

Gian-Grasso | Tomczak Immigration Law Group
Kimberly A. Tomczak
PA Bar: 310687
990 Spring Garden Street, Suite 304
Philadelphia, PA 19123
(215) 437-0392
kimberly@gtilg.com

Attorney for Petitioner

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

CLAUDIA ESTEFANIA IBARRA PINEDA

Petitioner,

v.

JOHN E. RIFE,
in his official capacity as Acting
Philadelphia Field Office Director, United
States Immigration and Customs
Enforcement;

TODD M. LYONS,
in his official capacity as Acting Director
of Immigration & Customs Enforcement;

MARKWAYNE MULLIN,
in his official capacity as Secretary, U.S.
Department of Homeland Security; and

PAMELA BONDI,
in her official capacity as Attorney General,
U.S. Department of Justice.

Respondents.

Case No. 2:26-cv-2073

**VERIFIED PETITION
FOR WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS PURSUANT TO
28 U.S.C. § 2241**

Petitioner, Claudia Estefania Ibarra Pineda (“Ms. Ibarra Pineda”) is a 25-year-old who petitions for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, challenging the lawfulness of her detention by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”). Petitioner requests that this Court

release her from detention by the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) or, alternatively, conduct or order a bond hearing in which the Respondents bear the burden of justifying Petitioner’s continued detention. Petitioner also requests that the Court set aside recent policies implemented by Respondents that are contrary to the statutory right of non-citizens like Petitioner to seek release and bail through an exercise of the Respondents’ discretion.

Ms. Ibarra Pineda is a 20-year-old, native and citizen of El Salvador. She entered the U.S. on or about August 14, 2018 as an Unaccompanied Minor (UAC). She was released from the Office of Refugee Resettlement to the custody of her father. She was placed into removal proceedings before the Philadelphia Immigration Court. She filed an application for asylum with the Immigration Court on May 22, 2019 and then with U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) on November 7, 2022. Her removal proceedings were administratively closed on November 14, 2022. *See* Exhibit A, Case Status printout.

On March 30, 2026, ICE detained Ms. Ibarra Pineda. ICE did not make any individualized assessment required under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) that she posed a flight risk or a danger to the community and, therefore, detained Ms. Ibarra Pineda without due process. Moreover, Respondents have adopted policies enshrined in administrative decisions by the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) that subject non-citizens like Ms. Ibarra Pineda to mandatory detention in violation of Section 1226(a). She therefore seeks immediate release from custody, or, in the alternative, the opportunity for a bond hearing.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. Ms. Ibarra Pineda is a 25-year-old, native and citizen of El Salvador.
2. She entered the U.S. on or about August 14, 2018 as an Unaccompanied Minor (UAC). She was released from the Office of Refugee Resettlement to the custody

of her father.

3. She was placed into removal proceedings before the Philadelphia Immigration Court. She filed an application for asylum with the Immigration Court on May 22, 2019 and then with U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) on November 7, 2022. Her removal proceedings were administratively closed on November 14, 2022. *See* Exhibit A.
4. Ms. Ibarra Pineda has remained in the United States since August 14, 2018 and attended all court hearings without incident.
5. Ms. Ibarra Pineda has one arrest for harassment, which is currently pending at the Magisterial Court in Delaware County, PA.
6. On March 30, 2026, ICE detained Ms. Ibarra Pineda.
7. ICE did not make any individualized assessment required under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) that she posed a flight risk or a danger to the community and, therefore, detained Ms. Ibarra Pineda without due process. Since then, she has remained detained without the ability to present himself at a bond hearing.
8. As of the date of this habeas corpus filing, Ms. Ibarra Pineda is being detained at the Philadelphia Field Office, Immigration Customs and Enforcement, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. *See* Exhibit B, ICE locator.

