

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

AIBEK ISHEMBIEV,

Petitioner,

V.

JAMAL L. JAMISON, Warden of

Philadelphia Detention Center,

JOHN E. RIFE, Acting Field Office Director)
of Enforcement and Removal Operations,)

Philadelphia Field Office, Immigration and)

Customs Enforcement, Acting Secretary,)

U.S. Department of Homeland Security,)

PAMELA BONDI, U.S. Attorney General,)

Respondents.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF

HABEAS CORPUS

Case No. 26-1515

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner Aibek Ishembiev, a citizen of Kyrgyzstan, is in the physical custody of the Respondents at the Philadelphia Federal Detention Center after being detained by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) on March 9, 2026. He now faces unlawful detention because the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) and the Executive Office for Immigration Review (“EOIR”) have concluded that the Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention.

2. The Petitioner arrived in the United States on March 28, 2022, at the San Ysidro Port of Entry, at which time he sought admission into this country. Also on March 28, 2022, the Petitioner was granted parole into the United States, which was valid until March 26, 2023. The Petitioner's wife, Kanykei Ishembieva, and their three children also entered and were paroled into the United States at the same time as the Petitioner.

3. On June 19, 2022, the Petitioner's wife, Mrs. Ishembieva, filed a timely application for asylum and related relief, based on the persecution she and her husband suffered in their native Kyrgyzstan due to [REDACTED] The Petitioner is included as a beneficiary of his wife's asylum application, which remains pending, and therefore he is in the United States pursuant to a period of stay authorized by the government.

4. The Petitioner has thus been lawfully present in the United States since his arrival. He has valid work authorization and a social security number. Since his entry into the United States, he has led a productive and law-abiding life. He has been working since his arrival, and the Petitioner's family relies on his income for their food and shelter.

5. As noted above, on March 9, 2026, Petitioner was arrested by ICE. Such arrest occurred when appeared at one of his regularly scheduled appointments which required him to appear at the ICE offices in Philadelphia, PA. As one of the conditions when he was originally paroled and released into the United States, the Petitioner was required to report to ICE on a regular basis. The Petitioner complied with this condition and appeared at the Philadelphia, PA ICE office when required, the last time being on March 9, 2026, when he was detained. There was no suggestion that the Petitioner had violated any criminal laws or ordinances.

6. The Respondent previously was issued a Notice to Appear ("NTA") before an immigration judge, charging him as an alien present in the United States being admitted or paroled, or who arrived in the United States at any time or place other than as designated. *See* INA Section 212(a)(6)(A)(i) [8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i)]. An additional charge claims that he is an alien who at the time of his application for admission, was not in possession of a valid unexpired immigrant visa, reentry permit, border crossing card, or other valid entry document, and a valid unexpired passport. *See* INA Section 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) [8 U.S.C. §

1182(a)(7)(A)(i)(I)]. *See also* Exhibit A, the Petitioner’s NTA. Based on these charges in Petitioner’s removal proceedings, DHS has denied or will deny Petitioner release from immigration custody, consistent with a new DHS policy issued on July 8, 2025, instructing all ICE employees to consider anyone inadmissible under § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) – i.e., those who entered the United States without admission or inspection – to be subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond.

7. Similarly, on September 5, 2025, the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA” or “Board”) issued a precedent decision, binding on all immigration judges, holding that an immigration judge has no authority to consider bond requests for any person who entered the United States without admission. *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). The Board determined that such individuals are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond.

8. Petitioner’s detention on this basis violates the plain language of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Section 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to individuals like the Petitioner who previously entered and are now residing in the United States. Instead, such individuals are subject to a different statute, § 1226(a), that allows for release on conditional parole or bond. The statute expressly applies to people who, like Petitioner, are charged as inadmissible for having entered the United States without inspection.

9. Respondents’ new legal interpretation is plainly contrary to the statutory framework and contrary to decades of agency practice applying § 1226(a) to people like Petitioner.

10. Accordingly, Petitioner seeks a writ of habeas corpus requiring that he be released immediately.

JURISDICTION

11. Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents. Petitioner is detained at the Philadelphia Federal Detention Center in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

12. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(5) (Habeas Corpus), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (Federal Question), and Article I, section 9, clause 2 of the United States Constitution (the Suspension Clause).

13. This Court may grant relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*, and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

VENUE

14. Pursuant to *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493-500 (1973), venue lies in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, the judicial district in which the Petitioner currently is detained.

15. Venue is also properly in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because Respondents are employees, officers, and agencies of the United States, and because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

16. The Court must grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus or order Respondents to show cause “forthwith,” unless the petitioner is not entitled to relief. 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If an order to show cause is issued, Respondents must file a return “within three days unless for good cause additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is allowed.” *Id.*

17. Habeas corpus is “perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law . . . 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). “The application for the writ usurps the attention and displaces the calendar of the judge or justice who entertains it and receives prompt action from him within the four corners of the application.” *Yong v. INS.*, 208 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted).

