

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
JACKSONVILLE DIVISION

MIFTAR HYSENI,

Petitioner,

Case No. 3:26-cv-1237-MMH-LLL

v.

WARDEN, NORTH FLORIDA
DETENTION CENTER, et al.,

Respondents.

RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner Miftar Hyseni challenges his continued detention by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”). Miftar Hyseni is no longer in ICE custody, as he was removed on May 7, 2026. Miftar Hyseni’s petition should therefore be denied as moot.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Miftar Hyseni is a native and citizen of Kosova. Doc. 1 at 7. He was ordered removed on April 8, 2025. *See* Doc. 1 at 5. Miftar Hyseni was removed on May 7, 2026 by way of  (Ex. 1 at 2, I-205 Warrant of Removal).

On May 11, 2026, Marcos Rene Gonzalez Velazquez filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus, arguing his detention violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth

Amendment and the Immigration and Nationality Act. (Doc. 1.) The petition was signed and mailed prior to his removal on May 7, 2026. *Id.* at 9 and 13.

ARGUMENT

Miftar Hyseni challenges his continued immigration detention. Because Miftar Hyseni is no longer in immigration custody, his Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus should be denied as moot.

Mootness is a jurisdictional doctrine that flows directly from the limitations imposed by Article III of the Constitution, that federal court jurisdiction extends only to the consideration of cases and controversies. *See* U.S. Const. art. III; *Al Najjar v. Ashcroft*, 273 F.3d 1330, 1335-36 (11th Cir. 2001). “[A] case is moot when the issues presented are no longer ‘live’ or the parties lack a legally cognizable interest in the outcome.” *Al Najjar*, 273 F.3d at 1335-36. In other words, “a case is moot when it no longer presents a live controversy with respect to which the court can give meaningful relief.” *Id.* at 1336 (internal quotation marks omitted). Thus, “[i]f events that occur subsequent to the filing of a lawsuit or an appeal deprive the court of the ability to give the plaintiff or appellant meaningful relief, then the case is moot and must be dismissed.” *Id.*

Of course, “a petitioner’s release from custody does not automatically moot a petitioner’s claim.” *Fregis v. Holder*, 2014 WL 54839, at *1 (M.D. Fla. Jan 7, 2014) (citing *Spencer v Kemna*, 523 U.S. 1, 7-8 (1998)). Indeed, “[t]he courts have

developed two exceptions to the mootness doctrine: (1) the existence of collateral consequences; and (2) when events surrounding the case are capable of repetition yet evading review.” *Id.* at *2.

The collateral consequences exception to the mootness doctrine applies “when there is some remaining ‘collateral consequence’ that may be redressed by success on the petition.” *Fregis*, 2014 WL 54839, at *2 (quoting *Spencer*, 523 U.S. at 7). In other words, a petitioner must demonstrate that he is suffering a continued, concrete injury that can be remedied by the Court. *See Spencer*, 523 U.S. at 7-8.

A second exception to mootness is the so-called “capable-of-repetition doctrine.” *See Spencer*, 523 U.S. at 17. This exception “applies only in exceptional situations,” *id.*, where “(1) there is a reasonable expectation or a demonstrated probability that the *same* controversy will recur involving the same complaining party, and (2) the challenged action is in its duration too short to be fully litigated prior to its cessation or expiration,” *Al Najjar*, 273 F.3d at 1336. Importantly, “[t]he remote possibility that an event might recur is not enough to overcome mootness, and even a likely recurrence is insufficient if there would be ample opportunity for review at that time.” *Id.*

Here, Miftar Hyseni challenges his continued detention in ICE custody. Because Miftar Hyseni is no longer in ICE custody, his petition should be denied as moot unless an exception to the mootness doctrine applies. *See Fregis*, 2014 WL

54839, at * 1. None does. Miftar Hyseni has not put forth any evidence of a continuing injury that could be remedied by this Court, as is his burden under *Spencer*. See 523 U.S. at 13-14. Similarly, Miftar Hyseni has not provided any reason to believe that he will be taken back into custody, and “[t]he remote possibility that an event might recur is not enough to overcome mootness” See *Al Najjar*, 273 F.3d at 1336. Moreover, should Miftar Hyseni ever face ICE detention again, he would not be foreclosed from filing another petition under section 2241. Accordingly, neither exception to the mootness doctrine applies, so Miftar Hyseni’s habeas petition should be dismissed. See *Fregis*, 2014 WL 54839, at *2-3.

CONCLUSION

As explained above, Miftar Hyseni is no longer in immigration custody. Because no exception to the mootness doctrine applies, Respondents respectfully request Miftar Hyseni’s petition be denied as moot.

DATED this 27th day of May, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

GREGORY W. KEHOE
United States Attorney

By: /s/Matthew T. Brodersen
MATTHEW T. BRODERSEN

Special Assistant United States
Attorney
IL No. 6312417
US Attorney's Office
400 W Washington Street, Suite 3100
Orlando, FL 32801
Telephone No. (407) 648-7651
Email: Matthew.Brodersen@usdoj.gov

Lead Counsel for Federal Respondents

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on May 27, 2026, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system, which will send notice of filing and a downloadable copy of the filed document to the following CM/ECF participant listed below:

Miftar Hyseni
Current Address Unknown

Petitioner

/s/ Matthew T. Brodersen

Matthew T. Brodersen
Special Assistant United States Attorney