Zandra Luz Lopez
California Bar No. 216567
Federal Defenders of San Diego, Inc.
225 Broadway, Suite 900
San Diego, California 92101-5030
Telephone: (619) 234-8467
Facsimile: (619) 687-2666
Zandra_Lopez@fd.org

Attorneys for Petitioners
ENRIQUE PUERTO-NARANJO
[redacted]
CARLOS ALBERTO PINO
[redacted]
JANIER RICO
[redacted]
MAIKEL ROJAS-PEREZ
[redacted]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ENRIQUE PUERTO-NARANJO, CARLOS ALBERTO PINO, JANIER RICO, and MAIKEL ROJAS-PEREZ[1]

Petitioner,

v.

KRISTI NOEM, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, PAMELA JO BONDI, Attorney General, TODD M. LYONS, Acting Director, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, JESUS ROCHA, Acting Field Office Director, San Diego Field Office, CHRISTOPHER LAROSE, Warden at Otay Mesa Detention Center

Respondents.

CIVIL CASE NO.: **'26CV1457 RSH MMP**

Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus

[1] Petitioners are detained at Otay Mesa Detention Center. Their cases present materially identical facts. In the interest of judicial efficiency, undersigned counsel presents their claims in this single petition. *See Villalobos v. Noem*, 26-cv-00559-JLS-MMP, Doc. 9 (Feb. 17, 2026).

INTRODUCTION

This civil immigration habeas petition seeks three grounds of relief. First, it seeks to prevent Petitioners' indefinite detention pending deportation to Cuba absent the basic regulatory and due process guarantees of 8 C.F.R. §§ 241.4(l), 241.13(i), and *United States ex rel. Accardi v. Shaughnessy*, 347 U.S. 260, 268 (1954). Second, it seeks to prevent their indefinite detention pending deportation to Cuba absent the basic statutory and due process guarantees outlined in *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001). Third, it seeks to prevent their deportation to a third country without them first receiving basic due process guarantees of notice and opportunity to be heard as to Petitioner's statutory rights to seek withholding of removal and Convention Against Torture relief.

Petitioners were deported to Cuba years ago. Because ICE could not remove them to Cuba, they were released under an order of supervision. During their supervision, they did not violate the conditions of their supervision.

Despite this long history of compliance, ICE re-arrested Petitioners during their check-ins in Florida. ICE has provided no information indicating that Petitioners will be removed to Cuba in the reasonably foreseeable future, or to any other country. ICE did not provide them with notice of the reasons for revocation of supervision and did not provide them with a prompt interview where they could contest their detention.

Courts in this district and around the country have ordered Cubans released from ICE custody for the same reasons. *See Rios v. Noem*, No. 25-CV-2866-JES, Doc. 15 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 10, 2025); *Rodriguez-Gutierrez v. Noem*, 25-cv-02726-BAS-SBC, Doc. 14 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2025); *Izquierdo-Matos v. Noem*, Doc. 12, 25-cv-02979-BJC-BLM (S.D. Cal. Nov. 18, 2025); *Arostegui-Campo v. Noem*, 25-cv-03064-JLS-MMP, Doc. 11 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 25. 2025). One court underlined, "Rules matter. Hearings matter. In recognition of this cornerstone principle of our jurisprudence, a growing chorus of district courts have found

that—in similar cases—the government's unlawful detention . . . . warrants immediate release." *Delkash v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-1675-HDV-AGR, 2025 WL 2683988 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2025).

Courts have also released petitioners like these under Zadvydas. *See* e.g. *Hernandez-Blanco v. Noem*, 26-cv-00425-DMS-JLB, Doc. 8 (Feb. 23. 2026) (granting on *Zadvydas* grounds for Cuban national); (*Reinoso Martinez v. Noem*, 26-cv-00138-DMS-SBC, Doc. 7 (Jan. 29, 2026) (same).

STATEMENT OF FACTS

I. Petitioners lived under supervision for years and then were re-detained without an individualized reason for detention and without an opportunity to contest their re-detention.