PARTIES

18. Petitioner Aibek Ishembiev is a citizen of Kyrgyzstan who has been in immigration detention since March 9, 2026. After arresting Petitioner when he appeared at the request of ICE at their offices, ICE did not set bond and Petitioner is unable to obtain review of his custody by an immigration judge, pursuant to the Board's decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I.&N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).

19. Respondent Jamal L. Jamison is employed by the Federal Bureau of Prisons as Warden of the Philadelphia Federal Detention Center, where the Petitioner is detained. He has immediate physical custody of the Petitioner. He is sued in his official capacity.

20. Respondent Acting Secretary of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the INA, and oversees ICE, which is responsible for the Petitioner's detention. The Acting Secretary has ultimate custodial authority over Petitioner and is sued in her official capacity.

21. Respondent Pamela Bondi is the Attorney General of the United States. She is responsible for the Department of Justice, of which the EOIR, and the immigration court system it operates, is a component agency. She is sued in her official capacity.

22. Respondent John E. Rife is the Acting Field Office Director of the Philadelphia Field Office of ICE's Enforcement and Removal Operation division. As such, Respondent Rife

is Petitioner's immediate custodian and is responsible for Petitioner's detention and removal. He is named in his official capacity.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

23. The INA prescribes three basic forms of detention for the vast majority of noncitizens in removal proceedings.

24. First, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 authorizes the detention of noncitizens in standard removal proceedings before an IJ. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. Aliens in § 1226(a) detention are generally entitled to a bond hearing at the outset of their detention, *see* 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19(a), 1236.1(d), while those who have been arrested, charged with, or convicted of certain crimes are subject to mandatory detention, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c).

25. Second, the INA provides for mandatory detention of noncitizens subject to expedited removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and for other recent arrivals seeking admission referred to under § 1225(b)(2).

26. Last, the INA also provides for detention of noncitizens who have been ordered removed, including individuals in withholding-only proceedings, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)-(b).

27. This case concerns the detention provisions at §§ 1226(a) and 1225(b)(2).

28. The detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) were enacted as part of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-208, Div. C, §§ 302-03, 110 Stat. 3009-546, 3009-582 to 3009-583, 3009-585. Section 1226(a) was most recently amended earlier this year by the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No. 119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025).

29. Following the enactment of the IIRIRA, EOIR drafted new regulations explaining that, in general, people who entered the country without inspection were not considered detained under § 1225 and that they were instead detained under § 1226(a). *See* Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum Procedures, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997).

30. Thus, in the decades that followed, most people who entered without inspection and were placed in standard removal proceedings received bond hearings, unless their criminal history rendered them ineligible pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c). That practice was consistent with many more decades of prior practice, in which noncitizen who were not deemed “arriving” were entitled to a custody hearing before an IJ or other hearing officer. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a) (1994); *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pl. I, at 229 (1996) (noting that § 1226(a) simply “restates” the detention authority previously found at § 1252(a)).

31. On July 8, 2025, ICE, “in coordination with” DOJ, announced a new policy that rejected the well-established understanding of the statutory framework and reversed decades of Practice.

32. The new policy, entitled “Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission,”¹ claims that all persons who entered the United States without inspection shall now be subject to the mandatory detention provision under § 1225(b)(2)(A). The policy applies regardless of when a person is apprehended, and it affects those who have resided in the United States for months, years, and even decades.

33. On September 5, 2025, the BIA adopted the same position in a published decision, *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*. There, the Board held that all noncitizens who entered the United

¹ Available at <https://www.aila.org/libraries/ice-memo-interim-guidance-regarding-detention-authority-for-applications-for-admission>.

States without admission are subject to detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A) and are ineligible for IJ bond hearings.

34. Since Respondents adopted their new policies, dozens of Federal courts have rejected their new interpretation of INA's detention authorities in over 1,600 decisions. Courts have likewise rejected *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, which adopts the same reading of the statute as ICE. These courts have adopted the same reading of the INA's detention authorities and rejected ICE and EOIR's new interpretation. *Barco Mercado v. Francis et al.*, No. 25-06582, ECF No. 28 at *9-10, *35-40 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 26, 2025). *See also Demirel v. Federal Detention Center Philadelphia, et al.*, No. 25-5488, 2025 WL 3218243, at *1 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 18, 2025) (providing full list of cases as of November 18, 2025); *Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 1:25- CV-11571-JEK, 2025 WL 1869299 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025); *Diaz Martinez v. Hyde*, No. CV 25- 11613-BEM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 2084238 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025); *Rosado v. Figueroa*, No. CV 25-02157 PHX DLR (CDB), 2025 WL 2337099 (D. Ariz. Aug. 11, 2025), *report and recommendation adopted*, No. CV-25-02157-PHX-DLR (CDB), 2025 WL 2349133 (D. Ariz. Aug. 13, 2025); *Lopez Benitez v. Francis*, No. 25 CIV. 5937 (DEH), 2025 WL 2371588 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2025); *Maldonado v. Olson*, No. 0:25-cv-03142-SRN-SGE, 2025 WL 2374411 (D. Minn. Aug. 15, 2025) *Arrazola-Gonzalez v. Noem*, No. 5:25-cv-01789-ODW (DFMx), 2025 WL 2379285 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2025); *Romero v. Hyde*, No. 25-11631-BEM, 2025 WL 2403827 (D. Mass. Aug. 19, 2025); *Samb v. Joyce*, No. 25 CIV. 6373 (DEH), 2025 WL 2398831 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 19, 2025); *Ramirez Clavijo v. Kaiser*, No. 25-CV-06248-BLF 2025 WL 2419263 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2025); *Leal-Hernandez v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-02428-JRR, 2025 WL 2430025 (D. Md. Aug. 24, 2025); *Kostak v. Trump*, No. 3:25-cv-01093-JE-KDM, 2025 WL 2472136 (W.D. La. Aug. 27, 2025); *Jose J.O.E. v. Bondi*, No. 25-CV-3051 (ECT/DJF), --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 2466670

