

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

FILED

MAY 19 2026

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BY UJ DEPUTY CLERK

This draft has been prepared by detainee in absence of legal and Technical Support at the Detention Center

Josman Ramirez Toro

Petitioner

v

U.S. Attorney General, Secretary of the Department of Justice, Secretary of Department of Homeland Security, Director of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), Director of ICE and Removal Operations, Warden of Karnes County Immigration Processing Center et al. All Named in their official Capacity.

Respondents

THIS PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS PERSUANT TO 28 U.S.C 2241

PETITIONER DETAILS

I, Josman Ramirez Toro, Alien No: # 
By and through this Petition and Response to the above stated Respondent's Response, pertaining to Civil Action / Case Number 5:26-CV-02764-JKP, seeking the relief through the Writ of Habeas Corpus Pursuant to 28 U.S.C 2241, to challenge the prolonged and unlawful Detention by Respondents, which violates the Petitioner's Statutory rights, which are granted, maintained and Protected by the U.S. Constitution, Federal Laws and International Treaties where U.S.A. is a party to.

One2Five.2EM

~g
Which is protected by U.S.C., Laws and treaties one of which is the immigration and nationality Act. which prohibits detainee for over 90 or 180 days unless justified by and governed by legal grounds with violation to the U.S. Constitution, Federal Laws and treaties where U.S. is member or a party to, such as Geneva Convention and U.N. statute for Human Rights.

Due process and Ground Relief

Ground 1:

Pro longed detention is a violation of due process and statutory rights. ICE detention violates the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment and 8 U.S.C. 1231 (a)(6) as interpreted by the supreme court in Zadvyelas V. Davis. the petitioner's detention is no longer reasonable related ti the purpose of effectuating removal deportation and has become indefinite and punitive. The petitioner has fully cooperated with Authority through the Detention process and relief has become due to enable the petitioner to continue the court hearing outside the detention, petitioner here agrees to be placed under supervision while outside detention, where appropriate and suitable to the respondents.

Petitioner's Request for Relief.

Petitioner appeals to the honorable court and the respected respondents to approve the relief as suggested below;

1. Respondents release petitioner from custody under appropriate conditions of release to suitable public place of the petitioner original place of arrest.
- 2- The respondents party shall file a joint status report confirming that petitioner has been released
- 3- Respondents notify petitioners consul of the exact location and time of release as soon as practicable.
- 4- Respondents are enjoined from re-detain the petitioner without notice and a pre-deprivation hearing before a neutral decision maker pursuant to U.S.C. 1226

Precedents of Fifth Circuits

The petitioner to the best of his ability, presents the following 5th circuits precedents in support of the petitioner request for release see Martinez V. Hyde 792 F.Supp. 3rd 211 223 n.23 (D.Mass 2025). because petitioner can't be detained under section 1225 (b)(2), the remaining option is section 1226, as respondents do not claim the petitioner is being detained under section 1226. However, the court has seen no reason to consider section 1226 as a Basis for petitioner's currant detention. His detention is unlawful and Habeas Corpus relief available to petitioner through Habeas Corpus is release from custody.

Addition al., 5th circuit Precedents;

Quandos V. Noem, 2025 U.S.Dist. Lexis 232321

Pineda V. Noem, 2025 U.S.Dist. Lexis 253622

Coulibaly V. Thompson, 2025 U.S.Dist. Lexis 250958

Gonzales-perez V. Bondi, 2026 U.S.Dist. Lexis 430

~g
Mogos V. Thompson, 2026 U.S.Dist. Lexis 336

Challenges to Detention

Petitioner challenges the legality of his continued detention by the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) on immigrant charges despite the existence of valid documents such as NA, N/A the petitioner has been detained since 04 / 19 / 2026, since his first arrest and has been in custody despite being in immigration court proceedings.

Pre-Determined Judgements

It has witnessed that immigration judges are under extreme pressure from the executive branch and as a result judges are entering courts with pre-determined judgement, which supports ICE's claims for Deportation/Removal which in turn violates the very basis of Democracy and Judicial independent in the United States of America.

Detention/Removal and Deportation order under the precedent of Zaduydas V. Davis, 53 U.S. 678(2001), such prolonged, indefinite detention is Constitutionally suspect.

Asylum Application has been submit by petition since his first entry into the United States.

Jurisdiction of Court

This court has jurisdiction to hear this petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2241, as it challenges the Lawfulness of the petitioner Detention under Federal Law, see Demore V. Kim, 538 U.S. 510 (2003). Venue is proper in the western district of Texas as the petitioner is currently confirm within this district.

Flight Risk / Threat to Community

Since my entry to the United States of America on NAI NAI NA and my continued Residence and Despite mistakes I now regret doing, I have never committed any crime or being involves in Traffic violations in Addition being a family person, Responsible worker, I'm always keep to follow and Ad here to the Country's Laws whether federal or state based. As a result of holding a clean record with no criminal or moral crimes, i am positive i shall always attend my immigration court hearings without delay.