Petitioners were all born in Cuba. *See* Exhibit A, Declaration of Maritza Puerto at ¶ 2; Exhibit B, Declaration of Jennifer Chavez at ¶ 2; Exhibit C, Declaration of Eduardo Fleitas at ¶ 2; Exhibit D, Declaration of Roxana Torres Valdez at ¶ 2. An immigration judge ordered Petitioners removed several years ago. Ex. A at ¶3; Ex. B at ¶3; Ex. C at ¶3, Ex. D at ¶3.

Because ICE could not deport them to Cuba, ICE placed them under an Order of Supervision. Ex. A at ¶4; Ex. B at ¶4; Ex. C at ¶4, Ex. D at ¶4.

Since their orders of supervision, they have complied with their conditions and appeared for their appointments. Ex. A at ¶4; Ex. B at ¶4; Ex. C at ¶4, Ex. D at ¶4.

They were all re-detained during an ICE check-in in Miramar Florida. Ex. A at ¶5 (Puerto-Naranjo on December 11, 2025); Ex. B at ¶4 (Pino in October of 2025); Ex. C at ¶5 (Rico on December 5, 2025), Ex. D at ¶4 (Rojas-Perez on October 30, 2025).

Based on information and belief, ICE did not provide them with proper notice for the revocation of supervision nor the proper opportunity to contest the revocation. Ex. A at ¶5-6; Ex. B at ¶4; Ex. C at ¶5, Ex. D at ¶5. Based on

information and belief, ICE has not provided Petitioners with any information indicating that they will be removed to Cuba in the reasonably foreseeable future.

All the detention of Petitioners occurred in Florida, and they were recently brought to the Otay Mesa Detention Center, where they remain today. Ex. A at ¶7; Ex. B at ¶5; Ex. C at ¶6, Ex. D at ¶6; Ex. E (immigrant locator). All petitioners have been moved constantly by ICE to different detention centers in different cities and states in the country. *Id.*

II. Cuba rarely accepts its nationals for removal.

It is no surprise that ICE has struggled to remove Petitioners to Cuba. Cuba rarely accepts its citizens for repatriation. What's more, Mexico accepts Central Americans only if they voluntarily agree to removal there.

Prior to 2017, there was no repatriation agreement between the United States and Cuba. *Clark v. Martinez*, 543 U.S. 371, 386 (2005). On January 12, 2017, the United States and Cuba signed a joint statement ("2017 Joint Statement") by which Cuba agreed to the repatriation of some Cuban nationals. *Cuba (17-112) – Joint Statement Concerning Normalization of Migration Procedures*, Jan. 12, 2017, available at https://www.state.gov/17-112/. Specifically, under the agreement Cuba "shall receive back all Cuban nationals who after the signing" of the 2017 Joint Statement "found by the competent authorities of the United States to have tried to irregularly enter or remain in that country in violation of United States law." *Id.* at 2.

In practice, however, Cuba did not accept its nationals for removal. Despite the 2017 Joint Statement, a 2019 report by the Office of Inspector General classified Cuba as an "uncooperative country" in 2017, 2018, and 2019 based on its failure to provide travel documents on a timely basis. Department of Homeland Security, Office of Inspector General, Report No. OIG-19-28, *ICE Faces Barriers in Timely Repatriation of Detained Aliens* (Mar. 11, 2019), available at https://www.oig.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/assets/2019-03/OIG-19-28-Mar19.pdf

at pages 6-7, 10, 29. In May of 2018, Cuba was one of nine countries with the uncooperative categorization. *Id.* at 10.

That tendency was borne out in this case. ICE proved unable to remove Petitioners under the agreement for the past several years.

III. The government is carrying out deportations to third countries without providing sufficient notice and opportunity to be heard.

When immigrants cannot be removed to their home country—including Cuban immigrants—ICE has begun trying to deport those individuals to third countries without adequate notice or a hearing. The Trump administration reportedly has negotiated with at least 58 countries to accept deportees from other nations. Edward Wong et al, *Inside the Global Deal-Making Behind Trump's Mass Deportations*, N.Y. Times, June 25, 2025. On June 25, 2025, the New York Times reported that seven countries—Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Kosovo, Mexico, Panama, and Rwanda—had agreed to accept deportees who are not their own citizens. *Id.* ICE has carried out highly publicized third country deportations to South Sudan and Eswatini.