(D. Minn. Aug. 27, 2025), *Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft*, No. 2:25-cv-12486-BRM-EAS, 2025 WL 2496379 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025); *Vasquez Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02180-DMS-MM, 2025 WL 2549431 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025); *Zaragoza Mosqueda v. Noem*, No. 5:25-CV-02304 CAS (BFM), 2025 WL 2591530 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2025); *Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft*, No. 25-CV-12546, 2025 WL 2609425 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9, 2025); *Sampiao v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11981-JEK, 2025 WL 2607924 (D. Mass. Sept. 9, 2025); *see also, e.g.,* *Palma Perez v. Berg*, No. 8:25 CV 494, 2025 WL 2531566, at *2 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025) (noting that “[t]he Court tends to agree” that § 1226(a) and not § 1225(b)(2) authorizes detention); *Jacinto v. Trump*, No. 4:25-cv-03161-JFB-RCC, 2025 WL 2402271 at *3 (D. Neb. Aug. 19, 2025)(same).

35. Indeed, within the Third Circuit, the Western District of Pennsylvania, the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and the District of New Jersey have all rejected ICE and EOIR’s new interpretation. *See Rios Porras v. O’Neill*, 2025 WL 3708900 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 22, 2025) (Beetlestone, C.J.); *Pereira v. O’Neill*, 2025 WL 3516665 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 8, 2025) (Marston, J.); *Conde v. Jamison*, 2025 WL 3499256 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 5, 2025) (Brody, J.); *Suspes v. Rose*, 2025 WL 3492820 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 5, 2025) (Brody, J.); *Hidalgo et al. v. O’Neill*, No. 25-cv-6775 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 5, 2025) (Diamond, J.); *Delgado Villegas v. Bondi*, No. 25-cv-6143 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 4, 2025) (Diamond, J.); *Nogueira-Mendes v. McShane*, 2025 WL 3473364 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 3, 2025) (Slomsky, J.); *Juarez v. O’Neill*, 2025 WL 3473363 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 3, 2025) (Henry, J.); *Yilmaz v. Warden of Fed. Det. Ctr. Philadelphia*, 2025 WL 3459484 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 2, 2025) (Rufe, J.); *Soumare v. Jamison*, 2025 WL 3461542 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 2, 2025) (Henry, J.); *Flores Obando v. Bondi*, 2025 WL 3452047 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 1, 2025) (Brody, J.); *Wu v. Jamison*, No. 25-cv-6469 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 1, 2025) (J. Gallagher); *Valdivia Martinez v. FDC*, No. 25-cv-6568 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 1, 2025) (J. Savage); *Moracho v. Jamison*, 2025 WL 3296300 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 26, 2025)

(Gallagher, J.); *Diallo v. O’Neill*, 2025 WL 3298003 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 26, 2025) (Savage, J.); *Centeno Ibarra v. Warden, of the Fed. Det. Ctr. Philadelphia*, 2025 WL 3294726 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 25, 2025) (Rufe, J.); *Espinal Rosa v. O’Neill*, No. 25-cv-6376 {E.D. Pa. Nov. 25, 2025} (Weilheimer, J.); *Patel v. McShane*, 2025 WL 3241212 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 20, 2025) (Brody, J.); *Ndiaye v. Jamison*, 2025 WL 3229307 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 19, 2025) (Sanchez, J.); *Demirel v. Fed. Det. Ctr. Philadelphia*, 2025 WL 3218243 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 18, 2025) (Diamond, J.); *Kashranov v. Jamison*, 2025 WL 3188399 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 14, 2025) (Wolson, J.); *Cantu-Cortes v. O’Neill*, 2025 WL 3171639 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 13, 2025) (Kenney, J.), *Del Cid v. Bondi*, 3:25-cv-00304, 2025 WL 2985150 (W.D. Pa. Oct. 23, 2025); *Zumba v. Bondi*, Civ. No. 25-cv-14626, 2025 WL 2753496 (WNL. Sept. 26, 2025); *Bethancourt Soto v. Louis Soto, et al.*, No. 25-CV-16200, 2025 WL 2976572 (D.N.J. Oct. 22, 2025); *Lomeu v. Soto, et al.*, No. 25CV16589 (EP), 2025 WL 2981296, at *8 (D.N.J. Oct. 23, 2025).

