 Original

FILED IN CLERK'S OFFICE
U.S.D.C. - Columbus, GA
2026 AUG 10 P 12:21

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA COLUMBUS DIVISION

JORGE LUIS SAEZ-MUJICA,
A# [redacted]
Petitioner (Pro Se, Detained),

v. Civil Action No. _____

WARDEN, STEWART DETENTION CENTER,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
(Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241)

INTRODUCTION

Petitioner respectfully petitions this Court for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, challenging the constitutionality of his current civil immigration detention under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

This Petition does not ask the Court to determine Petitioner's removability, adjudicate any pending application for immigration relief, review the validity of any final order of removal, or substitute its judgment for that of the immigration authorities in matters committed to their discretion. Nor does this Petition ask the Court to determine whether Petitioner's detention is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1225, § 1226, § 1231, or any other provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Whatever statutory authority Respondents invoke as the basis for Petitioner's detention, that question does not resolve the constitutional issue presented in this Petition.

The question before the Court is whether Respondents may continue to deprive Petitioner of his physical liberty through civil immigration detention without providing the procedural safeguards required by the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. Accordingly, this Petition presents an as-applied constitutional challenge to the procedures employed by Respondents in maintaining Petitioner's detention.

The constitutional protections at issue do not depend solely upon the statutory authority invoked by Respondents. Regardless of the statutory provision upon which Respondents rely, the Fifth Amendment independently requires constitutionally adequate procedures before the Government may continue to deprive an individual of physical liberty through civil immigration detention.

Following his encounter with immigration authorities, Petitioner was processed and released into the United States. Thereafter, he remained at liberty in the community while his immigration proceedings continued. During that period, Petitioner remained available to immigration authorities, complied with the governmental requirements applicable to him, maintained substantial family and community ties, and continued pursuing his immigration case.

Having previously determined that Petitioner could remain at liberty while his immigration proceedings continued, Respondents subsequently returned him to immigration custody, where he remains detained. Petitioner does not contend that his prior release permanently eliminated the Government's authority to detain him under circumstances permitted by law. Rather, he contends that, before withdrawing the physical liberty he had exercised in the community, Respondents were required to provide constitutionally adequate procedures reasonably designed to determine whether detention had become necessary under his present individual circumstances.

The Due Process Clause therefore requires more than the mere invocation or exercise of statutory detention authority under these circumstances. It requires a meaningful and individualized determination addressing whether continued detention is presently necessary, whether any material circumstances have changed since Petitioner's release, and

whether reasonable alternatives to physical detention would adequately protect the Government's legitimate interests.

Respondents have continued Petitioner's detention without providing a meaningful individualized determination that considers his present circumstances, including his history of compliance, family and community ties, pending immigration proceedings, stable residence, employment history, and the availability of less restrictive alternatives to detention. Petitioner has not been provided a constitutionally adequate determination establishing that he presently poses a danger to the community or an unacceptable risk of flight requiring continued physical confinement.

Civil immigration detention constitutes one of the most significant deprivations of liberty the Government may impose outside the criminal context. Although Congress possesses broad authority to regulate immigration, that authority remains subject to the limitations imposed by the Constitution. Accordingly, this case concerns not merely whether Respondents possess statutory authority to detain Petitioner, but whether they have exercised that authority in a manner consistent with the Due Process Clause.

As applied to Petitioner's particular circumstances, Respondents have deprived him of physical liberty without the process guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment. In the absence of a meaningful individualized determination, no neutral decision-maker has considered whether Petitioner's continued confinement remains necessary, whether any material circumstances justify the revocation of his prior release, or whether reasonable conditions of supervision would adequately protect the Government's legitimate interests.

Petitioner therefore respectfully requests that this Court exercise its habeas corpus jurisdiction to determine the constitutionality of his current detention. Petitioner requests immediate release under appropriate conditions or, in the alternative, a prompt, meaningful, and constitutionally adequate individualized custody determination before a neutral decision-maker, at which Respondents bear the burden of demonstrating that continued detention is constitutionally justified and that no reasonable alternative to detention would adequately protect the Government's legitimate interests.

Because physical liberty is the central interest at stake, and because Respondents continue to deprive Petitioner of that liberty without the procedural safeguards required by the Due Process Clause, the writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 should issue.