The Administration has reportedly negotiated with countries to have many of these deportees imprisoned in prisons, camps, or other facilities. The government paid El Salvador about $5 million to imprison more than 200 deported Venezuelans in a maximum-security prison notorious for gross human rights abuses, known as CECOT. *See id.* In February, Panama and Costa Rica took in hundreds of deportees from countries in Africa and Central Asia and imprisoned them in hotels, a jungle camp, and a detention center. *Id.*; Vanessa Buschschluter, *Costa Rican court orders release of migrants deported from U.S.*, BBC (Jun. 25, 2025). On July 4, 2025, ICE deported eight men to South Sudan. *See* Wong, *supra*. On July 15, ICE deported five men to the tiny African nation of Eswatini where they are reportedly being held in solitary confinement. Gerald Imray, *3 Deported by US held in African Prison Despite Completing Sentences,*

Lawyers Say, PBS (Sept. 2, 2025). Many of these countries are known for human rights abuses or instability. For instance, conditions in South Sudan are so extreme that the U.S. State Department website warns Americans not to travel there, and if they do, to prepare their will, make funeral arrangements, and appoint a hostage-taker negotiator first. *See* Wong, *supra*.

On June 23 and July 3, 2025, the Supreme Court issued a stay of a national class-wide preliminary injunction issued in *D.V.D. v. U.S. Department of Homeland Security*, No. CV 25-10676-BEM, 2025 WL 1142968, at *1, 3 (D. Mass. Apr. 18, 2025), which required ICE to follow statutory and constitutional requirements before removing an individual to a third country. *U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec. v. D.V.D.*, 145 S. Ct. 2153 (2025) (mem.); *id.*, No. 24A1153, 2025 WL 1832186 (U.S. July 3, 2025).[2] On July 9, 2025, ICE rescinded previous guidance meant to give immigrants a "'meaningful opportunity' to assert claims for protection under the Convention Against Torture (CAT) before initiating removal to a third country" like the ones just described. Exh. G ("Third Country Removal Policy").

Under the new guidance, ICE may remove any immigrant to a third country "without the need for further procedures," as long as—in the view of the State Department—the United States has received "credible" "assurances" from that country that deportees will not be persecuted or tortured. *Id.* at 1. If a country fails to credibly promise not to persecute or torture releasees, ICE may still remove

[2] Though the Supreme Court's order was unreasoned, the dissent noted that the government had sought a stay based on procedural arguments applicable only to class actions. *Dep't of Homeland Sec. v. D.V.D*, 145 S. Ct. 2153, 2160 (2025) (Sotomayor, J., dissenting). Thus, "even if the Government [was] correct that classwide relief was impermissible" in *D.V.D.*, Respondents still "remain[] obligated to comply with orders enjoining [their] conduct with respect to individual plaintiffs" like Petitioner. *Id.* In short, the Supreme Court's decision does not override this Court's authority to grant individual injunctive relief. *See Nguyen v. Scott*, No. 2:25-CV-01398, 2025 WL 2419288, at *20–23 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 21, 2025).

immigrants there with minimal notice. *Id.* Ordinarily, ICE must provide 24 hours' notice. But "[i]n exigent circumstances," a removal may take place in as little as six hours, "as long as the alien is provided reasonably means and opportunity to speak with an attorney prior to the removal." *Id.*

Upon serving notice, ICE "will not affirmatively ask whether the alien is afraid of being removed to the country of removal." *Id.* (emphasis original). If the noncitizen "does not affirmatively state a fear of persecution or torture if removed to the country of removal listed on the Notice of Removal within 24 hours, [ICE] may proceed with removal to the country identified on the notice." *Id.* at 2. If the noncitizen "does affirmatively state a fear if removed to the country of removal" then ICE will refer the case to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services ("USCIS") for a screening for eligibility for withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). *Id.* at 2. "USCIS will generally screen within 24 hours." *Id.* If USCIS determines that the noncitizen does not meet the standard, the individual will be removed. *Id.* If USCIS determines that the noncitizen has met the standard, then the policy directs ICE to either move to reopen removal proceedings "for the sole purpose of determining eligibility for [withholding of removal protection] and CAT" or designate another country for removal. *Id.*

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

This Court should grant this petition and order two forms of relief.