Fear-Based Relief and Hardship

The court may also consider the persuasive argument made in D.V.D. United States Dept. of Homeland Security.(25-10676) where the court temporarily restrained DHS from removing an Alien to a third Country with the opportunity to raise fear-based relief this highlights the importance of fair processes such ongoing detention also raises a humanitarian concerns, at my age, such long and repeated detentions inflict a significant emotional and psychological toll, revive painful memories and causing trauma where i suffer constant depression and anxiety as well as lack of sleep and constant nightmare, it is like a ground hog day, a recrewing nightmare of non-stop cruel, unusual punishment in contravene of the 8th Amendment.

I understand the Unites States of America need for Immigration Regulations and I am fully willing to Co-operate with Authorities, However, no one should forget, specially the Respondents that the American Democracy and Freedom principles don't exist when I come from and my fear for my life is what has encourage me to come to the United States of America the cradle of Democracy and Freedom.

Conclusion

~l

It is important to respond to respondents assertion that the courts jurisdiction is circumscribed in making its determination due to the sweeping powers granted to the other government branches in the field of immigration ECF No. 11 at 2 one must however distinguish between the substantive power of the executive branch over immigration issuers, an area in which it indeed has plenary power, and the means the government has chosen to exercise that plenary power to which no executive defense is necessary *Ashley V. Ridge* 288 F.Supp.2d 662, 667 (DNJ2003), see also *Zaduydas V. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 695, 121 S ct 2491. 150 L Ed 2nd 653 (2001). Noting the government's plenary power to expel immigrants but stating that congress must choose a constitutionally permissible means of implementing its immigration power, *INS V. Chadha*, 462 U.S. 919.940-941.103 S Ct 2764. 771 Ed 2d 317(1982).

Petitioner believes that his detention pursuant to the automatic stay provision of 8 C.F.R. [1003.19(i)(2) not the mandatory detention provision of 8 U.S.C. -1225 (b) there for the court should only be concerned with law fullness of the automatic stay, the present basis for the petitioners detention.

In addition, the respondents only minimally address the TRO legal standards see ECF No.11 in this regard, respondents primary argument concerning the question of detention does address the merits on which this petition was made for release from detention.

A likelihood of success on the merits noncitizens one entitled to due process of the law under the Fifth Amendment, see *Demore V. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510,523,123 5.Ct. 1708 155L Ed 724 (2003) to determine whether o civil detention violates a detainee's due process rights.

Courts apply the three part test set in *Mathews V. Elridge* 424 U.S. 319.96. 5 Ct. 893 47L Ed 2d 18 (1976) pursuant to *Mathews*, court weight the following 3 factor;

- 1) The private interest that will be affected by the official action
- 2) The risk of an erroneous deprivation of such interest through the procedures used and the probable value, if any of additional or substitute procedural safe guards and
- 3) The governments interest; including the function involved and the fiscal and administrative burdens that the additional or substitute procedural requirement would entail.

(1) Private Interest

~l

It is undisputed, petitioner has a significant private interest in being free from detention the interest in being free from physical detention is the most elemental of liberty interests. When addressing the private interest, courts should consider the detainee's conditions of confinement.

In this declaration, petitioner report being held at the Karnes County Immigration Processing Center and is experiencing all the deprivations of incarceration, including

~f
loss of income earning, lack of privacy and most fundamentally. The lack of freedom of movement see Gunaydin, 2025 U.S. Dist. Lexis 99237, 2025 al. 1459154 at *7. Thus, the first Mathews factor "private interest" supports the petitioners claim of a Fifth Amendment violation.

(2) Risk of Erroneous Deprivation

Under this factor the honorable court must answer whether the challenged procedure creates a risk of Erroneous deprivation of individuals private rights and the degree to which alternative procedures could ameliorate these risks. The risk of deprivation is high because, taking into account the past period, proving that petitioner is neither a flight risk nor a community risk. Taking into account, that petitioner has sought alternative means such as bonds, where immigration judge are denying such opportunities, specially in states like Texas.

The case presents a serious Risk of erroneous deprivation of the petitioners private interest and [1003 19(i)(1)] already provides a simple alternative that would safeguard these rights.

Thus the second Mathews factor also supports petitioners claim of a fifth Amendment violation.

(3) Respondents competing interest and Burdens

The Burdens of Additional or substitute procedural requirements. As to the third Mathews factor, court have found in numerous cases that Mathews is likely to succeed in demonstrating that ensuring persons subject to removal do not commit crimes or evade law enforcement is a significant governmental interest. In this case and under this factor, court should weight the private interest at stake and the risk of erroneous deprivation of these interests against respondents interests in persisting with the automatic stay and the burdens of additional or substitute requirements see Mathews 424. U.S. at 335.

