

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

Pascual Cruz Bonilla v. Warden, Otero County Processing Center,
Mary De Anda-Ybarra, Field Office Director of Enforcement and
Removal Operations, El Paso Field Office, Immigration and Customs
Enforcement; Todd Lyons, Acting Director Immigration and Customs
Enforcement; Current Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland
Security; and Pamela Bondi, U.S. Attorney General

Cruz Bonilla v. Warden · No. Civ. No. 26-0824-KG-GBW · Decided March 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of New Mexico orders Respondents to answer Pascual Cruz Bonilla’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition and motion for emergency release. The order addresses alleged prolonged immigration detention and lack of a meaningful bond hearing, sets a March 27, 2026 answer deadline, and permits an optional reply.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of New Mexico
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Kenneth J. Gonzales
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of New Mexico
DECIDED	March 20, 2026
DOCKET	Civ. No. 26-0824-KG-GBW
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and a motion for emergency release by an immigration detainee. Before receiving a response, the court ordered the respondents to answer both filings.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For purposes of deciding whether to require an answer, the court accepted the petition's factual allegations as true.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; interlocutory district court order directing an answer
PARTIES	Pascual Cruz Bonilla v. Warden, Otero County Processing Center, Mary De Anda-Ybarra, Field Office Director of Enforcement and

Removal Operations, El Paso Field Office, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Todd Lyons, Acting Director, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Current Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Pamela Bondi, U.S. Attorney General

TOPICS

immigration detention removal proceedings civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Immigration Federal habeas corpus Civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the allegations of prolonged immigration detention and the absence of a meaningful bond hearing warranted requiring the respondents to answer the § 2241 petition and motion for emergency release.
2. Which respondent is proper in an immigration habeas proceeding.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Accepting the facts as true, the Court will require an answer to the Petition.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner alleged that he entered the United States in 1999 and was detained by immigration authorities on September 1, 2025. He alleged that he had not received a meaningful bond hearing and was subject to prolonged immigration detention. He was detained at the Otero County Processing Center and proceeded pro se.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed a § 2241 habeas petition and a motion for emergency release. The court electronically served the respondents, substituted or added the proper respondent parties, and ordered an expedited response by March 27, 2026, with an optional reply permitted thereafter.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Torres-Torres v. Miller, 2020 WL 4430519 (D.N.M. July 31, 2020)
- Lowmaster v. Dir., Bureau of Prisons, 2024 WL 5135970, at *1 (D. Kan. Dec. 17, 2024)
- Danderson v. Page, 2024 WL 3913051, at *2 (E.D. Okla. Aug. 20, 2024)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-new-mexico-united-states-district-court-for-the-dis/2026/pascual-cruz-bonilla-v-warden-otero-county-processing-2g90er40>