First, it should order Petitioners' immediate release. ICE failed to follow its own regulations requiring changed circumstances before re-detention, as well as a chance to promptly contest a re-detention decision. And *Zadvydas v. Davis* holds that immigration statutes do not authorize the government to detain immigrants like Petitioners, for whom there is "no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future." 533 U.S. 678, 701 (2001).

Second, it should enjoin the Respondents from removing Petitioners to a third country without first providing notice and a sufficient opportunity to be heard before an immigration judge.

I. Count 1: ICE failed to comply with its own regulations before re-detaining Petitioners, violating Petitioners' rights under applicable regulations and the Fifth Amendment.

Two regulations establish the process due to someone who is re-detained in immigration custody following a period of release. 8 C.F.R. § 241.4(l) applies to re-detention generally. 8 C.F.R. § 241.13(i) applies to persons released after providing good reason to believe that they will not be removed in the reasonably foreseeable future, as Petitioners were. *See Rokhfirooz*, No. 25-CV-2053-RSH-VET, 2025 WL 2646165 at *2 (order from Judge Huie explaining this regulatory framework and granting a habeas petition for ICE's failure to follow these regulations).

These regulations permit an official to "return [the person] to custody" because they "violate[d] any of the conditions of release." 8 C.F.R. § 241.13(i)(1); *see also* § 241.4(*l*)(1).

Otherwise, they contain four major regulatory protections for people like Petitioners, who did not violate any condition of release. They permit revocation of release only if the appropriate official (1) "determines that there is a significant likelihood that the alien may be removed in the reasonably foreseeable future," § 241.13(i)(2), and (2) makes that finding "on account of changed circumstances." *Id.* No matter the reason for re-detention, (3) the re-detained person is entitled to "an initial informal interview promptly," during which they "will be notified of the reasons for revocation." §§ 241.4(*l*)(1); 241.13(i)(3). The interviewer must (4) "afford[] the [person] an opportunity to respond to the reasons for revocation," allowing them to "submit any evidence or information" relevant to re-detention and evaluating "any contested facts." *Id.*

ICE is required to follow its own regulations. *United States ex rel. Accardi v. Shaughnessy*, 347 U.S. 260, 268 (1954); *see Alcaraz v. INS*, 384 F.3d 1150, 1162 (9th Cir. 2004) ("The legal proposition that agencies may be required to abide by certain internal policies is well-established."). A court may review a re-detention decision for compliance with the regulations, and "where ICE fails to follow its own regulations in revoking release, the detention is unlawful and the petitioner's release must be ordered." *Rokhfirooz*, 2025 WL 2646165 at *4 (collecting cases).

ICE followed none of its four regulatory prerequisites to re-detention here.

First, Petitioners did not receive proper notice of the reasons for re-detention upon revocation.

Second, Petitioners did not receive an informal interview permitting them to contest re-detention.

Third, ICE did not revoke Petitioners' supervision for a permissible reason. They were not returned to custody because of a conditions violation. And there are no changed circumstances that justify re-detaining them. ICE has not been able to remove them to Cuba and there does not appear to be any changed circumstances that would indicate otherwise.

Absent any evidence for "why obtaining a travel document is more likely this time around[,] Respondents' intent to eventually complete a travel document request for Petitioner does not constitute a changed circumstance." *Hoac v. Becerra*, No. 2:25-CV-01740-DC-JDP, 2025 WL 1993771, at *4 (E.D. Cal. July 16, 2025) (citing *Liu v. Carter*, No. 25-3036-JWL, 2025 WL 1696526, at *2 (D. Kan. June 17, 2025)). Furthermore, past experience teaches that ICE almost certainly made no changed-circumstances determination before the arrest. *See Rokhfirooz*, 2025 WL 2646165 at *3.