PARTIES

9. Petitioner Ms. Ibarra Pineda is a resident of Pennsylvania who normally resides at Norwood, PA.

10. Respondent, John E. Rife is the Acting Philadelphia Field Office Director for Immigration and Customs Enforcement's ("ICE") Enforcement and Removal Operations. In this capacity, he is responsible for the custody of all noncitizens detained by ICE at the Philadelphia Field Office and has authority to release Ms. Ibarra Pineda or transfer her to a different facility. He is one of Ms. Ibarra Pineda's immediate custodians and is sued in his official capacity.
11. Respondent, Todd M. Lyons is the Acting Director of ICE. In this capacity he is responsible for decisions related to detaining and removing certain noncitizens. Director Lyons is a legal custodian of Ms. Ibarra Pineda and is sued in his official capacity.
12. Respondent, Markwayne Mullin is named in his official capacity as the Secretary of Homeland Security. In this capacity, he is responsible for the administration of the immigration laws pursuant to Section 402 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002. 107 Pub. L. 296 (November 25, 2003); *see also* 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a); and is legally responsible for Ms. Ibarra Pineda's incarceration and removal. He is therefore a custodian of Ms. Ibarra Pineda and is sued in his official capacity. Respondent Mullin's office is located at DHS headquarters in Washington, DC, 20528.
13. Respondent, Pamela Bondi is named in her official capacity as the Attorney General of the United States. She is responsible for the administration of the immigration laws as exercised by EOIR, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1103(g). She is legally responsible for administering Ms. Ibarra Pineda's removal proceedings as well as the procedural standards used in those proceedings. She is therefore a legal

custodian of Ms. Ibarra Pineda and is sued in her official capacity. Respondent Bondi's office is at DHS of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20530.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

14. Respondents incarcerated Ms. Ibarra Pineda on March 30, 2026 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and he is under the direct control of Respondents and their agents.
15. This action arises under the Constitution of the United States, and the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA").
16. This court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(1) and (c)(3) (habeas corpus) to determine whether people imprisoned in federal custody are held in violation of law. *INS v. St. Cyr*, 533 U.S. 289, 305 (2001).
17. Jurisdiction is also proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act); 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question); 5 U.S.C. § 702 (Administrative Procedures Act); U.S. Const. amend V (Due Process Clause), and U.S. Const. art. I § 9, cl. 2 (Suspension Clause).
18. Ms. Ibarra Pineda's detention constitutes a "severe restraint[]" on h[er] individual liberty" interest such that Ms. Ibarra Pineda is "subject to restraints not shared by the public generally" and "in custody in violation of the . . . laws . . . of the United States." *See Hensley v. Municipal Court*, 411 U.S. 345, 351 (1973).
19. The federal district courts have jurisdiction to hear habeas corpus claims by noncitizens challenging the lawfulness of their detention by DHS. *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 292-95 (2018); *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 516-17 (2003); *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 687 (2001).

20. Venue properly lies in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)(2), (e) and § 2241(d) because this petition is filed while Ms. Ibarra Pineda is physically present within the district, as she is detained at the Philadelphia Field Office of Immigration and Customs Enforcement in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

21. Exhaustion is not necessary because Congress did not codify a requirement that petitioners seeking a writ of habeas corpus exhaust administrative remedies. *McCarthy v. Madigan*, 503 U.S. 140, 144 (1992) (“Where Congress specifically mandates, exhaustion is required... But where Congress has not clearly required exhaustion, sound judicial discretion governs.”) (citation omitted).

22. Finally, even if meaningful administrative remedies were promptly available, Ms. Ibarra Pineda, as a noncitizen challenging the lawfulness of her ongoing immigration detention, is not required to exhaust those remedies under 8 U.S.C. § 2241. *See Louisaire v. Muller*, 758 F. Supp. 2d 229, 234 (S.D.N.Y. 2010).

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

23. For non-citizens attempting to enter the U.S., the INA provides that “in the case of [a non-citizen] who is an applicant for admission, if the examining immigration officer determines that an alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, the alien shall be detained.” “A noncitizen detained under Section 1225(b)(2) may be released only if he is paroled ‘for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit’ pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A).” *Gomes*

v. Hyde, 25 Civ. 11571, 2025 WL 1868288, at *2 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025) (quoting *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 300 (2018)).

24. In contrast, the Supreme Court has found that “U.S. immigration law authorizes the Government to detain certain [non-citizens] *already in the country* pending the outcome of removal proceedings under §§ 1226(a) and (c).” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 288-89.

25. Section 236 of the INA provides in relevant part as follows:

(a) Arrest, Detention, and Release. On a warrant issued by the Attorney General, *an alien may be arrested and detained pending a decision on whether the alien is to be removed from the United States*. Except as provided in subsection (c) and pending such decision, *the Attorney General—*

(1) *may continue to detain the arrested alien; and*

(2) *may release the alien on—*

(A) bond of at least \$1,500 with security approved by, and containing conditions prescribed by, the Attorney General; or

(B) conditional parole ...

