

Yudorki Ramirez Outerino

Mesa Verde ICE Processing Center
425 Golden State Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Petitioner, Pro Se

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

YUDORKI RAMIREZ OUTERINO,

Petitioner,

v.

Case No. 1-26-CV-5326-DJC-JDP

WARDEN, MESA VERDE ICE PROCESSING CENTER,

Respondent.

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

Petitioner, Yudorki Ramirez Outerino, proceeding pro se, files this Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging the lawfulness of his continued immigration detention and states as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 because Petitioner is currently confined within the Eastern District of California.
2. Petitioner is currently detained at the Mesa Verde ICE Processing Center in Bakersfield, California.
3. Venue is proper in the Eastern District of California because Petitioner is confined within this judicial district and challenges the legality of his present detention.

PARTIES

4. Petitioner, Yudorki Ramirez Outerino, is currently detained by Immigration and Customs Enforcement at the Mesa Verde ICE Processing Center in Bakersfield, California.
5. Respondent is the Warden of the Mesa Verde Detention Center, who has immediate custody of Petitioner.

FILED

JUL 10 2026

CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY [Signature]
DEPUTY CLERK

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

6. Petitioner entered the United States in 2007 and has remained physically present in the United States since that time.
7. On July 7, 2014, an Immigration Judge entered a final order of removal.
8. Following entry of the final order of removal, Petitioner remained in the custody of Immigration and Customs Enforcement during the statutory removal period.
9. When removal could not be accomplished, Immigration and Customs Enforcement released Petitioner under an Order of Supervision. Respondent's own detention records reflect Petitioner's prior period of detention and his subsequent release under supervision.
10. Following his release, Petitioner complied with the conditions of his Order of Supervision for many years while residing in Florida. He remained available to immigration authorities, complied with reporting requirements, and was not a flight risk.
11. On March 6, 2026, Immigration and Customs Enforcement again detained Petitioner pursuant to the same July 7, 2014 final order of removal.
12. Petitioner previously sought habeas corpus relief while detained in another federal judicial district.
13. That petition was denied without prejudice. Petitioner now seeks review based upon his current detention and the facts and circumstances that presently exist.
14. Petitioner is presently detained within the Eastern District of California and respectfully seeks judicial review of the legality of his continued detention under 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

15. Petitioner's current detention arises under the same final order of removal entered on July 7, 2014.
16. Respondent's own detention records establish that Petitioner was previously detained under that final order of removal and was subsequently released under an Order of Supervision after removal could not be accomplished.
17. Since his re-detention on March 6, 2026, Petitioner has remained continuously in the custody of Immigration and Customs Enforcement.
18. Petitioner previously completed the full 90-day statutory removal period following the July 7, 2014 final order of removal before being released under an Order of Supervision because removal could not be accomplished. As of July 7, 2026, Petitioner has now been subjected to an additional 123 days of continuous immigration detention under the same final order of removal, bringing the total period of detention under that order to well beyond the original statutory removal period. The Government has therefore had ample opportunity to effectuate removal but has not demonstrated that removal is significantly likely in the reasonably foreseeable future.

19. During his current detention, Petitioner has been transferred through multiple Immigration and Customs Enforcement detention facilities in several states before arriving at the Mesa Verde Detention Center in California.
20. Petitioner has remained continuously detained throughout those transfers.
21. To Petitioner's knowledge, Respondent has not provided documentation demonstrating that any country has agreed to accept him for removal or that his removal has been scheduled for a definite date.
22. Before his current detention, Petitioner complied with the conditions of his Order of Supervision for many years, remained available to immigration authorities, and complied with all reporting requirements.
23. Petitioner's continued detention has separated him from his family and community and has imposed significant personal hardship.
24. Petitioner respectfully requests this Court to determine whether his continued detention remains authorized under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and the governing law applicable to post-removal-order detention.