36. Courts have uniformly rejected DHS’s and EOIR’s new interpretation because it defies the INA. As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court and others have explained, the plain text of the statutory provisions demonstrates that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to people like the Petitioner.

37. Section 1226(a) applies by default to all persons “pending a decision on whether the [noncitizen] is to be removed from the United States.” These removal hearings are held under § 1229a, to “decid[e] the inadmissibility or deportability of an alien.”

38. The text of § 1226 also explicitly applies to people charged as being inadmissible, including those who entered without inspection. *See* U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E). Subparagraph (E)’s reference to such people makes clear that, by default, such people are afforded a bond hearing under subsection (a). As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court explained, “[w]hen Congress creates

‘specific exceptions’ to a statute’s applicability, it ‘proves’ that absent those exceptions, the statute generally applies.” *Rodriguez Vazquez*, 779 F. Supp. 3d at 1257 (citing *Shady Grove Orthopedic Assocs., P.A. v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 559 U.S. 393,400 (2010)); *see also Gomes*, 2025 WL 1869299, at *7.

39. Section 1226 therefore leaves no doubt that it applies to people who face charges of being inadmissible to the United States, including those who are present without admission or parole.

40. By contrast, § 1225(b) applies to people arriving at U.S. ports of entry or who recently entered the United States. The statute’s entire framework is premised on inspections at the border of people who are “seeking admission” to the United States. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Indeed, the Supreme Court has explained that this mandatory detention scheme applies “at the Nation’s borders and ports of entry, where the Government must determine whether a[] [noncitizen] seeking to enter the country is admissible.” *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287 (2018).

41. Accordingly, the mandatory detention provision of § 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to people like Petitioner, who have already entered and were residing in the United States at the time they were apprehended.

FACTS

42. Petitioner incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1-5 *supra*.

43. Following Petitioner's arrest and transfer to the Philadelphia Federal Detention Center, ICE presumptively issued a custody determination to continue Petitioner's detention without an opportunity to post bond or be released on other conditions.

44. Pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, the immigration judge is unable to consider the Petitioner's bond request.

45. As a result, the Petitioner remains in detention. Without relief from this court, he faces the prospect of months, or even years, in immigration custody, separated from his family and community.

IMMEDIATE RELEASE IS WARRANTED

46. The Supreme Court has recognized that "Habeas has traditionally been a means to secure *release* from unlawful detention." *Dep't of Homeland Sec. v. Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 107 140 S.Ct. 1959, 207 L.Ed.2d 427 (2020) (emphasis in original). Several decisions from the Eastern District of Pennsylvania have ordered immediate release in similar cases. *See eg. Bhatia v. O'Neill, et al.*, No. 25-6809, Dkt. 8 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 10, 2025); *Rodrigues Pereira v. O'Neill, et al.*, No. 25-6543, Dkt. 11 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 8, 2025); *Morocho v. Jamison, et al.*, No. 25-05930, 2025 WL 3296300, at *3 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 26, 2025); *Diallo v. O'Neill, et al.*, 25-06358, Dkt. 10 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 26, 2025); *Patel v. McShane, et al.*, 25-05975 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 20, 2025). The Court should not depart from this norm.

47. As noted above, hundreds of district court decisions have addressed the legal issues presented in the underlying Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and rejected the government's position. *Barco Mercado v. Francis et al.*, No. 25-06582, ECF No. 28 at *9-10, *35-40 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 26, 2025). Those Courts have roundly rejected Government's interpretation of the Immigration and Nationality Act; the interpretation that is part of the DHS

policy issued on July 8, 2025, instructing all ICE employees to consider anyone inadmissible under § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) – *i.e.*, those who entered the United States without admission or inspection – to be subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond; and the interpretation is part of the BIA’s September 5, 2025 precedent decision, binding on all immigration judges, holding that an immigration judge has no authority to consider bond requests for any person who entered the United States without admission. *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), which determined that such individuals are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond.

48. Many of these decisions have found that Respondents' erroneous application of the law violates the respective detainees constitutional right to Due Process. *See, eg., Cantu-Cortes v. O'Neill, et al.*, No. 25-CV-6338, 2025 WL 3171639 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 13, 2025); *Bethancourt Soto v. Soto, et al.*, No. 25-CV-16200, 2025 WL 2976572 (D.N.J. Oct. 22, 2025); *Sanchez Ballestros v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2880831 (W.D. Ky. Oct. 9, 2025); *Hernandez-Alonso v. Tindall*, 2025 WL 3083920 (W.D. Ky. Nov. 4, 2025); *Rodriguez Serrano v. Noem*, 2025 WL 3122825 (W.D. Mich. Nov. 7, 2025); *Ochoa Ochoa v. Noem*, No. 25 CV 10865, 2025 WL 2938779, (N.D. Ill. Oct. 16, 2025); *Rosales Ponce v. Olson*, 2025 WL 3049785 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 31, 2025); *Loza Valencia v. Noem*, 2025 WL 3042520 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 31, 2025); *Rosado v. Figueroa*, 2025 WL 2337099 (D. Ariz. Aug. 11, 2025); *Cuevas Guzman v. Andrews*, 2025 WL 2617256 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025); *Guerrero Lepe v. Andrews*, 2025 WL 2716910 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2025); *E.C. v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2916264 (D. Nev. Oct. 14, 2025); *Garcia Domingo v. Castro*, 2025 WL 2941217 (D.N.M. Oct. 15, 2025); *Artiga v. Genalo*, 2025 WL 2829434 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 5, 2025).

