

1 Jose Torres, Esq. 362715
Moonveil Legal, PC
2 7546 Parkway Dr. Apt. 1U
La Mesa, California 91942
3 Office: 619.573.1138
Fax: 619.694.5180
4 Email: jose@moonveilfirm.com

5 *Counsel for*
6 **Kenny Moises Rodriguez-Silva**

7
8
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT

10 Kenny Moises Rodriguez-Silva,
11
12 Petitioner,

13 v.

14 Patrick Divver, Field Office Director of
Enforcement and Removal Operations, San
Diego Field Office, Immigration and Customs
15 Enforcement; Kristi Noem, Secretary, U.S.
Department of Homeland Security; U.S.
16 Department of Homeland Security; Pamela
Bondi, U.S. Attorney General; Executive Office
17 for Immigration Review; Christopher J.
LaRose, Warden of Otay Mesa Detention
18 Center,

19 Respondents.
20
21
22
23
24

Case No. '26CV2411 TWR VET

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

1 Petitioner Kenny Moises Rodriguez-Silva, through counsel, petitions for a writ of habeas
2 corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and alleges:

3
4 **I. INTRODUCTION**

- 5 1. Petitioner seeks a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 because Petitioner is in
6 federal immigration custody and is being detained in violation of the Constitution and
7 laws of the United States.
8 2. Respondents' continued detention of Petitioner without a prompt and individualized
9 custody determination violates the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Administrative
10 Procedure Act, and the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.
11 3. Petitioner requests (a) expedited issuance of an Order to Show Cause pursuant to 28
12 U.S.C. § 2243; (b) an order requiring a prompt individualized custody hearing (or other
13 prompt individualized custody determination) with appropriate procedural safeguards; (c)
14 release unless Respondents carry the applicable burden to justify continued detention;
15 and (d) any further relief the Court deems just and proper.

16 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 17 4. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 because Petitioner is "in custody"
18 under color of federal authority within this judicial district and alleges that such custody
19 violates the Constitution and laws of the United States.
20 5. This Court is authorized to grant habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241–2243.
21 6. To the extent Petitioner seeks relief under the Administrative Procedure Act in addition
22 to habeas relief, this Court also has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
23 7. Venue is proper in this District because Petitioner is detained within the South District of
24 California.

III. REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241 AND 2243

8. Under 28 U.S.C. § 2243, this Court must either grant the writ or issue an Order to Show Cause “forthwith” unless it appears from the petition that Petitioner is not entitled to relief.
9. Habeas corpus is a fundamental mechanism for testing the legality of executive detention and provides a swift and imperative remedy for unlawful restraint of liberty.

IV. PARTIES

10. Petitioner Kenny Moises Rodriguez-Silva is detained by the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”), through Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”), at OMDC.
11. Respondent, Patrick Divver, is the Director of the San Diego Field Office of ICE’s Enforcement and Removal Operations division. As such, Patrick Divver is Petitioner’s immediate custodian and is responsible for Petitioner’s detention and removal. He is named in his official capacity.
12. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. She is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), and oversees ICE, which is responsible for Petitioner’s detention. Ms. Noem has ultimate custodial authority over Petitioner and is sued in her official capacity.
13. Respondent Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is the federal agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA, including the detention and removal of noncitizens.
14. Respondent Pamela Bondi is the Attorney General of the United States. She is responsible for the Department of Justice, of which the Executive Office for Immigration

1 Review and the immigration court system it operates is a component agency. She is sued
2 in her official capacity.

3 15. Respondent Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) is the federal agency
4 responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA in removal proceedings, including
5 for custody redeterminations in bond hearings.

6 16. Respondent Christopher J. LaRose is employed by CoreCivic as Warden of the Otay
7 Mesa Detention Center, where Petitioner is detained. He has immediate physical custody
8 of Petitioner. He is sued in his official capacity.

9 **V. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

10 17. Petitioner is a native and citizen of Venezuela.

11 18. On or about December 29, 2023, Petitioner entered the United States near Eagle Pass,
12 Texas. Upon apprehension, Petitioner expressed a fear of return to Venezuela.

13 19. Following his apprehension and processing, Petitioner was released from immigration
14 custody. As a condition of release, Petitioner was instructed to submit weekly
15 photographs by cellphone. After approximately one month, that requirement was
16 discontinued. Petitioner was also instructed to notify ICE of any change of address and
17 was not required to report for in-person check-ins or any other ongoing supervision.

18 20. After being released upon inspection, Petitioner complied with all conditions imposed by
19 immigration authorities, including the weekly photo reporting requirement, until it was
20 discontinued. He remained at his reported address and followed all instructions provided
21 by ICE.