Numerous courts have released re-detained immigrants after finding that ICE failed to comply with applicable regulations. *See, e g., Rokhfirooz*, 2025 WL

2646165; *Grigorian*, 2025 WL 2604573; *Delkash v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2683988; *Ceesay v. Kurzdorfer*, 781 F. Supp. 3d 137, 166 (W.D.N.Y. 2025); *You v. Nielsen*, 321 F. Supp. 3d 451, 463 (S.D.N.Y. 2018); *Rombot v. Souza*, 296 F. Supp. 3d 383, 387 (D. Mass. 2017); *Zhu v. Genalo*, No. 1:25-CV-06523 (JLR), 2025 WL 2452352, at *7–9 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 26, 2025); *M.S.L. v. Bostock*, No. 6:25-CV-01204-AA, 2025 WL 2430267, at *10–12 (D. Or. Aug. 21, 2025); *Escalante v. Noem*, No. 9:25-CV-00182-MJT, 2025 WL 2491782, at *2–3 (E.D. Tex. July 18, 2025); *Hoac v. Becerra*, No. 2:25-cv-01740-DC-JDP, 2025 WL 1993771, at *4 (E.D. Cal. July 16, 2025); *Liu*, 2025 WL 1696526, at *2; *M.Q. v. United States*, 2025 WL 965810, at *3, *5 n.1 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2025).

"[B]ecause officials did not properly revoke petitioner's release pursuant to the applicable regulations, that revocation has no effect, and [Petitioners] is entitled to [their] release (subject to the same Order of Supervision that governed [their] most recent release)." *Liu*, 2025 WL 1696526, at *3.

II. Count 2: Petitioners' detention violates *Zadvydas* and 8 U.S.C. § 1231.

A. Legal background

In *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001), the Supreme Court considered a problem affecting people like Petitioners: Federal law requires ICE to detain an immigrant during the "removal period," which typically spans the first 90 days after the immigrant is ordered removed. 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(1)-(2). After that 90-day removal period expires, detention becomes discretionary—ICE may detain the migrant while continuing to try to remove them. *Id.* § 1231(a)(6). Ordinarily, this scheme would not lead to excessive detention, as removal happens within days or weeks. But some detainees cannot be removed quickly. Perhaps their removal "simply require[s] more time for processing," or they are "ordered removed to countries with whom the United States does not have a repatriation agreement," or their countries "refuse to take them," or they are "effectively 'stateless' because of their race and/or place of birth." *Kim Ho Ma v. Ashcroft*,

257 F.3d 1095, 1104 (9th Cir. 2001). In these and other circumstances, detained immigrants can find themselves trapped in detention for months, years, decades, or even the rest of their lives.

If federal law were understood to allow for "indefinite, perhaps permanent, detention," it would pose "a serious constitutional threat." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 699. In *Zadvydas*, the Supreme Court avoided the constitutional concern by interpreting § 1231(a)(6) to incorporate implicit limits. *Id.* at 689.

As an initial matter, *Zadvydas* held that detention is "presumptively reasonable" for at least six months. *Id.* at 701. This presumption is, in some circumstances even before the running of six months, "rebuttable." *See Zavvar*, 2025 WL 2592543 at *5–*6 (explaining this point when granting *Zadvydas* habeas relief).

Courts must use a burden-shifting framework to decide whether detention remains authorized. First, the petitioners must make a prima facie case for relief: Petitioners must prove that there is "good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 689.

If Petitioners does so, the burden shifts to "the Government [to] respond with evidence sufficient to rebut that showing." *Id.* Ultimately, then, the burden of proof rests with the government: The government must prove that there is a "significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future," or the immigrant must be released. *Id.*

To underline the government's burden, good faith is beside the point. "[U]nder *Zadvydas*, the reasonableness of Petitioner's detention does not turn on the degree of the government's good faith efforts. Indeed, the *Zadvydas* court explicitly rejected such a standard. Rather, the reasonableness of Petitioner's detention turns on whether and to what extent the government's efforts are likely to bear fruit." *Hassoun v. Sessions*, No. 18-CV-586-FPG, 2019 WL 78984, at *5

(W.D.N.Y. Jan. 2, 2019). Accordingly, "the Government is required to demonstrate the likelihood of not only the *existence* of untapped possibilities, but also of a probability of success in such possibilities." *Elashi v. Sabol*, 714 F. Supp. 2d 502, 506 (M.D. Pa. 2010).