II. CUSTODY

Petitioner, **Jorge Luis Saez-Mujica**, A# [redacted] is presently detained at:

Stewart Detention Center
146 CCA Road
Lumpkin, Georgia 31815

Petitioner is in the physical custody of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") under the authority of Respondent.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 2241** because Petitioner is in the custody of the United States and challenges the legality of his continued civil immigration detention as violating the Constitution and laws of the United States.

This Court also has jurisdiction pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 1331** because this action arises under the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

Venue is proper in the **United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Columbus Division**, because Petitioner is presently confined within this District at the **Stewart Detention Center** in **Lumpkin, Georgia**, and Respondent exercises physical custody over Petitioner within this judicial district.

IV. PARTIES

Petitioner

Petitioner, **Jorge Luis Saez-Mujica**, A#[redacted] is a citizen and national of Venezuela who is currently detained by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") at the **Stewart Detention Center** in **Lumpkin, Georgia**.

Respondent

Warden, Stewart Detention Center

The Warden is Petitioner's immediate physical custodian and is responsible for Petitioner's day-to-day detention.

V. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

1. Petitioner, **Jorge Luis Saez-Mujica**, is a native and citizen of Venezuela who entered the United States through **Del Rio, Texas**, on or about **January 26, 2022**. Upon his arrival, Petitioner was taken into the custody of the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS"), processed, and subsequently released from immigration custody on or about **February 3,**

2022, while his immigration proceedings remained pending. Following his release, Petitioner complied with all scheduled ICE check-ins and all governmental requirements applicable to him.

2. Following his release, Petitioner remained in the United States while pursuing his immigration case and continued to comply with all governmental requirements applicable to him. On or about **June 29, 2023**, Petitioner filed an affirmative application for asylum, which remains pending. On **July 27, 2023**, Petitioner appeared for his scheduled biometrics appointment and continued diligently pursuing his application for protection.

3. In connection with his pending asylum application, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services ("USCIS") granted Petitioner employment authorization. Petitioner also obtained a Social Security number and maintained authorized employment while residing openly in the community. Throughout this period, Petitioner remained available to immigration authorities, complied with his immigration obligations, and continued pursuing his pending immigration proceedings.

4. While residing in the United States, Petitioner established substantial personal, family, employment, and community ties. He maintained a stable residence, remained continuously employed, and lived openly in the community while awaiting the adjudication of his immigration case. At all relevant times, Petitioner complied with the conditions of his prior release, remained available to immigration authorities, and attended all required ICE reporting appointments.

5. On or about **July 31, 2023**, Petitioner was arrested by state authorities in Kentucky in connection with a criminal case involving allegations related to a firearm and possession of marijuana. Petitioner remained in state custody for approximately fifteen (15) days before being transferred into the custody of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE"). On **November 7, 2023**, Petitioner was temporarily returned to state court to resolve the pending criminal matter. On that date, Petitioner entered into a plea agreement that resulted in a probationary disposition without the imposition of any additional term of incarceration. Approximately three days later, Petitioner was returned to ICE custody.

6. On **January 11, 2024**, ICE determined that Petitioner could again be released from immigration custody upon the posting of an immigration bond in the amount of **$2,500**. Petitioner was released after the bond was posted and thereafter remained at liberty in the community. During that period, Petitioner complied with the conditions of his immigration release, attended all required ICE check-ins, successfully completed all conditions imposed in the state criminal case, and completed his two-year probationary period in **November 2025** without violations.

7. Nevertheless, on or about **December 8, 2025**, Petitioner was stopped by officers with the **Catoosa County Sheriff's Office** in the State of Georgia, who alleged that he had failed to use his turn signal. The officers requested Petitioner's driver's license, vehicle registration, proof of insurance, and asked whether he was lawfully present in the United States. Petitioner explained that he had just washed his vehicle and that the requested documents were located in the trunk. Before Petitioner was given an opportunity to retrieve the

documents, the officers informed him that he was going to be deported to his country. The officers subsequently arrested Petitioner and charged him with traffic-related offenses, including driving without a valid driver's license, lack of registration, and failure to maintain insurance. Petitioner was transported to the **Catoosa County Jail**, where he remained detained for approximately seven days

8. On **December 16, 2025**, Petitioner appeared before the state court to resolve the pending traffic charges. During those proceedings, all charges except the charge for driving without a valid driver's license were dismissed. Petitioner paid the fine imposed by the state court, and the state proceedings concluded. However, instead of being released, Petitioner remained in custody because U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") had lodged an immigration detainer against him. On **December 19, 2025**, Petitioner was transferred into ICE custody and transported to the **Stewart Detention Center** in Lumpkin, Georgia.

