

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
FORT MYERS DIVISION**

RENE RODRIGUEZ-ALES,

Petitioner,

v.

Case No. 2:26-cv-612-SPC-DNF

WARDEN, FLORIDA SOFT
SIDE SOUTH, et al.,

Respondents.

FEDERAL RESPONDENTS' MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION

The Federal Respondents respectfully request clarification of the Court's April 9, 2026 order directing ICE to conduct a custody review considering whether Rene Rodriguez-Ales ("Petitioner") presents a danger to the community. (Doc. 8).

BACKGROUND

On March 4, 2026, this matter commenced with the filing of a petition seeking relief pursuant to the Writ of Habeas Corpus. (Doc. 1.) As directed, Federal Respondents filed their response on March 12, 2026. (Doc. 5.) In their response, Federal Respondents argued that Petitioner's detention did not violate the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution because his period of detention remained presumptively reasonable. *See* Doc. 5, pp 4-5; *see also Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 689 (2001). Because Petitioner's detention remained presumptively reasonable, Federal Respondents argued that the burden-shifting framework requiring the

government to demonstrate a significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future (“SLRRFF”) had not been triggered. *Id.* The Court disagreed, finding that the presumptively reasonable detention period had expired and that the government had not demonstrated SLRRFF. (Doc 8.) However, given the Petitioner’s criminal history, the Court directed ICE to “conduct a custody review to determine whether Rodriguez-Ales poses a danger to the community sufficient to justify continued detention.” *Id.* at 4.

DISCUSSION

Federal Respondents’ position is that where a determination has been made that there is no SLRRFF—as is the case here with the Court’s finding—the operative regulation governing detention is 8 C.F.R. § 241.13. This regulation considers the alien’s likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future and generally does not permit the government to base its detention decision on whether the alien presents a potential danger to the community. *Id.* There is a narrow exception for “special circumstances” in which the alien’s detention may be considered under a separate regulation: 8 C.F.R. § 241.14. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 241.13(e)(6). Examples of “special circumstances” include contagious disease posing a threat to public safety, potential serious adverse foreign policy consequences, terrorism, or where the alien has been deemed “specially dangerous” based on his commission of serious crimes on account of a mental condition or personality disorder. 8 C.F.R. § 241.14(b)–(f).

In Federal Respondents' view the facts do not support the conclusion that Petitioner falls within any of § 241.14's criteria. Therefore, Petitioner's detention should be considered under § 241.13. Given the Court's determination that the government failed to establish SLRRFF, the appropriate remedy here would be an order directing Federal Respondents to release Petitioner from custody under appropriate conditions of supervision to be determined by ICE. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 241.13(g)(1) (where the alien has demonstrated to ICE that there is no significant likelihood of removal, "[u]nless there are special circumstances justifying continued detention, the Service shall promptly make arrangements for the release of the alien subject to appropriate conditions, as provided in" 8 C.F.R. § 241.13(h)). Put simply, although Federal Respondents appreciate the opportunity the Court has provided to consider Petitioner's potential danger to the community, under the facts of this case, Federal Respondents do not see a regulatory mechanism that would permit the Federal Respondents or the Court to continue Petitioner's detention due to concerns about his dangerousness.

Federal Respondents respectfully request clarification as to whether the Court's order directing them to conduct a custody review to consider whether Petitioner presents a danger to the community is appropriate in light of the regulatory framework. If so, to ensure compliance with the Court's order, Federal Respondents respectfully request further clarification as to the specific criteria the Court would like them to consider in determining whether Petitioner presents a danger to the

community. If the Court concludes that such review is not appropriate, Federal Respondents request that the Court issue an order directing Federal Respondents to release Petitioner under appropriate conditions of supervision to be determined by ICE.

LOCAL RULE 3.01(g) CERTIFICATION

Pursuant to Local Rule 3.01(g), the undersigned certifies that she was unable to confer with Petitioner about this relief, because Petitioner, who is pro se, is currently detained at Krome.

DATED: April 29, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

GREGORY W. KEHOE
United States Attorney

s/ Stephanie S. Leuthauser
STEPHANIE S. LEUTHAUSER
Assistant United States Attorney
Florida Bar No. 0044981
400 North Tampa Street, Suite 3200
Tampa, Florida 33602
Telephone: 813-274-6000
Facsimile: 813-274-6198
Stephanie.leuthauser@usdoj.gov
Lead Counsel for Federal Respondents

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, on April 29, 2026, I filed the foregoing documents and any exhibits referenced therein using the CM/ECF system, which will send a Notice of Electronic Filing to all counsel of record.

I further certify that I caused a copy of the foregoing documents and any exhibits referenced therein to be sent via U.S. Mail to Rene Rodriguez-Ales, at the address listed in the Petition (Doc. 1).

s/ Stephanie S. Leuthauser
STEPHANIE S. LEUTHAUSER
Assistant United States Attorney