Further more, respondents state only in conclusory fashion "the government and the public at large have a strong interest in the enforcement of the immigration laws and the removal of criminal aliens. these is no doubt that such interests have already been secured by the judge throughout the immigration court hearing, the petitioner is neither a danger nor a flight risk. this the government's interest is both vague and minimal especially in contrast to the significant liberty interest at stake for the petitioner.

Based on the above the petitioner appeal to the Honorable court to adopt the view that petitioner is likely to succeed in demonstrating the automatic stay regulation found at 8 C.F.R. -1003.19(i)(2) violates the petitioner is procedural due process rights under the Fifth Amendment, fulfilling the first element an applicant must satisfy to obtain a TRO.

~f
(4) Suffering and Hardship

~g
No doubt petitioner has suffered greatly of irreparable harm including but not limited to psychological, financial not just to him but to his immediate family whether in the U.S.S. or in his home country.

Respondents give short shrift to irreparable harm, failing to refute or respond to the petitioner claims other stating petitioner has provided no basis for this court to determine that his continued detention will cause him irreparable harm, therefore the honorable court should notice that the harm is self-evident, fulfilling the second element, the petitioner satisfy to obtain TRO.

(5) Balance of Harms vs. Public interest


The balance of harm and public interest favor the petitioner, as judge(s) have not cited during the hearings any events of danger or risk. In addition respondents have not presented any evidence to support their request for continuous detention.

The petitioner clearly reports here that this unlawful detention outweigh in terms of harm and suffering due to the deny of his liberty.

No doubt the protection of constitution and national security are the ultimate interest of the public, yet. The respondents state only in conclusory fashion the government and the public at large have strong interest in the enforcement of the immigration laws and the removal of criminal Aliens ECF No 11 at 6, thus, the petitioner here clearly meets his burden of persuasion.

Accordingly, I, the petitioner have with urge the honorable court to issue the write of Habeas Corpus relief of Release, subject to reasonable conditions of supervision if necessary further grant deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted.

SIGNATURE:  _____

Karnes County Immigration Processing Center.

~g

Respect Fully Submitted

Verification.

I, Josman Ramirez Toro, THE PETITIONER, DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE U.S.A. THAT THE FORE GOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY. I FURTHER UNDERSTAND THAT FALSE STATEMENT OF ANY MATERIAL FACT HERE, MAY SERVE AS THE BASIS FOR PROSECUTION FOR PERJURY.

I CERTIFY THAT ON, 05/15 /2026 A COPY OF THE FOREGOING DOCUMENT WAS MAILED TO RESPONDENTS, AT THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS,

U.S ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

601 N.W. LOOP 410, SUITE 600
SAN ANTONIO TX, 78216

NAME: Josman Ramirez Toro

A#



EXECUTED ON: 05/15/2026

SIGNATURE: x

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'JR' or similar, written over a horizontal line.

**PRIME
EXPRESS**

**FLAT
ENVELOPE
ONE RATE**



\$0.00

Origin: 78118
05/18/26
4845650118-18

PRIORITY MAIL EXPRESS®

KARNES COUNTY IMMIGRATION PR 0 Lb 2.70 Oz
409 FM 1144
KARNES CITY TX 78118-8508 RDC 07

SCHEDULED DELIVERY DAY: 05/20/26 08:00 PM

SHIP TO:



CLERK US DIST COURT
262 W NUEVA
SAN ANTONIO TX 78207-4529


C009

USPS TRACKING® #



9570 1154 1551 5139 1818 28

To schedule scan



USPS.COM/PICKUP



PS10001000008

EP13F October 2023
OD: 12 1/2 x 9 1/2

WHEN USED INTERNATIONALLY, A C



Label 225, December 2023

FOR DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL USE



**UNITED STATES
POSTAL SERVICE**

**DOMESTIC A
PLACE MAIL**

guaranteed deliver
guaranteed deliver
SPS Tracking® se
id many Internati
ck up available.
omestic shipment
restrictions apply
gnature included

ney Back Guarantee to l
ect International destinat
e DMM and IMM at pe.u
urance does not cover c
lms exclusions see the C
p://pe.usps.com.
ney Back Guarantee for

**UNITED STATES
POSTAL SERVICE**

**PRIORITY®
MAIL**

FROM: *Josman Ramirez Toro*
A#

VISIT US AT USPS.COM®
ORDER FREE SUPPLIES ONLINE

Karnes County Immigration Processing Center
409 Farm to Market Road 1144
Karnes City, Texas 78118

RECEIVED

MAY 19 2026

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT 1
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BY *[Signature]*
DEPUTY CLERK

TO:

CX-4

SCREENED BY STBT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
262 W NUEVA STREET
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78207

This packaging is the property of the U.S. Postal Service® and is provided solely for use in sending Priority Mail Express® shipments. Additional restrictions and limitations apply. Please visit usps.com for more information. ©2023 USPS® All rights reserved.

This package is made from post-consumer waste. Please recycle ♻️ again.