9. Before his re-detention, Petitioner had a **Master Calendar Hearing** scheduled for **November 25, 2026, at 9:00 a.m.**, before Immigration Judge **Gina Reynolds** at the Chicago Immigration Court, located at **55 E. Monroe Street, Suite 1500, Chicago, Illinois 60603**. After being taken into ICE custody, jurisdiction over Petitioner's immigration proceedings was transferred to the Immigration Court in **Lumpkin, Georgia**. Petitioner was then scheduled to appear for a hearing on **January 26, 2026, at 8:30 a.m.**, before Immigration Judge **Bobbie C. Masters**, at **146 CCA Road, P.O. Box 248, Lumpkin, Georgia 31815**. That hearing was cancelled due to a severe winter storm and was rescheduled for **February 3, 2026**.

10. Petitioner was never brought before the Immigration Court on **February 3, 2026**, and no detention officer came to escort him to the scheduled hearing. Despite Petitioner's absence from the courtroom, an order of removal was entered against him. Petitioner was never informed of the factual or legal basis for the removal order and never understood why the order was entered without his appearing before the Immigration Judge. Thereafter, immigration officials informed Petitioner that he would be removed to a third country. On **Tuesday, June 9, 2026**, Petitioner was transferred to the **Winn Correctional Center** in Louisiana for the purpose of executing his removal. The following day, **June 10, 2026**, Petitioner was placed aboard an aircraft for removal to **Ecuador**. However, before the aircraft departed, Petitioner was removed from the aircraft, and the removal was not carried out.

11. Following the aborted removal, Petitioner was scheduled to appear before Immigration Judge **Bianca H. Brown** on **July 15, 2026, at 8:30 a.m.**, at **146 CCA Road, P.O. Box 248, Lumpkin, Georgia 31815**. Thereafter, Petitioner received notice scheduling another hearing for **August 12, 2026**, before Immigration Judge **Bianca H. Brown** at the same Immigration Court. Subsequently, on **July 23, 2026**, Petitioner was transferred back to the **Stewart Detention Center**. Following that transfer, Petitioner received another notice scheduling a hearing for **August 12, 2026**, at the same Immigration Court in Lumpkin, Georgia, but this time before Immigration Judge **Ashley Lassiter**. As of the filing of this Petition, Petitioner has received notices reflecting **two separate hearings scheduled for August 12, 2026, before two different Immigration Judges.**

12. If conditions of release are deemed necessary, Petitioner has an available sponsor, **Beatrice Elizabeth Brown**, who is willing to assist him upon his release. Petitioner is willing to comply with any lawful and reasonable conditions of supervision that this Court or the Department of Homeland Security may impose.

13. Petitioner's continued detention substantially impairs his ability to prepare and present his pending asylum case. His confinement restricts his access to legal materials, supporting documentation, country conditions evidence, witnesses, and communication with family members and other individuals who may assist him in gathering and organizing evidence. This prejudice is particularly significant because his immigration proceedings remain pending while he continues to prepare and present his application for protection from immigration custody.

14. Petitioner remains in the custody of Respondent pursuant to the civil immigration laws of the United States. Since being returned to immigration custody in **December 2025**, Petitioner has remained continuously detained for approximately **eight months**. During that period, Petitioner has not received a meaningful individualized custody determination addressing whether his continued detention is presently necessary, despite his prior releases from immigration custody, his compliance with ICE reporting requirements, his completion of all conditions imposed in his state criminal case, and the continued pendency of his asylum proceedings. Petitioner does not ask this Court to determine his removability or adjudicate his asylum application. Rather, Petitioner challenges the constitutionality of the procedures through which Respondent revoked Petitioner's previously granted liberty and continues to maintain Petitioner's physical confinement.

VI. THE FIFTH AMENDMENT PROTECTS PHYSICAL LIBERTY FROM ARBITRARY CIVIL DETENTION

1. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment protects one of the most fundamental liberty interests recognized under the Constitution: freedom from physical restraint by the Government. Civil immigration detention, although civil rather than criminal in nature, constitutes a significant deprivation of personal liberty. Accordingly, whenever the Government deprives an individual of physical liberty through civil immigration detention, that deprivation is subject to the protections guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment.

2. This Petition does not ask the Court to determine Petitioner's removability, adjudicate any pending application for immigration relief, **review the validity of any final order of removal**, or substitute its judgment for that of the immigration authorities in matters committed to their discretion. Nor does Petitioner ask the Court to determine whether his detention is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1225, § 1226, § 1231, or any other provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Whatever statutory authority Respondents invoke, that question does not resolve the constitutional issue presented in this Petition.