49. Despite this overwhelming rejection of Respondents' new policies and *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, and hundreds of decisions finding that Respondents are violating the constitutional rights, Respondents refuse to relent and continue act in defiance of the law and the Constitution. It has been reported that ICE agents inform detainees that they "have to sue us [ICE] to get out."

50. Petitioner is now one of the approximately 71,000 people detained by Respondents.² Respondents' unlawful behavior is pervasive and defies decision after decision from the Courts. As Petitioner's arrest and detention were blatantly unlawful from the start, the only commensurate and appropriate equitable remedy to even partially restore Petitioner is to immediate release the Petitioner to prevent a further similar transgression. *See, eg., Martinez v. McAleenan*, 385 F. Supp. 3d 349, 373 (S.D.N.Y. 2019).

CLAIM FOR RELIEF

COUNT I **Violation of the INA**

51. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

52. 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 are detained under § 1226(a), unless they are subject to § 1225(b)(1), § 1226(c), or § 1231.

² See ICE's publicly available detention data, available at: <https://www.ice.gov/detain/detention-management>.

53. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates his continued detention and violates the INA.

COUNT II
Violation of the Bond Regulations

54. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in preceding paragraphs.

55. In 1997, after Congress amended the INA through IIRIRA, EOIR and the then Immigration and Naturalization Service issued an interim rule to interpret and apply IIRIRA. Specifically, under the heading of “Apprehension, Custody, and Detention of [Noncitizens],” the agencies explained that “[d]espite being applicants for admission, [noncitizens] who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as [noncitizens] who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination.” 62 Fed. Reg. at 10323 (emphasis added). The agencies thus made clear that individuals who had entered without inspection were eligible for consideration for bond and bond hearings before IJs under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and its implementing regulations.

56. Nonetheless, pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, EOIR has a policy and practice of applying § 1225(b)(2) to individual like the Petitioner.

57. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to the Petitioner unlawfully mandates his continued detention and violates 8 C.F. R. §§ 236.1, 1236.1, and 1003.19.

COUNT III
Violation of Due Process

58. Petitioner repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

59. The government may not deprive a person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. U.S. Const. amend. V. “Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lie at the heart of the liberty that the Clause protects.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).

60. The Petitioner has a fundamental interest in liberty and being free from official restraint.

61. The government’s detention of the Petitioner without a bond redetermination hearing to determine whether he is a flight risk or danger to others violates his right to due process.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

- a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- b. **Order that Petitioner shall not be transferred outside the Eastern District of Pennsylvania while this habeas petition is pending;**
- c. Issue an Order to Show Cause ordering Respondent to show cause why this Petition should not be granted within three days;
- d. Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus requiring that Respondents **immediately release the Petitioner in Philadelphia, PA;**
- e. Declare that the Petitioner’s detention is unlawful;
- f. Order Respondents to return all of the Petitioner’s personal documents, including, but not limited to, his driver’s license, employment authorization document, and social security card.

- g. Order that Respondents be required at any bond hearing affecting the Petitioner to prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that the Petitioner is a flight risk or a danger to the community to justify denial of bond.
- f. Award Petitioner attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA"), as amended, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and on any other basis justified under law; and
- g. Grant any other and further relief that this court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 9, 2026

/s/ Francois-Ihor Mazur
FRANCOIS-IHOR MAZUR
Bar No. PA 87218
2434 Huntingdon Pike, Suite 1
Huntingdon Valley, PA 19006
(215) 636-0993
(215) 636-0995 (fax)
PACER/ECF mail@lawmazur.com

Attorney for Petitioner

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

AIBEK ISHEMBIEV, <i>Petitioner,</i> v. JAMAL L. JAMISON, <i>et al.</i> , <i>Respondents.</i>	))))))))))	PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS Case No. 26-1515
---	--	--

EXHIBIT INDEX

A. Petitioner's Notice to Appear 1-4

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Aibek Ishembiev

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Philadelphia
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Francois-Ihor Mazur, Mazur Law Firm, PC, 2434
Huntingdon Pike, Suite 1, Huntingdon Valley, PA 19006

DEFENDANTS

Jamal L. Jamison, John E. Rife, Acting Secretary
Department of Homeland Security, Pamela Bondi

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant

(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF
THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

U.S. Attorney's Office

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff ☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
- ☒ 2 U.S. Government Defendant ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- | | PTF | DEF | | PTF | DEF |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Citizen of This State | ☐ 1 | ☐ 1 | Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State | ☐ 4 | ☐ 4 |
| Citizen of Another State | ☐ 2 | ☐ 2 | Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State | ☐ 5 | ☐ 5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | ☐ 3 | ☐ 3 | Foreign Nation | ☐ 6 | ☐ 6 |