26. The Supreme Court has interpreted similar “may” language in other provisions of the INA to require “some level of individualized determination.” *I.N.S. v. Nat’l Ctr. For Immigrants’ Rights*, 502 U.S. 183, 194 (1991). The regulation implementing Respondents’ authority to arrest non-citizens present in the United States reads:

“Any officer authorized to issue a warrant of arrest may, in the officer’s discretion, release an alien not described in [8 U.S.C. § 1236(c)(1)] of the Act, under the conditions at section [8 U.S.C. § 1236(a)(2) and (3)]; provided that the alien must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the officer that such release would not pose a danger to property or persons, and that the alien is likely to appear for any future proceeding.”

8 U.S.C. § 1236.1(c)(8).

27. Noncitizens may request a review of an initial custody determination before an Immigration Judge (“IJ”). 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(d)(1); 8 C.F.R. § 1002.19(a). At this hearing an IJ may make the decision “upon any information that is available to the [Immigration Judge] or that is presented to him or her by the [non-citizen] or the [government].” 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(d); *see also Matter of Guerra*, 24 I&N Dec. 37, 39 (BIA 2006). Non-citizens may appeal a negative decision in a custody review before an IJ to the Board of Immigration Appeals. 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(d)(3)(i). The current statutory scheme was created through the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (“IIRIRA”).
28. For the first time in nearly three decades, Respondents have taken the position through a series of precedential decisions by the Board of Immigration Appeals that non-citizens residing in the interior of the United States are not entitled to a custody redetermination (a “bond hearing”) before an Immigration Judge.
29. First, in *Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. 66 (BIA 2025), the BIA held that a non-citizen who had been apprehended at the border and subsequently released into the United States is subject to mandatory detention without a possibility of bail upon re-detention, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), even if that re-detention occurs years after their initial release from custody. The BIA reasoned that “an applicant for admission who is arrested and detained without a warrant while in the process of arriving in the United States, whether or not at a port of entry, and subsequently placed in removal proceedings is detained under section [1225(b)] [], and is ineligible for any subsequent release on bond under section [1226(a)].” *Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. at 74.

30. Then in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), the BIA stated that all non-citizens who are present in the United States without admission are subject to mandatory detention under Section 1225(b), regardless of how long they have been residing in the U.S. and absent any prior interaction with immigration authorities.

ARGUMENT

COUNT ONE

FIFTH AMENDMENT – DUE PROCESS

31. Petitioner repeats and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

32. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that “[n]o person shall . . . be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.” U.S. Const. amend. V.

33. Procedural due process requires that the government be constrained before it acts in a way that deprives individuals of liberty interests protected under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

34. Ms. Ibarra Pineda is indisputably entitled to the protections of the Due Process Clause. *See Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001) (“[T]he Due Process Clause applies to all ‘persons’ within the United States, including aliens, whether their presence here is lawful, unlawful, temporary, or permanent.”). Specifically, “[i]t is well established that the Fifth Amendment entitles [non-citizens] to due process of law in deportation proceedings. *Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 306 (1993); *see also Abdulai v. Ashcroft*, 239 F.3d 542, 549 (3d Cir. 2001) (“[Non-

citizens] facing removal are entitled to due process”); *Calderon-Rosas v. Atty’ Gen.*, 957 F.3d 378, 386 (3d Cir. 2020) (“In sum, petitioners seeking discretionary relief are entitled to fundamentally fair removal proceedings, which constitutes a protected interest supporting a due process claim.”). Ms. Ibarra Pineda has lived in the United States continuously since August 2018.

35. Respondents have deprived Ms. Ibarra Pineda of her liberty interest protected by the Fifth Amendment by detaining him since March 30, 2026, without making an individualized custody determination required under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), and without any hearing to determine whether her ongoing detention is justified.
36. Evaluating the adequacy of the process provided to a non-citizen requires a balancing of factors. “First, the private interest that will be affected by the official action; second, the risk of an erroneous deprivation of such interest through the procedures used, and the probable value, if any, of additional or substitute procedural safeguards; and finally, the Government’s interest, including the function involved and the fiscal and administrative burdens that the additional or substitute procedural requirement would entail.” *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 335 (1976).
37. First, Ms. Ibarra Pineda faces “the most significant liberty interest there is—the interest in being free from imprisonment.” *Velasco Lopez v. Decker*, 978 F.3d 842, 851 (2d Cir. 2020) (citing *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507, 529 (2004)). Second, Respondents have erroneously deprived Ms. Ibarra Pineda of her liberty without any individualized assessment of her circumstances. Third, Respondents did not

make any individualized finding that Ms. Ibarra Pineda was a danger or flight risk, so there does not appear to be a significant government interest in detaining her.