Using this framework, Petitioners can make all the threshold showings needed to shift the burden to the government.

B. The six-month grace period expired long ago.

As an initial matter, the six-month grace period has long since ended. The *Zadvydas* grace period lasts for "*six months* after a final order of removal—that is, *three months* after the statutory removal period has ended." *Kim Ho Ma v. Ashcroft*, 257 F.3d 1095, 1102 n.5 (9th Cir. 2001). All Petitioners were ordered removed years ago and ICE has been unable to remove them since then. Exhibit F (EOIR Automated Case Information for all petitioners with the exception of Rojas-Perez). Thus, the grace period has long passed. 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(1)(B).

C. There is good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood of Petitioners' removal in the reasonably foreseeable future.

Because the six-month grace period has passed, this Court must evaluate Petitioners' *Zadvydas* claim using the burden-shifting framework. At the first stage of the framework, there must be "good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 701. This standard can be broken down into three parts.

"Good reason to believe." The "good reason to believe" standard is a relatively forgiving one. "A petitioner need not establish that there exists no possibility of removal." *Freeman v. Watkins*, No. CV B:09-160, 2009 WL 10714999, at *3 (S.D. Tex. Dec. 22, 2009). Nor does "'[g]ood reason to believe' . . . place a burden upon the detainee to demonstrate no reasonably foreseeable, significant likelihood of removal or show that their detention is indefinite; it is something less than that." *Rual v. Barr*, No. 6:20-CV-06215 EAW,

2020 WL 3972319, at *3 (W.D.N.Y. July 14, 2020) (quoting *Senor v. Barr*, 401 F. Supp. 3d 420, 430 (W.D.N.Y. 2019)). In short, the standard means what it says: Petitioners need only give a "good reason"—not prove anything to a certainty.

"No significant likelihood of removal." This component focuses on whether Petitioners will likely be removed: Continued detention is permissible only if it is "significant[ly] like[ly]" that ICE will be able to remove Petitioner. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 701. This inquiry targets "not only the *existence* of untapped possibilities, but also [the] probability of *success* in such possibilities." *Elashi v. Sabol*, 714 F. Supp. 2d 502, 506 (M.D. Pa. 2010) (second emphasis added). In other words, even if "there remains *some* possibility of removal," a petitioner can still meet its burden if there is good reason to believe that successful removal is not significantly likely. *Kacanic v. Elwood*, No. CIV.A. 02-8019, 2002 WL 31520362, at *4 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 8, 2002) (emphasis added).

"In the reasonably foreseeable future." This component of the test focuses on when Petitioners will likely be removed: Continued detention is permissible only if removal is likely to happen "in the reasonably foreseeable future." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 701. This inquiry places a time limit on ICE's removal efforts. If the Court has "no idea of when it might reasonably expect [Petitioner] to be repatriated, this Court certainly cannot conclude that their removal is likely to occur—or even that it might occur—in the reasonably foreseeable future." *Palma v. Gillis*, No. 5:19-CV-112-DCB-MTP, 2020 WL 4880158, at *3 (S.D. Miss. July 7, 2020), *report and recommendation adopted*, 2020 WL 4876859 (S.D. Miss. Aug. 19, 2020) (quoting *Singh v. Whitaker*, 362 F. Supp. 3d 93, 102 (W.D.N.Y. 2019)). Thus, even if this Court concludes that Petitioners "would *eventually* receive" a travel document, they can still meet their burden by giving good reason to anticipate sufficiently lengthy delays. *Younes v. Lynch*, 2016 WL 6679830, at *2 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 14, 2016).

Petitioners readily satisfy the above standards for an obvious reason: ICE has already tried and failed to remove them under the operative repatriation agreements between the United States and Cuba. Their order of removal became final years ago and ICE could not effectuate their removal. And ICE has not managed to remove them now.