CLAIM FOR RELIEF

25. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment limits the Government's authority to detain a noncitizen following the entry of a final order of removal.
26. In *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001), the Supreme Court held that post-removal-order detention is subject to constitutional limitations and may not continue indefinitely where there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future.
27. Petitioner's current detention arises under the same final order of removal entered on July 7, 2014, under which he was previously detained and later released under an Order of Supervision after removal could not be accomplished.
28. Respondent's own detention records reflect Petitioner's prior detention under that final order of removal, his release under an Order of Supervision, and his present detention under the same final order of removal.
29. Petitioner does not contend that his prior detention, standing alone, requires his release. Rather, Petitioner respectfully submits that the complete history of his detention under the same final order of removal is relevant in determining whether his continued detention remains authorized by law and reasonably related to the Government's present ability to effectuate his removal.
30. To Petitioner's knowledge, Respondent has not demonstrated that a receiving country has agreed to accept Petitioner or that his removal is significantly likely to occur within the reasonably foreseeable future. More than a decade has passed since the July 7, 2014 final order of removal, yet Respondent has not demonstrated that circumstances have materially changed such that Petitioner's removal is now significantly likely to occur within the reasonably foreseeable future.
31. Under the circumstances presented here, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court determine whether Respondent has demonstrated a lawful basis for Petitioner's continued

detention and whether Respondent can establish that Petitioner's removal is significantly likely to occur in the reasonably foreseeable future, as required by *Zadvydas v. Davis*.


32. If Respondent cannot establish that Petitioner's removal is significantly likely to occur within the reasonably foreseeable future, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court grant appropriate habeas relief consistent with the Constitution and governing federal law.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court:

- A. Accept jurisdiction over this Petition;
- B. Issue an Order directing Respondent to show cause why Petitioner's continued detention is lawful;
- C. Require Respondent to demonstrate that Petitioner's continued detention is authorized by law and that there is a significant likelihood that Petitioner's removal will occur in the reasonably foreseeable future;
- D. If Respondent fails to establish a lawful basis for Petitioner's continued detention, grant the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and order Petitioner's release from Immigration and Customs Enforcement custody;
- E. In determining the appropriate relief, consider that Immigration and Customs Enforcement previously released Petitioner under an Order of Supervision after concluding that removal could not be accomplished under the same July 7, 2014 final order of removal, and order Petitioner's release under appropriate conditions of supervision, if any, if the Court determines that continued detention is not authorized by law.
- F. Grant such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,



Yudorki Ramirez Outerino




Petitioner, Pro Se.

VERIFICATION

I, Yudorki Ramirez Outerino, declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 that I am the Petitioner in this action, that I have read the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, and that the facts stated therein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Executed on July 7, 2026, at Bakersfield, California.



Yudorki Ramirez Outerino



Petitioner, Pro Se

In the Matter of

RAMIREZ OUTERINO, YUDORKI
Respondent

Case No.:

IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS

ORDER OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE

This is a summary of the oral decision entered on 7/7/2014.
This memorandum is solely for the convenience of the parties. If the proceedings should be appealed or reopened, the oral decision will become the official opinion in the case.

- [] The respondent was ordered removed from the United States to Q.S.
or in the alternative to .
[] Respondent's application for voluntary departure was denied and respondent was ordered removed to or in the alternative to .
[] Respondent's application for voluntary departure was granted until upon posting a bond in the amount of \$ _____ with an alternate order of removal to .

Respondent's application for:

- [] Asylum was () granted () denied () withdrawn.
[] Withholding of removal was () granted () denied () withdrawn.
[] A Waiver under Section _____ was () granted () denied () withdrawn.
[] Cancellation of removal under section 240A(a) was () granted () denied () withdrawn.

Respondent's application for:

- [] Cancellation under section 240A(b)(1) was () granted () denied () withdrawn. If granted, it is ordered that the respondent be issued all appropriate documents necessary to give effect to this order.
[] Cancellation under section 240A(b)(2) was () granted () denied () withdrawn. If granted it is ordered that the respondent be issued all appropriated documents necessary to give effect to this order.
[] Adjustment of Status under Section _____ was () granted () denied () withdrawn. If granted it is ordered that the respondent be issued all appropriated documents necessary to give effect to this order.
[] Respondent's application of () withholding of removal () deferral of removal under Article III of the Convention Against Torture was () granted () denied () withdrawn.
[] Respondent's status was rescinded under section 246.
[] Respondent is admitted to the United States as a _____ until _____.
[] As a condition of admission, respondent is to post a \$ _____ bond.
[] Respondent knowingly filed a frivolous asylum application after proper notice.
[] Respondent was advised of the limitation on discretionary relief for failure to appear as ordered in the Immigration Judge's oral decision.
[] Proceedings were terminated.
[] Other: _____

Date: Jul 7, 2014

RENE D. MATEO
Immigration Judge

Appeal: Waived/Reserved Appeal Due By: _____