

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
KENTUCKY, NORTHERN DIVISION AT COVINGTON

Sidi Ould Ahmed v. Samuel Olson, et al.

Civil Action No. 26-89-DLB (E.D. Ky. Mar. 26, 2026) · No. Civil Action No. 26-89-DLB · Decided March 26,
2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky granted Sidi Ould Ahmed’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging his detention after ICE revoked his Order of Supervision. The court held that ICE failed to provide adequate notice and an opportunity to respond as required under 8 C.F.R. § 241.13(i), violating due process. The court ordered Ahmed’s immediate release subject to the conditions of his preexisting Order of Supervision and denied his emergency motion as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, Northern Division at Covington
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, Northern Division at Covington
DECIDED	March 26, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 26-89-DLB
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 from immigration detention and requested release under his preexisting Order of Supervision. He also sought emergency injunctive relief preventing his removal while the habeas petition was pending.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the § 2241 habeas challenge to the lawfulness of Petitioner's detention and the alleged failure to follow applicable immigration regulations and due-process procedures.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Sidi Ould Ahmed v. Samuel Olson, Todd M. Lyons, Kristi Noem, Pamela Bondi, Marc Fields

TOPICS

immigration detention

removal proceedings

procedural due process

remedies

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration law

habeas corpus

constitutional law

administrative law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether ICE violated 8 C.F.R. §§ 241.4(l) and 241.13(i), and the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause, by revoking Ahmed's Order of Supervision and redetaining him without adequate notice of the reasons for revocation and a meaningful opportunity to respond.
2. Whether ICE's generalized statements that circumstances had changed and that a travel document had been requested established the changed circumstances and significant likelihood of removal required for revocation under 8 C.F.R. § 241.13(i).
3. Whether immediate release under the conditions of Ahmed's preexisting Order of Supervision was the appropriate remedy.
4. Whether Ahmed's emergency motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction was moot after the court granted habeas relief.

HOLDINGS

1. When ICE revokes an Order of Supervision under 8 C.F.R. § 241.13(i), it must provide notice adequately identifying the changed circumstances supporting revocation and afford the noncitizen a meaningful opportunity to respond. A notice stating only that circumstances have changed or that removal is likely is insufficient.
2. The mere submission of a request for a travel document, without evidence that the document is likely to be obtained or that removal is significantly likely in the reasonably foreseeable future, is insufficient to establish changed circumstances supporting redetention under § 241.13(i). ICE also may not rely on post-hoc reasons that were not communicated to the detainee in the revocation notice.
3. ICE's failure to provide adequate individualized notice and a meaningful opportunity to respond before revoking Ahmed's supervised release and redetaining him violated his Fifth Amendment due-process rights.
4. Immediate release under the conditions of Ahmed's preexisting Order of Supervision was the appropriate remedy because ICE's revocation had not been properly effectuated and Ahmed continued to lack a meaningful opportunity to challenge it.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Simply to say that circumstances had changed or there was a significant likelihood of removal in the foreseeable future is not enough. Petitioner must be told what circumstances had changed or why there was now a significant likelihood of removal in order to meaningfully proceed.” (Analysis § III.B)

“Accordingly, Respondents “may not rationalize a re-detention after the fact; rather the reason must be articulated to the detainee so that he has ‘a meaningful opportunity to respond to the reasons and to submit

evidence in opposition.’”” (Analysis § III.B)

“In looking towards other district courts for guidance, this Court finds that the only appropriate remedy is immediate release pursuant to the conditions of Petitioner’s preexisting OSUP.” (Analysis § III.C)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Sidi Ould Ahmed, a Mauritanian citizen, entered the United States in 2001, applied for asylum and withholding of removal, and was ordered removed in 2006 after the Immigration Judge and Board of Immigration Appeals denied relief. ICE released him under an Order of Supervision in 2009, and he complied with supervision requirements for many years. In January 2026, ICE detained him after requesting that he report, issued a removal warrant, and later sought a travel document from Mauritania. ICE's notice stated generally that circumstances had changed and removal could be accomplished expeditiously, but did not identify the specific changed circumstances.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Ahmed was ordered removed in 2006 but remained in the United States under an Order of Supervision beginning in 2009. ICE detained him in January 2026 after requesting that he appear, and he was transferred to the Kenton County Detention Center. He filed this § 2241 petition on February 25, 2026; after receiving the respondents' response and Ahmed's reply, the district court granted habeas relief, ordered immediate release subject to the prior Order of Supervision, and denied the emergency motion as moot.

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Respondents must immediately release Ahmed from custody subject to the conditions of his preexisting Order of Supervision and file a status report by April 6, 2026 certifying compliance. The emergency motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction was denied as moot.

CASES CITED

- K.E.O. v. Woosley, No. 4:25-cv-74-RGJ, 2025 WL 2553394, at *3-*4, *7 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 4, 2025)
- Hernandez v. Sessions, 872 F.3d 976, 981 (9th Cir. 2017)
- United States v. Accardi, 347 U.S. 260, 266-68 (1954)
- Delgado-Corea v. Immigration & Naturalization Service, 804 F.2d 261, 263 (4th Cir. 1986)
- Choy v. Woosely, No. 4:25-cv-197-DJH, 2026 WL 324601, at *3-*7 (W.D. Ky. Feb. 6, 2026)
- Saengnakhone S. v. Noem, No. 25-cv-4775, 2026 WL 34132, at *5 (D. Minn. Jan. 6, 2025)
- Qui v. Carter, No. 25-3131-JWL, 2025 WL 2770502, at *2, *4 (D. Kan. Sept. 26, 2025)
- Roble v. Bondi, 803 F. Supp. 3d 766, 772 (D. Minn. 2025)
- Perez-Escobar v. Moniz, 792 F. Supp. 3d 224, 226 (D. Mass. 2025)

- Sarail A. v. Bondi, 803 F. Supp. 3d 775, 780, 787-89 (D. Minn. 2025)
- Vu Quoc Pham v. Warden et al., No. 1:25-cv-1873, 2026 WL 673404, at *9 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2026)
- Nguyen v. Hyde, 788 F. Supp. 3d 144, 150, 152-53 (D. Mass. 2025)
- Hall v. Nessinger, No. 25-cv-667, 2026 WL 18538, at *7-*8 (D.R.I. Jan. 2, 2026)
- Hoac v. Becerra, No. 2:25-cv-1740, 2025 WL 1993771, at *4 (E.D. Cal. July 16, 2025)
- Liu v. Carter, No. 25-3036-JWL, 2025 WL 1696526, at *2-*3 (D. Kan. June 17, 2025)
- Karki v. Raycraft, No. 2025 WL 3516782, at *7 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 8, 2025)
- Rombot v. Souza, 296 F. Supp. 3d 383, 389 (D. Mass. 2017)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-kentucky-northern-division-at-covington-uni/2026/sidi-ould-ahmed-v-samuel-olson-et-al-4p810gim>