

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Maestre-Jimenez v. Baltazar

Maestre-Jimenez · No. 1:26-cv-01782-CNS · Decided May 14, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Colorado denied Yurieth Lucia Maestre-Jimenez’s motion for reconsideration of an order granting habeas relief and requiring an immigration bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). The court held that Petitioner had not shown an intervening change in law, newly available evidence, clear error, or manifest injustice warranting immediate release instead of a bond hearing.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Colorado
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Charlotte N. Sweeney
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Colorado
DECIDED	May 14, 2026
DOCKET	1:26-cv-01782-CNS
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b) for reconsideration of the Court's prior order granting habeas relief and requiring Respondents to provide a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), arguing that she should have been immediately released from immigration detention.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A motion to reconsider an interlocutory order under Rule 54(b) is committed to the court's sound discretion and is generally appropriate only upon an intervening change in controlling law, newly available evidence, or the need to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Yurieth Lucia Maestre-Jimenez v. Juan Baltazar, Warden, Aurora ICE Processing Center, George Valdez, Acting Field Office Director, U.S. Immigration & Customs Enforcement, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Todd M. Lyons, Acting Director, U.S. Immigration & Customs Enforcement, U.S. Department of Homeland Security,

TOPICS

immigration detention

motion for reconsideration

removal proceedings

civil procedure

immigration

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration

civil procedure

habeas corpus

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Petitioner established grounds under Rule 54(b) for reconsideration of the prior interlocutory order.
2. Whether the Court clearly erred or caused manifest injustice by ordering a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) rather than ordering Petitioner's immediate release from immigration detention.

HOLDINGS

1. Reconsideration was not warranted because Petitioner did not demonstrate an intervening change in controlling law, newly available evidence, clear error, or manifest injustice.
2. The prior order requiring a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), rather than immediate release, was not clear error and did not result in manifest injustice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“the Tenth Circuit has advised that reconsideration is generally appropriate where there is “(1) an intervening change in the controlling law, (2) new evidence previously unavailable, [or] (3) the need to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice,”” (Analysis)

“an immigration judge is better suited [than the Court] to consider whether Petitioner poses a flight risk and a danger to the community in this instance.” (Analysis)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner was detained by ICE in February 2026 after previously being released on her own recognizance and enrolled in ICE's Intensive Supervision Appearance Program in 2023. Her habeas petition stated that she had accumulated 39 alleged ISAP violations, which were referenced in the Form I-213 administrative warrant supporting her re-detention. Because the record before the Court did not establish whether the violations were legitimate indicators of flight risk or danger, the Court ordered a bond hearing rather than immediate release. At a later bond hearing, the immigration judge found that Petitioner was neither a flight risk nor a danger to the community and released her on bond, based on additional information not previously before the Court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Court previously granted Petitioner's habeas petition in part by ordering a bond hearing rather than immediate release. Petitioner moved for reconsideration, Respondents opposed, and Petitioner replied. The Court denied reconsideration, concluding that Petitioner had not shown an intervening change in controlling law, newly available evidence, clear error, or manifest injustice.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Paramount Pictures Corp. v. Thompson Theatres, Inc., 621 F.2d 1088, 1090 (10th Cir.)
- Trujillo v. Bd. of Educ. of Albuquerque Public Schools, 212 Fed.Appx. 760, 765 (10th Cir.)
- Servants of the Paraclete v. Does, 204 F.3d 1005, 1012 (10th Cir.)
- Nava Hernandez v. Baltazar, No. 25-cv-03094-CNS, 2025 WL 2996643 (D. Colo. Oct. 24, 2025)
- Singh v. Baltazar, 2026 WL 352870 (D. Colo. Feb. 9, 2026)
- Loa Caballero v. Baltazar, No. 25-cv-03120-NYW, 2025 WL 2977650, at *9 (D. Colo. Oct. 22, 2025)