38. An application of these factors requires that Ms. Ibarra Pineda should have been provided with additional process before being detained or in the alternative should be able to petition for bond upon a showing she is neither a danger to the community or flight risk.

COUNT TWO

VIOLATION OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)

39. Petitioner repeats and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

40. 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 grounds of inadmissibility. As, relevant here, it does not apply to those who have been residing in the United States at liberty after entering without inspection. Such noncitizens, if detained, are done so under § 1226(a), and are generally eligible for release on bond.

41. Respondents' authority to detain Ms. Ibarra Pineda is derived from 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) as she is already present in the United States.

42. Respondents have detained Ms. Ibarra Pineda without making an individualized determination regarding whether she posed a danger or flight risk as required by 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and its regulations.

43. Moreover, Respondents' current policies as set forth in the BIA's decisions in *Matter of Q. Li* and *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* unlawfully prevent Ms. Ibarra Pineda

from obtaining a custody redetermination in front of an Immigration Judge as is her right by statute.

COUNT THREE

VIOLATION OF THE BOND REGULATIONS

8 C.F.R. § 236.1, 1236.1 and 1003.19

44. Petitioner repeats and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
45. In 1997, after Congress amended the INA through IIRIRA, EOIR 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 [Non-citizens],” 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). Thus, the agencies made clear that non-citizens present in the United States would be eligible for consideration for bond and bond hearings before IJs under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and its implementing regulations.
46. Yet, Respondents have adopted a policy and practice of applying § 1225(b)(2) to non-citizens like Ms. Ibarra Pineda who are present in the United States without being admitted or paroled.
47. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Ms. Ibarra Pineda unlawfully mandates her continued detention in violation of 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1, 1236.1, and 1003.19.

COUNT FOUR

VIOLATION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT (“APA”)

5 U.S.C. § 701, *et. seq.*

48. Petitioner repeats and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
49. The Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”) provides a right to sue when an individual has been “aggrieved” by a “final agency action for which there is no other adequate remedy in court.” 5 U.S.C. § 704.
50. Respondents have violated procedural and substantive requirements of the Fifth Amendment and the Immigration and Nationality Act by arbitrarily detaining Ms. Ibarra Pineda without conducting an individualized determination into her circumstances. Essentially, they have not presented any indication that her circumstances have changed since she was initially placed into removal proceedings such that she is now a danger to the community or a flight risk.
51. Respondent DHS’ actions in detaining and seeking to remove Ms. Ibarra Pineda and in its recent policies announced through administrative decisions issued by the BIA were arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law; contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity; in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right; and without observance of procedure required by law, in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)-(D).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Ms. Ibarra Pineda prays that this Court grant the following relief:

- 1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- 2) Enjoin Respondents from transferring Ms. Ibarra Pineda outside of the jurisdiction of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania pending the resolution of this case;
- 3) Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus ordering Respondents to release Petitioner from custody immediately on her own recognizance or under parole, bond, or reasonable conditions of supervision, on the ground that her continued detention by the Department of Homeland Security violates his Due Process rights;
- 4) Set aside Respondents' unlawful detention policy contained in *Matter of Q. Li* and *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* under the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2), as contrary to law, arbitrary and capricious, and contrary to constitutional right;
- 5) Issue a Writ requiring an immediate release of respondent as the Executive Office of Immigration Review's position makes it impossible to have a constitutionally adequate hearing before an Immigration Judge. In the alternative, petitioner requests a Constitutionally adequate bond hearing, at which: (i) DHS bears the burden to demonstrate, by clear and convincing evidence, that Petitioner's continued detention is necessary, and (ii) the immigration judge considers Petitioner's ability to pay a bond.
- 6) While this petition is pending, order Petitioner's immediate release pursuant to the Court's inherent authority to release habeas corpus petitioners on bail.
- 7) Award Ms. Ibarra Pineda attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA") as amended, 5 U.S.C. § 504 and 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and on any other basis justified under law;

- 8) Order the Respondents to return any and all personal property to Petitioner upon her release; and
- 9) Grant any other and further relief that this Court deems just and proper.