Thus, Petitioners have met their initial burden, and the burden shifts to the government. Unless the government can prove a "significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future," Petitioners must be released. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 701.

III. Count 3: ICE may not remove Petitioners to a third country without adequate notice and an opportunity to be heard.

In addition to unlawfully detaining Petitioners, ICE's policies threaten their removal to a third country without adequate notice and an opportunity to be heard. These policies violate the Fifth Amendment, the Convention Against Torture, and implementing regulations. Though the government will not be able to prove that there is a significant prospect of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future, an unanticipated change of circumstances could open up a heretofore unavailable avenue to third-country removal. If that happens, ICE could remove Petitioners with as little as 24 hours' notice or no notice at all. This Court should enter an order prohibiting such surprise removals, as they violate the Due Process Clause.

A. Legal background

U.S. law enshrines protections against dangerous and life-threatening removal decisions. By statute, the government is prohibited from removing an immigrant to any third country where they may be persecuted or tortured, a form of protection known as withholding of removal. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(3)(A). The government "may not remove [a noncitizen] to a country if the Attorney General decides that the [noncitizen's] life or freedom would be threatened in that country because of the [noncitizen's] race, religion, nationality, membership in a

particular social group, or political opinion." *Id.*; *see also* 8 C.F.R. §§ 208.16, 1208.16. Withholding of removal is a mandatory protection.

Similarly, Congress codified protections enshrined in the CAT prohibiting the government from removing a person to a country where they would be tortured. *See* FARRA 2681-822 (codified as 8 U.S.C. § 1231 note) ("It shall be the policy of the United States not to expel, extradite, or otherwise effect the involuntary return of any person to a country in which there are substantial grounds for believing the person would be in danger of being subjected to torture, regardless of whether the person is physically present in the United States."); 28 C.F.R. § 200.1; *id.* §§ 208.16-208.18, 1208.16-1208.18. CAT protection is also mandatory.

To comport with the requirements of due process, the government must provide notice of the third country removal and an opportunity to respond. Due process requires "written notice of the country being designated" and "the statutory basis for the designation, i.e., the applicable subsection of § 1231(b)(2)." *Aden v. Nielsen*, 409 F. Supp. 3d 998, 1019 (W.D. Wash. 2019); *accord D.V.D. v. U.S Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, No. 25-cv-10676-BEM, 2025 WL 1453640, at *1 (D. Mass. May 21, 2025); *Andriasian v INS*, 180 F.3d 1033, 1041 (9th Cir. 1999).

The government must also "ask the noncitizen whether he or she fears persecution or harm upon removal to the designated country and memorialize in writing the noncitizen's response. This requirement ensures DHS will obtain the necessary information from the noncitizen to comply with section 1231(b)(3) and avoids [a dispute about what the officer and noncitizen said]." *Aden*, 409 F. Supp. 3d at 1019. "Failing to notify individuals who are subject to deportation that they have the right to apply for asylum in the United States and for withholding of deportation to the country to which they will be deported violates both INS regulations and the constitutional right to due process." *Andriasian*, 180 F.3d at

1041.

If the noncitizen claims fear, measures must be taken to ensure that the noncitizen can seek asylum, withholding, and relief under CAT before an immigration judge in reopened removal proceedings. The amount and type of notice must be "sufficient" to ensure that "given [a noncitizen's] capacities and circumstances, he would have a reasonable opportunity to raise and pursue his claim for withholding of deportation." *Aden*, 409 F. Supp. 3d at 1009 (citing *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 349 (1976) and *Kossov v. I.N.S.*, 132 F.3d 405, 408 (7th Cir. 1998)); *cf. D.V.D.*, 2025 WL 1453640, at *1 (requiring the government to move to reopen the noncitizen's immigration proceedings if the individual demonstrates "reasonable fear" and to provide "a meaningful opportunity, and a minimum of fifteen days, for the non-citizen to seek reopening of their immigration proceedings" if the noncitizen is found to not have demonstrated "reasonable fear"); *Aden*, 409 F. Supp. 3d at 1019 (requiring notice and time for a respondent to file a motion to reopen and seek relief).

