Chance v. Napolitano*, 453 F. App'x 535, 536 (5th Cir. 2011); *Agyei-Kodie v. Holder*, 418 F. App'x 317, 318 (5th Cir. 2011); *Okpoju v. Ridge*, 115 F. App'x 302, 302 (5th Cir. 2004).

when or later in time." *Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Ubiquiti, Inc.*, No. 1:23-cv-00865-JCG, 2025 WL 1640270, at *3 (D. Del. June 10, 2025) (cleaned up). The word gets used to "describe a temporal sequence." *Id.*; *see also Arlaine & Gina Rockey, Inc. v. Cordis Corp.*, No. 02-22555-CIV, 2004 WL 5504978, at *42 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 5, 2004) (giving "after" its "ordinary meanings" like "following in time"). Until the Supreme Court recognizes a *Zadvydas* challenge *during* that six-month period, the Court cannot create that cause of action where none exists in derogation of *Akinwale*. *See* 287 F.3d at 1052 ("This six-month period thus must have expired . . . in order to state a claim under *Zadvydas*.").

To require detailed justification from ICE before the *Zadvydas* period expires is a significant infringement on separation of powers principles. Essentially every question related to immigration is "exclusively entrusted to the political branches of government as to be largely immune from judicial inquiry or interference." *Harisiades v. Shaughnessy*, 342 U.S. 580, 588-89 (1952). This isn't a recent development. *Trump v. Hawaii*, 585 U.S. 667, 702 (2018) ("For more than a century, this Court has recognized that the admission and exclusion of foreign nationals is a fundamental sovereign attribute exercised by the Government's political departments." (cleaned up)). That power, however, is always "subject to important constitutional limitations." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 695. "In these cases, we focus upon those limitations." *Id.*

Other principles of judicial review come into play too. *Id.* at 700. Courts "recognize primary Executive Branch responsibility" in this field. *Id.* They must also

"give expert agencies decisionmaking leeway in matters that invoke their expertise." *Id.* Important here, that includes "Executive Branch primacy in foreign policy matters." *Id.* These basic separation-of-powers principles "require courts to listen with care when the Government's foreign policy judgments, including, for example, the status of repatriation negotiations, are at issue, and to grant the Government appropriate leeway when its judgments rest upon foreign policy expertise." *Id.*

The Executive branch is attempting to remove Pena Quesada. He was a convicted felon from Cuba—a country whose government is traditionally hostile to the United States. The Executive's efforts to remove Pena Quesada in these circumstances go to the very core of its power to enforce immigration laws and conduct delicate, ever-shifting foreign policy negotiations. *See United States v. Texas*, 599 U.S. 670, 679 (2023) ("That principle of enforcement discretion over arrests and prosecutions extends to the immigration context, where the Court has stressed that the Executive's enforcement discretion implicates not only normal domestic law enforcement priorities but also foreign-policy objectives." (cleaned up)); *Biden v. Texas*, 597 U.S. 785, 805-06 (2022) ("That is no less true in the context of immigration law, where the dynamic nature of relations with other countries requires the Executive Branch to ensure that enforcement policies are consistent with this Nation's foreign policy." (cleaned up)). Until Pena Quesada's detention raises a constitutional problem—i.e., after six months—the political branches (namely, the Executive) must be permitted to pursue law enforcement and foreign policy objectives without interference.

To find otherwise would demand the Executive explain its constitutionally acceptable actions for the Judiciary to decide if it concurs based on an individual judge's interpretation of current world events. Yet in the American system of delegated, separated powers, coequal branches need not justify to one another the determinations made within their legal discretion. That is especially true where—as here—the law largely entrusts the subject to the Executive alone.

What's more, an interpretation allowing a challenge now grants rights based on the statutory definitions of removal and post-removal periods under 8 U.S.C. § 1231. But that statute literally specifies it "shall [not] be construed to create any substantive or procedural right or benefit that is legally enforceable by any party against the United States." *Id.* § 1231(h). The only way to conclude SLRRFF burden-shifting applies now is by first concluding ICE's failure to remove within the statutory period somehow entitles Pena Quesada to review. Again, that's atextual.

As explained, these claims fail. Apart from that, Pena Quesada cannot make a *Zadvydas* claim on these facts.

2. Failure to Cooperate with Removal

When ICE executes a removal order, an alien must comply and assist. Failure to do so results in detention and tolling any *Zadvydas* time. 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(1)(C).

"*Zadvydas* does not save an alien who fails to provide requested documentation to effectuate his removal." *Pelich v. INS*, 329 F.3d 1057, 1060 (9th Cir. 2003). "The reason is self-evident: the detainee cannot convincingly argue that there is no [SLRRFF] if the detainee controls the clock." *Id.* In sum, a *Zadvydas* claim fails if

petitioner holds the "keys to his freedom in his pocket and could likely effectuate his removal by providing the information requested by" ICE. *Id.* (cleaned up).

The Eleventh Circuit recognizes these commonsense principles. *Singh v. U.S. Att'y General*, 945 F.3d 1310, 1314 (11th Cir. 2019). Specifically, it reads the plain language of § 1231(a)(1)(C) for what it says—extending the detention period if the alien "fails or refuses to make timely application in good faith for travel or other documents necessary to the alien's departure." *Id.* (citation omitted). If an alien withheld travel documents needed for removal in bad faith, detention continues. *Id.*

Here, the only evidence on bad faith noncompliance is ICE's declaration. (Ex. 1 at 3). A deportation officer ("DO") affirms that Pena Quesada refused to get dressed or get on the bus when ICE was attempting to remove him to Mexico. (Ex. 1 at 3).

Pena Quesada has no allegations otherwise. He fails to make even a conclusory allegation on efforts to comply with removal much less rebutting ICE's allegations on his refusal to comply with the attempted removal in early February. On these facts, ICE attempted to remove and the only thing that stopped it was Pena Quesada's conduct. This is a quintessential example of a petitioner holding the "keys to his freedom in his pocket." *See Pelich*, 329 F.3d at 1060; *Singh*, 945 F.3d at 1314.

As explained, the *Zadvydas* period is on hold until Pena Quesada complies with ICE's efforts to secure his removal.

3. No Lack of SLRRFF

Even if the Court were to get past those matters, there is no way for Pena Quesada to show no SLRRFF exists. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 689. At this point, ICE

is working toward removal "the reasonably foreseeable future." *See id.* There are no allegations—much less evidentiary support—to rebut ICE's SLRRFF determination. ICE actually tried removing Pena Quesada. And there is no suggestion it would not merely try again after he complies with the removal efforts. There are simply no facts to support a lack of SLRRFF.

Conclusion

For those reasons, the Court should deny the Petition. To the extent that the Court grants any relief, the only proper relief would be whatever notice and hearing requirement it believes proper—not outright release.

Certificate of Service

I certify that a copy of this Response and Exhibits will be sent by US Mail on March 18, 2026, to the following:

Roland Pena Quesada
A [redacted]
Florida Soft Side South Inmate Mail
54575 Tamiami Trail E.
Ochopee, FL 34141

Date: March 17, 2026

Respectfully submitted,
GREGORY W. KEHOE
United States Attorney

Kevin R. Huguelet
Assistant United States Attorney
Florida Bar Number 125690
Kevin.Huguelet@usdoj.gov
2110 First Street, Suite 3-137
Fort Myers, Florida 33901
(239) 461-2237
(Lead counsel for Federal Respondent)