3. Accordingly, this Petition does not challenge Congress's authority to enact the immigration laws, authorize civil immigration detention, determine which detention statute

applies, or otherwise interpret the Immigration and Nationality Act. Rather, Petitioner challenges only whether Respondents have exercised their detention authority, whatever its statutory source, in a manner consistent with the procedural protections guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment.

4. Because physical liberty occupies a unique position among the interests protected by the Constitution, the legality of continued civil immigration detention ultimately depends upon compliance with the Due Process Clause. Regardless of the statutory authority invoked by Respondents, the Constitution requires that any continued deprivation of physical liberty be supported by constitutionally adequate procedures.

VII. CIVIL IMMIGRATION DETENTION REMAINS SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF DUE PROCESS

1. The Government possesses legitimate interests in enforcing the immigration laws, ensuring an individual's appearance at future immigration proceedings, and protecting the public where appropriate. Those interests may justify the use of civil immigration detention in circumstances authorized by law.
2. The existence of those legitimate governmental interests, however, does not eliminate the constitutional limitations imposed by the Due Process Clause. Even when civil immigration detention is authorized, the Government must pursue those interests through constitutionally adequate procedures reasonably designed to ensure that continued detention remains justified under the particular circumstances of the individual case.
3. Accordingly, the question presented by this Petition is not whether the Government possesses statutory authority to detain Petitioner under the immigration laws. Rather, the question is whether Respondents exercised that authority in a manner consistent with the procedural protections guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment before continuing to deprive Petitioner of his physical liberty.

VIII. PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS REQUIRES MEANINGFUL SAFEGUARDS BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT MAY CONTINUE DEPRIVING AN INDIVIDUAL OF PHYSICAL LIBERTY

1. The Due Process Clause protects not only the substantive interest in physical liberty but also the procedures through which the Government may deprive an individual of that liberty. Because civil immigration detention results in the physical restraint of an individual's freedom, the Constitution requires fair and reliable procedures reasonably designed to guard against arbitrary or erroneous deprivations of liberty and to minimize the risk that an individual will be deprived of physical liberty without constitutionally adequate justification.
2. Meaningful procedural protections ordinarily include notice sufficient to permit the individual to understand the basis for continued detention, a meaningful opportunity

to challenge the factual and legal basis for that detention, meaningful consideration of the individual's particular circumstances, and review by a neutral decision-maker.

3. Procedural due process further requires that the decision to continue depriving an individual of physical liberty rest upon an individualized determination rather than generalized assumptions, categorical classifications, or administrative convenience alone. These constitutional safeguards ensure that continued detention is based on the particular circumstances of the individual whose liberty is being restrained.
4 These procedural protections do not dictate a particular outcome in every case Rather, they ensure that, before the Government continues to restrain an individual's liberty through civil immigration detention, the decision is reached through constitutionally adequate procedures designed to protect against arbitrary or erroneous confinement.

IX. RESPONDENT FAILED TO PROVIDE THE PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS REQUIRED BY THE FIFTH AMENDMENT

A. Governing Constitutional Principles

1. Before the Government may continue to restrain an individual's liberty through civil immigration detention, it must employ procedures reasonably designed to ensure that continued detention remains constitutionally justified under the particular facts and circumstances of the individual case.

2. Constitutionally adequate procedures must provide a meaningful opportunity for an individualized determination based on the individual's actual circumstances rather than on generalized assumptions, categorical classifications, or the mere existence of statutory detention authority. Such procedures must meaningfully consider the facts existing at the time continued detention is maintained, including whether continued physical confinement remains necessary to serve the Government's legitimate interests under Petitioner's present circumstances.

3. Procedural due process also requires review by a neutral decision-maker capable of evaluating the evidence presented, considering the particular facts of the case, and determining whether continued detention remains constitutionally justified under the individual's present circumstances.

B. Application to Petitioner's Case

1. Respondent has continued to deprive Petitioner of his physical liberty without providing the procedural safeguards required by the Fifth Amendment.