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.](#)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander ☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability ☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury ☐ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability ☐ 367 Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY ☐ 370 Other Fraud ☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage ☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 690 Other LABOR ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act ☐ 720 Labor/Management Relations ☐ 740 Railway Labor Act ☐ 751 Family and Medical Leave Act ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation ☐ 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION ☐ 462 Naturalization Application ☐ 465 Other Immigration Actions	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS ☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent ☐ 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application ☐ 840 Trademark ☐ 880 Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016 SOCIAL SECURITY ☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS ☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) ☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ☐ 480 Consumer Credit (15 USC 1681 or 1692) ☐ 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts ☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act ☐ 896 Arbitration ☐ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	CIVIL RIGHTS ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/Accommodations ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment ☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other ☐ 448 Education PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: ☒ 463 Alien Detainee ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence ☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penalty Other: ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement			

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☒ 1 Original Proceeding ☐ 2 Removed from State Court ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened ☐ 5 Transferred from Another District (specify) ☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer ☐ 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):
8 U.S.C. § 2241, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)

Brief description of cause:
Respondent's are unlawfully Detaining Petitioner without a bond hearing.

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. **DEMAND \$**

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND: ☐ Yes ☒ No**VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY**

(See instructions):

JUDGE _____ DOCKET NUMBER _____

DATE

03/09/2026

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

/s/ Francois-Ihor Mazur

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # _____ AMOUNT _____ APPLYING IFP _____ JUDGE _____ MAG. JUDGE _____

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
 - (b) County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
 - (c) Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
- United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
- Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
- Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions](#).
- V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.
- Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.
- Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441.
- Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
- Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
- Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
- Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.
- Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.
- PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.
- VI. Cause of Action.** Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service.
- VII. Requested in Complaint.** Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.
- Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.
- Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

DESIGNATION FORM

Place of Accident, Incident, or Transaction: Philadelphia, PA

RELATED CASE IF ANY: Case Number: _____ Judge: _____

- | | |
|---|------------------------------|
| 1. Does this case involve property included in an earlier numbered suit? | Yes ☐ |
| 2. Does this case involve a transaction or occurrence which was the subject of an earlier numbered suit? | Yes ☐ |
| 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent which was the subject of an earlier numbered suit? | Yes ☐ |
| 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus petition, social security appeal, or pro se case filed by the same individual? | Yes ☐ |
| 5. Is this case related to an earlier numbered suit even though none of the above categories apply?
If yes, attach an explanation. | Yes ☐ |

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the within case ☐ **is** / ☒ **is not** related to any pending or previously terminated action in this court.

Civil Litigation Categories

A. Federal Question Cases:

- ☐ 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts)
- ☐ 2. FELA
- ☐ 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury
- ☐ 4. Antitrust
- ☐ 5. Wage and Hour Class Action/Collective Action
- ☐ 6. Patent
- ☐ 7. Copyright/Trademark
- ☐ 8. Employment
- ☐ 9. Labor-Management Relations
- ☐ 10. Civil Rights
- ☒ 11. Habeas Corpus
- ☐ 12. Securities Cases
- ☐ 13. Social Security Review Cases
- ☐ 14. Qui Tam Cases
- ☐ 15. Cases Seeking Systemic Relief ***see certification below***
- ☐ 16. All Other Federal Question Cases. (Please specify): _____

B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:

- ☐ 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
- ☐ 2. Airplane Personal Injury
- ☐ 3. Assault, Defamation
- ☐ 4. Marine Personal Injury
- ☐ 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
- ☐ 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): _____
- ☐ 7. Products Liability
- ☐ 8. All Other Diversity Cases: (Please specify) _____

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, that the remedy sought in this case ☐ **does** / ☒ **does not** have implications beyond the parties before the court and ☐ **does** / ☒ **does not** seek to bar or mandate statewide or nationwide enforcement of a state or federal law including a rule, regulation, policy, or order of the executive branch or a state or federal agency, whether by declaratory judgment and/or any form of injunctive relief.

ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (CHECK ONLY ONE BOX BELOW)

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief:

☒ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2(3), this case is not eligible for arbitration either because (1) it seeks relief other than money damages; (2) the money damages sought are in excess of \$150,000 exclusive of interest and costs; (3) it is a social security case, includes a prisoner as a party, or alleges a violation of a right secured by the U.S. Constitution, or (4) jurisdiction is based in whole or in part on 28 U.S.C. § 1343.

☐ None of the restrictions in Local Civil Rule 53.2 apply and this case is eligible for arbitration.

NOTE: A trial de novo will be by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
NOTICE TO APPEAR

DOB: 
Event: 

In removal proceedings under section 240 of the Immigration and Nationality Act:

Subject ID: 

FINS: 1061242223

File No: 

In the Matter of:

Respondent: AIBEK ISHEMBIEV

currently residing at:



(Number, street, city, state and ZIP code)

(Area code and phone number)

- ☐ You are an arriving alien.
- ☒ You are an alien present in the United States who has not been admitted or paroled.
- ☐ You have been admitted to the United States, but are removable for the reasons stated below.

