Rene L. Valladares
Federal Public Defender
Nevada State Bar No. 11479
*Jennifer Joseph
Assistant Federal Public Defender
New York No. 5500038
411 E. Bonneville Ave., Ste. 250
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
(702) 388-6577
Jennifer_Joseph@fd.org

*Attorney for Petitioner Manuel Garcia Ugalde

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Manuel Garcia Ugalde,

Petitioner,

v.

David Venturella, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Case No. 2:26-cv-01243-APG-EJY

Opposition to Federal Respondents' Motion for Extension of Time to File a Response to Petitioner's Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus

Petitioner opposes Federal Respondents' request[1] for a one-week extension of time to respond to the Amended Petition. Respondents' motion concedes a critical issue raised in the Amended Petition: Petitioner submitted a second request for a bond hearing, and no hearing has been conducted. Respondents state that they need additional time to determine "why the bond hearing has not been conducted."[2] But the reason for the failure to conduct the hearing is not necessary to resolve the due-process problem presented here. Petitioner requested a custody redetermination, the

[1] ECF No. 15.

[2] *Id.* at 1.

Immigration Court received that request, and no hearing occurred. His continued detention therefore rests on the failure to provide the process required by law.

Respondents have not shown good cause for delaying this habeas matter another week. Petitioner filed his Amended Petition on June 3, 2026. Respondents have already had a week to gather information from the Immigration Court and the agency respondents about the lack of bond hearing. Their motion does not identify any unavailable record, unavoidable obstacle, or specific reason why the relevant information could not have been obtained before the existing deadline. Instead, Respondents seek more time to regarding a fact they have already conceded: the second bond hearing has not been held.

Further delay would prejudice Petitioner. Petitioner remains detained while the legality of that detention is before the Court. Each additional day of delay prolongs detention without due process. The prejudice is especially acute where the requested extension concerns the very issue that requires prompt habeas review: the failure to provide a bond hearing after Petitioner requested one.

Nor do Respondents' staffing constraints justify delaying resolution of a petition challenging ongoing detention. While courts may generally construe Rule 6(b) liberally, a pre-deadline extension requires diligence and must account for prejudice. Here, Respondents' motion shows that the essential issue is already known, and the asserted need for more time is to determine why the hearing did not occur, not whether it occurred. That explanation does not supply good cause to delay resolution of a habeas petition where Petitioner remains in custody.

For these reasons, Petitioner respectfully requests that the Court deny Federal Respondents' motion for extension of time and grant the Amended Petition on the undisputed ground that Petitioner requested a second bond hearing and no hearing was conducted. In the alternative, if the Court permits any extension, Petitioner

respectfully requests that the Court order Federal Respondents to file their response no later than June 12, 2026, so that this matter may be resolved promptly.

Dated June 10, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

Rene L. Valladares
Federal Public Defender

/s/ Jennifer Joseph
Jennifer Joseph
Assistant Federal Public Defender