2. No meaningful individualized determination has evaluated whether Petitioner's continued detention remains necessary under his present circumstances. Nor has any constitutionally adequate review meaningfully considered Petitioner's individual

circumstances, including his prior releases from immigration custody, his history of compliance with ICE reporting requirements, his successful completion of all conditions imposed in his state criminal case, his completion of his probationary period, his pending asylum application, his employment authorization, the availability of a sponsor, whether less restrictive alternatives to detention would adequately protect the Government's legitimate interests, or whether continued physical confinement remains necessary under the facts existing at the time his detention continues.

3. Where the Government has previously determined that an individual may remain at liberty while immigration proceedings continue, due process requires more than the mere existence of statutory detention authority before that liberty may again be withdrawn. Constitutionally adequate procedures must meaningfully evaluate whether continued physical detention has become necessary under the individual's present circumstances, whether any material facts or circumstances have changed since the Government's original release determination, and whether less restrictive alternatives to continued physical detention remain sufficient to protect the Government's legitimate interests. Absent such an individualized determination, the Government cannot reasonably ensure that continued detention is justified under the individual's present circumstances, thereby creating a substantial risk of an arbitrary or erroneous deprivation of one of the fundamental liberty interests protected by the Fifth Amendment.

4. In Petitioner's case, Respondent failed to undertake any such meaningful individualized determination. Before returning Petitioner to immigration custody, Respondent did not meaningfully evaluate Petitioner's prior releases from immigration custody, his compliance with ICE reporting requirements, his successful completion of all conditions imposed in his state criminal case, his completion of his probationary period, his pending asylum application, his employment authorization, the availability of a sponsor, or whether reasonable alternatives to detention would adequately protect the Government's legitimate interests. Instead, Petitioner's physical liberty was withdrawn and continues to be restrained without any meaningful constitutional process addressing the particular facts and circumstances of his individual case.

5. The absence of a meaningful individualized custody determination is particularly significant in Petitioner's case because Petitioner previously lived successfully in the community after being released from immigration custody, complied with all ICE reporting requirements, completed all conditions imposed in his state criminal case, completed his probationary period without violations, continued pursuing his pending asylum application, and remained available to immigration authorities. Nevertheless, Respondent continues to maintain Petitioner's physical confinement without constitutionally adequate procedures demonstrating that such detention remains necessary under Petitioner's present circumstances.

6. Because Respondent has failed to provide the procedural safeguards required by the Fifth Amendment, Petitioner's continued detention violates the Constitution and cannot be sustained absent constitutionally adequate process.

X. CONTINUED CIVIL IMMIGRATION DETENTION CANNOT BE SUSTAINED CONSISTENT WITH THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE

1. As demonstrated above, this Petition presents a constitutional challenge to the procedures through which Petitioner's continued civil immigration detention has been maintained. The question before the Court is whether those procedures satisfy the requirements of the Fifth Amendment.

2. Because the Due Process Clause independently limits the Government's authority to deprive an individual of physical liberty, continued civil immigration detention cannot be sustained where constitutionally adequate procedural safeguards have not been provided.

3. As set forth in this Petition, Respondent has continued Petitioner's detention without affording the procedural protections required by the Fifth Amendment. As a result, Petitioner's continued confinement constitutes an ongoing deprivation of physical liberty in violation of the Constitution.

4. Accordingly, Petitioner's continued detention cannot be sustained consistent with the Due Process Clause unless and until Respondent provides constitutionally adequate procedures sufficient to justify the continued deprivation of Petitioner's physical liberty.

XI. HABEAS CORPUS PROVIDES THE APPROPRIATE REMEDY

1. Petitioner seeks relief through the writ of habeas corpus because his continued civil immigration detention violates the Fifth Amendment. Habeas corpus is the traditional mechanism through which federal courts determine the legality of executive detention and grant appropriate relief when continued confinement is inconsistent with the Constitution.

2. Petitioner does not ask the Court to resolve the merits of his immigration proceedings, determine his removability, or review discretionary decisions committed to the Executive Branch. The sole question presented is whether Petitioner's continued detention complies with the procedural requirements of the Due Process Clause.

3. When a petitioner establishes that continued detention violates the Constitution, federal courts possess the authority to grant habeas relief sufficient to remedy the constitutional violation. The appropriate remedy depends on the nature of the constitutional defect established in the particular case.

4. Accordingly, if the Court concludes that Petitioner's continued detention has been maintained without the procedural safeguards required by the Fifth Amendment, it may order such relief as is necessary to remedy that constitutional violation, including Petitioner's immediate release under appropriate conditions or such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

XII. REQUEST FOR NON-TRANSFER

Petitioner respectfully requests that the Court enter an order prohibiting **Respondent** from transferring Petitioner outside the territorial jurisdiction of this Court while this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus remains pending.

