

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

E.A.P.C. v. Minga Wofford, et al.

Case No. 1:25-cv-01546-JLT-CDB (HC) · No. 1:25-cv-01546-JLT-CDB (HC) · Decided January 6, 2026

SUMMARY

These findings and recommendations address a federal detainee’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The court recommends granting the petition in part, concluding that the petitioner’s procedural due process claim concerning parole revocation and detention warrants relief. The document also addresses exhaustion, the statutory immigration detention framework, and substantive due process.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	United States Magistrate Judge
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	January 6, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-01546-JLT-CDB (HC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 by a federal immigration detainee challenging his detention under procedural and substantive due process theories. The magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that the petition be granted in part and that the case be closed, subject to review by the assigned district judge after a 14-day objection period.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For procedural due process, the court applied the three-factor balancing test from Mathews v. Eldridge. For substantive due process, the court considered whether the detention had a rational regulatory purpose or was excessive in relation to that purpose, applying the standard articulated in United States v. Torres.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	E.A.P.C., Petitioner v. Minga Wofford, et al., Respondents

TOPICS

immigration detention

federal habeas corpus

procedural due process

substantive due process

removal proceedings

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration law

habeas corpus

constitutional law

civil rights

administrative law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether prudential exhaustion of available administrative remedies should be waived as futile in a § 2241 challenge to immigration detention.
2. Whether Petitioner's re-detention without a substantive, individualized parole-revocation hearing violated procedural due process.
3. Whether Petitioner's continued immigration detention was punitive or excessive in relation to a legitimate regulatory purpose, in violation of substantive due process.

HOLDINGS

1. The prudential exhaustion requirement should be waived because seeking administrative release would be futile where Respondents maintained that Petitioner was subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), leaving him without a statutory right to a bond hearing.
2. Petitioner's petition should be granted as to procedural due process because, given his prior release on his own recognizance and the government's failure to establish that the new mandatory-detention interpretation applied to him, the procedures used for his re-detention were inadequate to protect his liberty interest in remaining out of custody.
3. Petitioner's petition should be denied as to substantive due process because the record did not establish that his detention lacked a rational regulatory purpose or was excessive in relation to that purpose.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"because Petitioner has shown the procedures or lack thereof as applied to Petitioner are not sufficient to protect his liberty interest, the Court concluded that Petitioner has demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits of his procedural due process claim." (at IV.A)

"Petitioner does not show that his detention was punitive or excessive in relation to the purpose of the governing detention regime." (at IV.B)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner had been present in the United States for approximately four years and had been released by ICE on his own recognizance in November 2021 while his section 240 removal proceedings were pending. After the government adopted a new interpretation of 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225 and 1226, ICE re-detained him at the Mesa Verde ICE Processing Center. The record showed several late or missed check-ins and virtual office visits, although Petitioner had otherwise pursued employment, maintained community relationships, and had no criminal record during his release.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed the § 2241 petition and requested emergency injunctive relief while detained by ICE. The court initially ordered the respondents to show cause, then converted the matter to a preliminary-injunction proceeding and granted preliminary relief in part, requiring a substantive parole-revocation hearing before an immigration judge with the government bearing the burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence. Respondents declined to file further merits briefing, and the magistrate judge recommended granting the procedural due process claim, denying the substantive due process claim, and closing the case.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Salcedo Aceros v. Kaiser, No. 25-CV-06924-EMC, 2025 WL 2637503 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 12, 2025)
- Department of Homeland Security v. Thuraissigiam, 591 U.S. 103, 108-10 (2020)
- Jennings v. Rodriguez, 583 U.S. 281, 282, 287, 303, 306 (2018)
- Aroldo Rodriguez Diaz v. Merrick Garland, Diaz v. Garland, 53 F.4th 1189, 1196-97, 1201 (9th Cir. 2022)
- Matter of E-R-M- & L-R-M-, 25 I. & N. Dec. 520, 520 (B.I.A. 2011)
- Matter of Guerra, 24 I. & N. Dec. 37, 40 (B.I.A. 2006)
- Ortega v. Bonnar, 415 F. Supp. 3d 963, 968-69 (N.D. Cal. 2019)
- Panosyan v. Mayorkas, 854 F. App'x 787, 788 (9th Cir. 2021)
- Saravia v. Sessions, 280 F. Supp. 3d 1168, 1197 (N.D. Cal. 2017)
- Y-Z-H-L v. Bostock, 2025 WL 1898025, at *3, *10-*13 (D. Or. July 9, 2025)
- Mata Velasquez v. Kurzdorfer, No. 25-CV-493-LJV, 2025 WL 1953796, at *11 (W.D.N.Y. July 16, 2025)
- Pinchi v. Noem, 792 F. Supp. 3d 1025, 1032 (N.D. Cal. 2025)
- Laing v. Ashcroft, 370 F.3d 994, 997-98 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Castro-Cortez v. INS, 239 F.3d 1037, 1047 (9th Cir. 2001)
- United States v. Pirro, 104 F.3d 297, 299 (9th Cir. 1997)
- McKart v. United States, 395 U.S. 185, 193 (1969)
- El Rescate Legal Services, Inc. v. Executive Office of Immigration Review, 959 F.2d 742, 746 (9th Cir. 1991)
- United States v. Quintero, 995 F.3d 1044, 1051-52 (9th Cir. 2021)
- United States v. Salerno, 481 U.S. 739, 746-47 (1987)
- Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319, 333-35 (1976)
- Armstrong v. Manzo, 380 U.S. 545, 552 (1965)
- Morrissey v. Brewer, 408 U.S. 471, 481 (1972)
- Hernandez v. Sessions, 872 F.3d 976, 990, 994-95 (9th Cir. 2017)
- Doe v. Becerra, 704 F. Supp. 3d 1006, 1020 (N.D. Cal. 2023)
- Doe v. Garland, 109 F.4th 1188 (9th Cir. 2024)