22 21. Petitioner was working normally as an Uber and DoorDash delivery driver. During one
23 such work shift, he parked his motorcycle while completing an order at a restaurant. As
24

1 he was leaving the location, a police officer stopped him without valid justification. The
2 officer claimed that Petitioner had driven over a pedestrian walkway; however, the area
3 in question was not a pedestrian walkway but included a ramp designed for vehicle
4 access. Petitioner had not committed any traffic violation.

5 22. Petitioner did not possess a U.S. driver's license at the time but provided his international
6 driver's license. Despite this, he was arrested and taken into custody.

7 23. At some point thereafter, DHS initiated removal proceedings under INA § 240 by issuing
8 a Form I-862, Notice to Appear.

9 24. Petitioner has never received an individualized custody determination or bond hearing
10 before a neutral adjudicator at which the government bears the burden of justifying initial
11 and continued detention.

12 25. During the pendency of his appellate procedures, Petitioner was transported to an airport
13 facility in Arizona, where he was detained for approximately three days under severely
14 overcrowded conditions. The holding room was designed to accommodate approximately
15 30 individuals but housed nearly 60 detainees. During this time, Petitioner was restrained
16 in hand and foot shackles, and detainees were forced to take turns sleeping on the floor.

17 26. After approximately three days, media attention reportedly highlighted the conditions of
18 confinement, including coverage by Telemundo. Shortly thereafter, Petitioner and other
19 detainees were transferred to a CoreCivic-operated detention facility.

20 27. Approximately two days later, Petitioner was transported through Nogales, Arizona, for
21 removal to Mexico. During transport, however, officers were unable to locate Petitioner's
22 belongings. As a result, Petitioner, along with four other individuals, was returned to
23 custody instead of being removed.

1 28. Petitioner was then transferred to the Florence Detention Center, where he remained
2 detained. Approximately two days later, an ICE officer approached him, and Petitioner
3 informed the officer that he had pending appeal proceedings.

4 29. Following that disclosure, Petitioner was transferred to San Diego, California, where he
5 remained in immigration custody until the first week of April of 2026. There, he was
6 transferred to Florence Detention Facility and then transferred back to Otay Mesa
7 detention center where he remains.

8 VI. LEGAL FRAMEWORK

9 30. Immigration detention is civil and nonpunitive in nature and may be imposed only to
10 serve legitimate regulatory purposes, such as ensuring appearance at removal proceedings
11 or protecting the community. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001); *Reno v.*
12 *Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 306 (1993). Detention that is excessive in relation to these
13 purposes, or that lacks adequate procedural safeguards, violates due process.

14 31. Noncitizens in removal proceedings are entitled to the protections of the Due Process
15 Clause of the Fifth Amendment. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 693; *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S.
16 510, 523 (2003). At minimum, due process requires a meaningful opportunity to contest
17 the factual and legal basis for continued civil confinement before a neutral
18 decisionmaker.

19 32. Where detention authority is exercised under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), custody determinations
20 must be individualized and must meaningfully assess whether continued detention is
21 necessary to address flight risk or danger to the community. The statute expressly
22 authorizes release on bond or conditional parole, and implementing regulations provide
23
24

1 for custody redetermination before an Immigration Judge. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a); 8 C.F.R.
2 §§ 1236.1(d), 1003.19.

3 33. Even where DHS invokes authority to revoke a prior release under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(b),
4 such revocation must be based on individualized facts and exercised only by officials
5 authorized by regulation. 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(c)(9). A categorical or automatic re-
6 detention, or a revocation undertaken without a reasoned, individualized assessment,
7 exceeds statutory and regulatory limits and is inconsistent with due process.

8 VII. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF (HABEAS GROUNDS)

9 Ground One: Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) Abuse of 10 Discretion Violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(b) and 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(c)(9)

11 34. Petitioner incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs.

12 35. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 to remedy unlawful federal custody,
13 including custody maintained in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States.
14 Petitioner also seeks relief under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 701 et
15 seq. to the extent Respondents' custody decision constitutes reviewable agency action
16 and no other adequate remedy provides complete relief.

17 36. Under the APA, a reviewing court must "hold unlawful and set aside agency action"
18 found to be "arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance
19 with law." 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

20 37. Agency action is arbitrary and capricious where the agency fails to consider an important
21 aspect of the problem, offers an explanation that runs counter to the evidence, or reaches
22 a decision that is implausible in light of the record. *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n of U.S.*,

1 *Inc. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463 U.S. 29 (1983); *Nat'l Ass'n of Home Builders*
2 *v. Defs. of Wildlife*, 551 U.S. 644 (2007).

3 38. To satisfy APA review, the agency must provide a reasoned explanation reflecting a
4 rational connection between facts found and choices made. *Dep't of Com. v. New York*,
5 139 S. Ct. 2551 (2019).