This Court's jurisdiction over this habeas action is based upon Petitioner's present physical custody within this District and the authority exercised by **Respondent** over that custody. An unnecessary transfer during the pendency of these proceedings could interfere with the Court's ability to exercise its jurisdiction, provide effective relief, and ensure the orderly adjudication of Petitioner's constitutional claims.

Any transfer to another detention facility during the pendency of this action would substantially prejudice Petitioner's ability to communicate with family members, obtain supporting evidence, consult with legal assistants or counsel, prepare for his pending immigration proceedings, pursue any available forms of immigration relief, and effectively litigate the constitutional claims presented in this Petition. Because this action challenges the legality of Petitioner's present detention, maintaining the status quo during the pendency of this litigation serves the interests of judicial economy, fairness, and the orderly resolution of the constitutional issues before the Court.

Maintaining Petitioner's current place of detention will not prejudice any legitimate governmental interest while the Court considers the important constitutional questions presented in this Petition.

Moreover, a transfer during the pendency of this action could unnecessarily complicate or delay these proceedings, create uncertainty regarding the identity of Petitioner's immediate custodian, and impair the Court's ability to provide effective habeas relief. Preserving Petitioner's current place of detention until the resolution of this Petition best protects the Court's jurisdiction and promotes the orderly administration of justice.

Accordingly, Petitioner respectfully requests that the Court prohibit **Respondent** from transferring Petitioner outside the jurisdiction of this Court unless prior authorization is obtained from the Court.

XIII. REQUEST FOR STAY OF REMOVAL

Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court temporarily stay his removal from the United States while this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus remains pending.

Absent a stay, **Respondent** may remove Petitioner before this Court has an opportunity to adjudicate the constitutional claims presented herein. Such removal could substantially interfere with the Court's ability to provide meaningful habeas relief and to fully resolve the constitutional issues presented in this action.

A temporary stay will preserve the status quo while the Court considers Petitioner's claims and will not unduly prejudice **Respondent**. By contrast, removal before the resolution of this Petition could irreparably prejudice Petitioner and frustrate this Court's ability to grant effective relief.

Accordingly, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court stay his removal from the United States until final disposition of this Petition or until further order of the Court.

XIV. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, for the reasons set forth above, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Honorable Court:

1. Grant this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus;
2. Order Petitioner's immediate release from immigration custody;
3. Alternatively, order Petitioner's release under reasonable conditions of supervision or other less restrictive alternatives to physical detention;
4. Upon Petitioner's release, order **Respondent** to promptly return to Petitioner all original personal documents, identification documents, records, personal property, and any other items lawfully belonging to Petitioner that remain in **Respondent's** possession, custody, or control;
5. Alternatively, order **Respondent** to provide Petitioner with a prompt, meaningful, individualized, and constitutionally adequate custody determination before a neutral decision-maker, consistent with the requirements of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, at which **Respondent** shall bear the burden of demonstrating that continued detention is constitutionally justified and that no reasonable alternative to detention would adequately protect the Government's legitimate interests;
6. Enjoin **Respondent** from transferring Petitioner outside the territorial jurisdiction of this Court while this action remains pending unless prior authorization is obtained from this Court;
7. Stay Petitioner's removal from the United States until this Court has entered a final judgment resolving the constitutional claims presented in this Petition;
8. Expedite consideration of this Petition in light of Petitioner's ongoing deprivation of physical liberty, the constitutional nature of the claims presented, and the continuing prejudice resulting from Petitioner's detention; and
9. Grant such other and further relief as this Court deems just, equitable, and proper.

XV. DECLARATION

I, **Jorge Luis Saez-Mujica, A#** [redacted] declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 1746** that I have read the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 2241**; that I am the Petitioner in this action; and that the factual statements contained therein are true and correct to the best of my personal knowledge, information, and belief.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on: **August 6, 2026.**

Jorge Luis Saez Mujica

Jorge Luis Saez-Mujica

A# [redacted]

Petitioner, Pro Se

XVI. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on **August 6, 2026**, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241** by depositing it in the United States Mail, First-Class Mail, postage prepaid, properly addressed to the following:

Office of the United States Attorney
Middle District of Georgia
P.O. Box 1702
Macon, GA 31202-1702

Respectfully submitted,

Jorge Luis Saez Mujica

Jorge Luis Saez-Mujica
A# [redacted]
Petitioner, Pro Se