Dated: March 30, 2026

Respectfully submitted:

/s/ Kimberly A. Tomczak

Gian-Grasso | Tomczak
Immigration Law Group
PA Bar: 310687
990 Spring Garden St., Ste. 304
Philadelphia, PA 19123
Ph. (215) 437-0392
Fax: (215) 437-0490
kimberly@gtilg.com

Attorney for Petitioner

LIST OF EXHIBITS

- A. Case Status printout showing proceedings were administratively closed
- B. ICE Detainee Locator

VERIFICATION

I, /s/ Kimberly A. Tomczak, hereby declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 that, on information and belief, the factual statements in the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus are true and correct.

Dated: March 30, 2026

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Kimberly A. Tomczak, certify that on March 30, 2026 I electronically filed the attached the foregoing Petition for Habeas Corpus with the Clerk of the Court for the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania using the CM/ECF system.

Dated: March 30, 2026

Respectfully submitted:

/s/ Kimberly A. Tomczak

Gian-Grasso | Tomczak
Immigration Law Group
PA Bar: 310687
990 Spring Garden St., Ste. 304
Philadelphia, PA 19123
Ph. (215) 437-0392
Fax: (215) 437-0490
kimberly@gtilg.com

Attorney for Petitioner

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

Claudia Estefania Ibarra Pineda

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

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

Kimberly Tomczak, GT Immigration Law Group
990 Spring Garden St, Ste 304, Phila PA 19123
215-437-0392

DEFENDANTSJohn E. Rife, Todd M. Lyons,
Markwayne Mullin, 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)

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):
28 U.S.C. § 2241

Brief description of cause: Petitioner is unlawfully detained

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

03/30/2026

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD



FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

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.

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? Yes ☐
If yes, attach an explanation.

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.



An official website of the United States government

Here's how you know



EOIR | Automated Case Information

Court Closures Today March 30, 2026

Please check <https://www.justice.gov/eoir-operational-status> for up to date closures.

[Home](#) > **IBARRA-PINEDA, CLAUDIA ESTEFANIA**



Automated Case Information

Name: IBARRA-PINEDA, CLAUDIA ESTEFANIA | A-Number:



Next Hearing Information



There are no future hearings for this case.



Court Decision and Motion Information

The immigration judge administratively **CLOSED** the case.

DECISION DATE

November 14, 2022

COURT ADDRESS

900 MARKET STREET, SUITE 504
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19107

**BIA Case Information**

No appeal was received for this case.

**Court Contact Information**

If you require further information regarding your case, or wish to file additional documents, please contact the immigration court.

COURT ADDRESS

900 MARKET STREET, SUITE 504
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19107

PHONE NUMBER

(215) 656-7000

[Archive](#)[Accessibility](#)[Information Quality](#)[Privacy Policy](#)

[Legal Policies & Disclaimers](#)

[Social Media](#)

[Budget & Performance](#)

[Office of the Inspector General](#)

[No FEAR Act](#)

[For Employees](#)

[EOIR Freedom of Information Act \(FOIA\)](#)

[USA.gov](#)

[Contact EOIR](#)

[EOIR Home](#)

[Justice.gov](#)

[Immigration Court Online Resource](#)

[Contact Technical Support](#)

This site is protected by hCaptcha:

[hCaptcha Privacy Policy](#)

[hCaptcha Terms of Service](#)

Department of Justice | Executive Office for Immigration Review
5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 2600, Falls Church, VA 22041



EOIR | Automated Case Information



U.S. Immigration
and Customs
Enforcement

Report Cri

Main Menu

< BACK TO RESULTS

Facility Page

Detention Information For:

CLAUDIA ESTEFANIA IBARRA-PINEDA

Country of Birth: El Salvador

A-Number:



Current Detention Facility:

Call ICE For Details

ERO Office Information

Family members and legal representatives may be able to obtain additional information about this individual's case by contacting this ERO office:

PHILADELPHIA, PA, DOCKET CONTROL OFFICE

Phone Number: (215) 656-7164

BACK TO SEARCH >

Related
Information

Privacy - Terms

Helpful Info

Status of a Case

About the Detainee Locator

Brochure

ICE ERO Field Offices

ICE Detention Facilities

Privacy Notice

External Links

Bureau of Prisons Inmate
Locator



[DHS.gov](#)[USA.gov](#)[OIG](#)[OpenFOI](#)[Metrics](#) [No](#) [Site](#) [Site](#)
[Gov](#) [FearMap](#)[Policies](#)
[Act](#) [& Plug-](#)
[Ins](#)