6 39. Petitioner was previously released from immigration custody and later re-detained. On
7 information and belief, Respondents re-detained Petitioner and/or revoked Petitioner's
8 prior release determination without a reasoned, individualized assessment of Petitioner's
9 current circumstances, and without providing a meaningful custody determination
10 adequate to test whether confinement remains necessary.

11 40. On information and belief, Respondents' re-detention and continued detention operate in
12 practice as a categorical denial of individualized custody review (including by treating
13 parole as the only release mechanism, refusing neutral custody redetermination, or
14 otherwise maintaining detention without an individualized custody analysis), rather than
15 a reasoned exercise of discretion on Petitioner's facts.

16 41. If Respondents contend Petitioner's prior release was revoked pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §
17 1226(b), then the revocation had to be the product of an individualized exercise of
18 discretion within the limits set by statute and the implementing regulation, including the
19 requirement that revocation authority be exercised only by the official(s) authorized
20 under 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(c)(9).

21 42. By re-detaining Petitioner and maintaining custody without a reasoned, individualized
22 revocation decision and without procedures adequate to test the necessity of confinement
23
24

1 as applied, Respondents acted arbitrarily and capriciously and abused discretion in
2 violation of 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

3 43. Petitioner is entitled to habeas and APA relief setting aside the unlawful revocation/re-
4 detention decision as applied and ordering a prompt, individualized custody
5 determination by a neutral decisionmaker

6 **Ground Two: Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) Not in**
7 **Accordance with Law / In Excess of Statutory Authority / Without Observance of**
8 **Procedure Required by Law Violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(b) and 8 C.F.R. §**
9 **1236.1(c)(9).**

10 44. Petitioner realleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs.

11 45. The APA requires a court to set aside agency action that is “not in accordance with law,”
12 “in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations,” or “without observance of
13 procedure required by law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A), 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(C), 5 U.S.C. §
14 706(2)(D).

15 46. To the extent Respondents purported to revoke a prior release determination under 8
16 U.S.C. § 1226(b), that revocation had to be (a) made on an individualized basis and (b)
17 made by the official(s) authorized to exercise revocation authority under 8 C.F.R. §
18 1236.1(c)(9).

19 47. On information and belief, Petitioner’s custody posture has been determined, directed, or
20 maintained through a categorical practice, blanket rule, or non-authorized decisionmaker
21 rather than an individualized revocation decision by an authorized official consistent with
22 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(c)(9).

1 48. As a result, Respondents' re-detention and continued detention are not in accordance with
2 law, are in excess of statutory authority, and/or were taken without observance of
3 required procedure, in violation of 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A), 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(C), and 5
4 U.S.C. § 706(2)(D).

5 49. Petitioner is entitled to habeas and APA relief ordering Respondents to cure these legal
6 defects and provide a prompt, individualized custody determination consistent with
7 governing law

8 **Ground Three: Violation of the Fifth Amendment Procedural Due Process (As-**
9 **Applied Challenge to Continued Civil Detention Without a Constitutionally**
10 **Adequate Custody Determination).**

11 50. Petitioner realleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs.

12 51. The Due Process Clause prohibits the federal government from depriving any person of
13 liberty without due process of law. U.S. Const. amend. V; *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S.
14 678 (2001); *Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292 (1993).

15 52. The Supreme Court has held that the INA cannot be rewritten by statutory interpretation
16 to impose an automatic schedule of bond hearings; however, as-applied constitutional
17 challenges to immigration detention remain cognizable on the merits. *Jennings v.*
18 *Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 131 (2018).

19 53. Petitioner is detained and has not received a prompt, individualized custody hearing
20 before a neutral adjudicator at which release on bond or conditions may be meaningfully
21 considered.

22 54. Because immigration detention is civil and nonpunitive, due process requires procedures
23 adequate to ensure detention remains justified as applied. At minimum, due process
24

requires a meaningful opportunity to contest the factual and legal basis for continued confinement and to obtain an individualized determination whether continued detention remains justified. *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976).

55. Applying the *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976) balancing framework, (a) Petitioner's private liberty interest is substantial, (b) the risk of erroneous deprivation is high absent an individualized, neutral custody determination, and (c) the Government's interests can be served through less restrictive alternatives and conditions of release where appropriate.

56. Continued detention without a prompt, individualized, constitutionally adequate custody determination violates the Due Process Clause as applied and warrants habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

VIII. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

57. Petitioner respectfully requests that the Court:

A. Issue an Order to Show Cause under 28 U.S.C. § 2243 requiring Respondents to respond forthwith;

B. Grant a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and order Petitioner released immediately;

C. Award Petitioner attorneys' fees and costs to the extent permitted by law, including under 28 U.S.C. § 2412; and

D. Grant such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DATED this April 15, 2026.

/s/ Jose Torres
Jose Torres
Counsel for Petitioner