The Department of Homeland Security alleges that you:

1. You are not a citizen or national of the United States.
2. You are a native of Kyrgyzstan and a citizen of Kyrgyzstan.
3. On or about March 28, 2022, you applied for admission into the United States from Mexico at the San Ysidro Port of Entry.
4. You are an immigrant not in possession of a valid unexpired immigrant visa, reentry permit, border crossing card, or other valid entry document as required by the Immigration and Nationality Act.

See Continuation Page Made a Part Hereof

On the basis of the foregoing, it is charged that you are subject to removal from the United States pursuant to the following provision(s) of law:

See Continuation Page Made a Part Hereof

☐ This notice is being issued after an asylum officer has found that the respondent has demonstrated a credible fear of persecution or torture.

☐ Section 235(b)(1) order was vacated pursuant to: ☐ 8CFR 208.30 ☐ 8CFR 235.3(b)(5)(iv)

YOU ARE ORDERED to appear before an immigration judge of the United States Department of Justice at:

900 MARKET ST STE 504 PHILADELPHIA PA 19107. PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

(Complete Address of Immigration Court, including Room Number, if any)

on March 25, 2026 at 2:00 PM to show why you should not be removed from the United States based on the
(Date) (Time)

charge(s) set forth above.

E8051 COXHEAD - SDDO

(Signature and Title of Issuing Officer)

Date: October 24, 2024

PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

(City and State)

Notice to Respondent

Warning: Any statement you make may be used against you in removal proceedings.

Alien Registration: This copy of the Notice to Appear served upon you is evidence of your alien registration while you are in removal proceedings. You are required to carry it with you at all times.

Representation: If you so choose, you may be represented in this proceeding, at no expense to the Government, by an attorney or other individual authorized and qualified to represent persons before the Executive Office for Immigration Review, pursuant to 8 CFR 1003.16. Unless you so request, no hearing will be scheduled earlier than ten days from the date of this notice, to allow you sufficient time to secure counsel. A list of qualified attorneys and organizations who may be available to represent you at no cost will be provided with this notice.

Conduct of the hearing: At the time of your hearing, you should bring with you any affidavits or other documents that you desire to have considered in connection with your case. If you wish to have the testimony of any witnesses considered, you should arrange to have such witnesses present at the hearing. At your hearing you will be given the opportunity to admit or deny any or all of the allegations in the Notice to Appear, including that you are inadmissible or removable. You will have an opportunity to present evidence on your own behalf, to examine any evidence presented by the Government, to object, on proper legal grounds, to the receipt of evidence and to cross examine any witnesses presented by the Government. At the conclusion of your hearing, you have a right to appeal an adverse decision by the immigration judge. You will be advised by the immigration judge before whom you appear of any relief from removal for which you may appear eligible including the privilege of voluntary departure. You will be given a reasonable opportunity to make any such application to the immigration judge.

One-Year Asylum Application Deadline: If you believe you may be eligible for asylum, you must file a Form I-589, Application for Asylum and for Withholding of Removal. The Form I-589, Instructions, and information on where to file the Form can be found at www.uscis.gov/i-589. Failure to file the Form I-589 within one year of arrival may bar you from eligibility to apply for asylum pursuant to section 208(a)(2)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Failure to appear: You are required to provide the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), in writing, with your full mailing address and telephone number. You must notify the Immigration Court and the DHS immediately by using Form EOIR-33 whenever you change your address or telephone number during the course of this proceeding. You will be provided with a copy of this form. Notices of hearing will be mailed to this address. If you do not submit Form EOIR-33 and do not otherwise provide an address at which you may be reached during proceedings, then the Government shall not be required to provide you with written notice of your hearing. If you fail to attend the hearing at the time and place designated on this notice, or any date and time later directed by the Immigration Court, a removal order may be made by the immigration judge in your absence, and you may be arrested and detained by the DHS.

Mandatory Duty to Surrender for Removal: If you become subject to a final order of removal, you must surrender for removal to your local DHS office, listed on the internet at <http://www.ice.gov/contact/ero>, as directed by the DHS and required by statute and regulation. Immigration regulations at 8 CFR 1241.1 define when the removal order becomes administratively final. If you are granted voluntary departure and fail to depart the United States as required, fail to post a bond in connection with voluntary departure, or fail to comply with any other condition or term in connection with voluntary departure, you must surrender for removal on the next business day thereafter. If you do not surrender for removal as required, you will be ineligible for all forms of discretionary relief for as long as you remain in the United States and for ten years after your departure or removal. This means you will be ineligible for asylum, cancellation of removal, voluntary departure, adjustment of status, change of nonimmigrant status, registry, and related waivers for this period. If you do not surrender for removal as required, you may also be criminally prosecuted under section 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

U.S. Citizenship Claims: If you believe you are a United States citizen, please advise the DHS by calling the ICE Law Enforcement Support Center toll free at (855) 448-6903.

Sensitive locations: To the extent that an enforcement action leading to a removal proceeding was taken against Respondent at a location described in 8 U.S.C. § 1229(e)(1), such action complied with 8 U.S.C. § 1367.