"[L]ast minute" notice of the country of removal will not suffice, *Andriasian*, 180 F.3d at 1041; *accord Najjar v. Lunch*, 630 Fed. App'x 724 (9th Cir. 2016), and for good reason: To have a meaningful opportunity to apply for fear-based protection from removal, immigrants must have time to prepare and present relevant arguments and evidence. Merely telling a person where they may be sent, without giving them a chance to look into country conditions, does not give them a meaningful chance to determine whether and why they have a credible fear.

B. The June 6, 2025 memo's removal policies violate the Fifth Amendment, 8 U.S.C. § 1231, the Conviction Against Torture, and Implementing Regulations.

The policies in the June 6, 2025 memo do not adhere to these requirements. First, under the policy, ICE need not give immigrants *any* notice or *any* opportunity to be heard before removing them to a country that—in the State Department's estimation—has provided "credible" "assurances" against persecution and torture. By depriving immigrants of any chance to challenge the State Department's view, this policy violates "[t]he essence of due process," "the requirement that a person in jeopardy of serious loss be given notice of the case against him and opportunity to meet it." *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 348 (1976) (cleaned up).

Second, even when the government has obtained no credible assurances against persecution and torture, the government can still remove the person with between 6 and 24 hours' notice, depending on the circumstances. Exh. C. Practically speaking, there is not nearly enough time for a detained person to assess their risk in the third country and martial evidence to support any credible fear—let alone a chance to file a motion to reopen with an IJ. An immigrant may know nothing about a third country, like Eswatini or South Sudan, when they are scheduled for removal there. Yet if given the opportunity to investigate conditions, immigrants would find credible reasons to fear persecution or torture—like patterns of keeping deportees indefinitely and without charge in solitary confinement or extreme instability raising a high likelihood of death—in many of the third countries that have agreed to removal thus far. Due process requires an adequate chance to identify and raise these threats to health and life. This Court must prohibit the government from removing Petitioners without these due process safeguards.

IV. This Court must hold an evidentiary hearing on any disputed facts.

Resolution of a prolonged-detention habeas petition may require an evidentiary hearing. *Owino v. Napolitano*, 575 F.3d 952, 956 (9th Cir. 2009). Petitioners hereby request such a hearing on any material, disputed facts.

V. Prayer for relief

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioners respectfully request that this Court:

1. Order Respondents to immediately release Petitioners from custody under the same conditions of supervision;
2. Enjoin Respondents from re-detaining Petitioners under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6) unless and until Respondents obtain a travel document for Petitioners' removal;
3. Enjoin Respondents from re-detaining Petitioners without first following all procedures set forth in 8 C.F.R. §§ 241.4(*l*), 241.13(i), and any other applicable statutory and regulatory procedures;
4. Enjoin Respondents from removing Petitioners to any country other than Cuba, unless they provide the following process, *see D.V.D. v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, No. CV 25-10676-BEM, 2025 WL 1453640, at *1 (D. Mass. May 21, 2025):
   a) written notice to both Petitioners and Petitioners' counsel in a language Petitioners can understand;
   b) a meaningful opportunity, and a minimum of ten days, to raise a fear-based claim for CAT protection prior to removal;
   c) if Petitioners is found to have demonstrated "reasonable fear" of removal to the country, Respondents must move to reopen Petitioners' immigration proceedings;

d) if Petitioners are not found to have demonstrated a "reasonable fear" of removal to the country, a meaningful opportunity, and a minimum of fifteen days, for the Petitioners to seek reopening of Petitioners' immigration proceedings.

5. Order all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 6, 2026

s/ Zandra L. Lopez

Zandra L. Lopez
Federal Defenders of San Diego, Inc.
Attorneys for Petitioners
Email: Zandra_Lopez @fd.org

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, will cause the attached petition for a writ of habeas corpus to be emailed to the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of California at USACAS.Habeas2241@usdoj.gov when I receive the court-stamped copy.

Dated: March 6, 2026

s/ Zandra L. Lopez
Zandra L. Lopez
Federal Defenders of San Diego, Inc.
Email: Zandra_Lopez@fd.org