Request for Prompt Hearing

To expedite a determination in my case, I request this Notice to Appear be filed with the Executive Office for Immigration Review as soon as possible. I waive my right to a 10-day period prior to appearing before an immigration judge and request my hearing be scheduled.

Before:

(Signature of Respondent)

Date: _____

(Signature and Title of Immigration Officer)

Certificate of Service

This Notice To Appear was served on the respondent by me on October 24, 2024, in the following manner and in compliance with section 239(a)(1) of the Act.

- ☒ in person ☐ by certified mail, returned receipt # _____ requested ☐ by regular mail
☐ Attached is a credible fear worksheet.
☒ Attached is a list of organization and attorneys which provide free legal services.

The alien was provided oral notice in the Russian language of the time and place of his or her hearing and of the consequences of failure to appear as provided in section 240(b)(7) of the Act.

+ [Signature]
(Signature of Respondent if Personally Served)

E 0492 NEWNOM - Deportation Officer
(Signature and Title of officer)

Privacy Act Statement

Authority:

The Department of Homeland Security through U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) are authorized to collect the information requested on this form pursuant to Sections 103, 237, 239, 240, and 290 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended (8 U.S.C. 1103, 1229, 1229a, and 1360), and the regulations issued pursuant thereto.

Purpose:

You are being asked to sign and date this Notice to Appear (NTA) as an acknowledgement of personal receipt of this notice. This notice, when filed with the U.S. Department of Justice's (DOJ) Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR), initiates removal proceedings. The NTA contains information regarding the nature of the proceedings against you, the legal authority under which proceedings are conducted, the acts or conduct alleged against you to be in violation of law, the charges against you, and the statutory provisions alleged to have been violated. The NTA also includes information about the conduct of the removal hearing, your right to representation at no expense to the government, the requirement to inform EOIR of any change in address, the consequences for failing to appear, and that generally, if you wish to apply for asylum, you must do so within one year of your arrival in the United States. If you choose to sign and date the NTA, that information will be used to confirm that you received it, and for recordkeeping.

Routine Uses:

For United States Citizens, Lawful Permanent Residents, or individuals whose records are covered by the Judicial Redress Act of 2015 (5 U.S.C. § 552a note), your information may be disclosed in accordance with the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. § 552a(b), including pursuant to the routine uses published in the following DHS systems of records notices (SORN): DHS/USCIS/ICE/CBP-001 Alien File, Index, and National File Tracking System of Records, DHS/USCIS-007 Benefit Information System, DHS/ICE-011 Criminal Arrest Records and Immigration Enforcement Records (CARIER), and DHS/ICE-003 General Counsel Electronic Management System (GEMS), and DHS/CBP-023 Border Patrol Enforcement Records (BPER). These SORNs can be viewed at <https://www.dhs.gov/system-records-notices-sorn>. When disclosed to the DOJ's EOIR for immigration proceedings, this information that is maintained and used by DOJ is covered by the following DOJ SORN: EOIR-001, Records and Management Information System, or any updated or successor SORN, which can be viewed at <https://www.justice.gov/opcl/doj-systems-records>. Further, your information may be disclosed pursuant to routine uses described in the abovementioned DHS SORNs or DOJ EOIR SORN to federal, state, local, tribal, territorial, and foreign law enforcement agencies for enforcement, investigatory, litigation, or other similar purposes.

For all others, as appropriate under United States law and DHS policy, the information you provide may be shared internally within DHS, as well as with federal, state, local, tribal, territorial, and foreign law enforcement; other government agencies; and other parties for enforcement, investigatory, litigation, or other similar purposes.

Disclosure:

Providing your signature and the date of your signature is voluntary. There are no effects on you for not providing your signature and date; however, removal proceedings may continue notwithstanding the failure or refusal to provide this information.

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Continuation Page for Form I-862

Alien's Name ISHEMBIEV, AIBEK	File Number 	Date 10/24/2024
THE SERVICE ALLEGES THAT YOU: ----- 5. You are not a citizen or national of the United States; 6. You are a native of KYRGYZSTAN and a citizen of KYRGYZSTAN; 7. You entered the United States at or near SAN YSIDRO, on or about March 28, 2022; 8. You were not then admitted or paroled after inspection by an Immigration Officer. ----- ON THE BASIS OF THE FOREGOING, IT IS CHARGED THAT YOU ARE SUBJECT TO REMOVAL FROM THE UNITED STATES PURSUANT TO THE FOLLOWING PROVISION(S) OF LAW: ----- 212(a)(6)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, in that you are an alien present in the United States without being admitted or paroled, or who arrived in the United States at any time or place other than as designated by the Attorney General. 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), as amended, as an immigrant who, at the time of application for admission, is not in possession of a valid unexpired immigrant visa, reentry permit, border crossing card, or other valid entry document required by the Act, and a valid unexpired passport, or other suitable travel document, or document of identity and nationality as required under the regulations issued by the Attorney General under section 211(a) of the Act.		
Signature E8051 COXHEAD		Title SDDO