- Mahdawi v. Trump, 781 F. Supp. 3d 214, 232 (D. Vt. 2025)
- Mapp v. Reno, 241 F.3d 221 (2d Cir. 2001)
- Jackson v. Indiana, 406 U.S. 715, 738 (1972)
- Doe v. Becerra, 732 F. Supp. 3d 1071 (N.D. Cal. 2024)
- Espinoza v. Wofford, No. 1:24-cv-01118-SAB-HC, 2025 WL 1556590, at *7 n.7 (E.D. Cal. June 2, 2025)
- Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014)

OPINION

Wofford

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 E.A.P.C., Case No. 1:25-cv-01546-JLT-CDB (HC) 12 Petitioner, FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS TO

GRANT IN PART PETITIONER’S PETITION

13 v. FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

14 MINGA WOFFORD, et al., (Doc. 1)

15 Respondents. 14-DAY OBJECTION PERIOD

16 17 Petitioner E.A.P.C.1 (“Petitioner”), a federal detainee proceeding by counsel, initiated this
18 action by filing a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. For the
reasons 19 set forth herein, the undersigned recommends that Petitioner’s petition for writ of
habeas corpus be 20 granted in part. 21 I. Relevant Background 22 For the purpose of these
findings and recommendations, the undersigned refers to and 23 incorporates by reference the
factual and procedural background set forth in the Court’s order 24 converting the matter to a
preliminary injunction and granting the preliminary injunction in part 25 (Doc. 12 at 1-4). 26
Petitioner filed the instant petition, a request for emergency injunctive relief, and a motion 27 1 On
December 11, 2025, the Court granted Petitioner’s unopposed request to proceed via 28
pseudonym as to Petitioner E.A.P.C. (Doc. 17). 1 to proceed via pseudonym on November 12,
2025, while in the custody of the Immigration and 2 Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) at the Mesa
Verde ICE Processing Center in Bakersfield, California. 3 (Doc. 1 ¶ 28); see (Docs. 1-3). On
November 13, 2025, the Court preliminarily reviewed the 4 petition and request for emergency
injunctive relief and found that Petitioner may be able to 5 demonstrate success on his due process
claim and that some form of immediate relief may be 6 appropriate. (Doc. 6). The Court therefore
ordered Respondents to show cause in writing why the 7 Court should not grant Petitioner’s
motion for a temporary restraining order and set a briefing 8 schedule for Petitioner’s reply
thereto. Id. On November 18, 2025, Respondents filed an 9 opposition to Petitioner’s motion for a
temporary restraining order and on November 20, 2025, 10 Petitioner filed a reply. (Docs. 10, 11).

11 On November 25, 2025, the Court converted the matter to a preliminary injunction and 12 granted the preliminary injunction in part and referred the matter to the undersigned for a 13 recommendation on the merits of the petition. (Doc. 12). The Court ordered that Petitioner shall 14 be provided a substantive parole revocation hearing at which an immigration judge will determine 15 whether Petitioner poses a risk of flight or a danger to the community if he is released, with the 16 government to bear the burden of establishing, by clear and convincing evidence, that Petitioner 17 poses a danger to the community or a risk of flight. *Id.* at 21. The government was permitted to 18 file a further brief on the merits of the habeas petition within 45 days of the order, or alternatively, 19 to file within 30 days a notice that it does not intend to file further briefing. *Id.* 20 On December 18, 2025, the government filed a notice indicating that it does not intend to 21 file further briefing in this matter. (Doc. 18). Therefore, the government's filings made in 22 connection with its opposition to Petitioner's motion for a temporary restraining order (Doc. 10) 23 serves as its argument on the merits of the habeas petition. 24

II. Governing Authority 25

A. Statutory Immigration Framework (8 U.S.C. § 1225 and § 1226) 26

Two statutes govern the detention and removal of inadmissible noncitizens from the United 27 States: 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and § 1225. Relevant here is the legal background accurately presented by 28 the district court in *Salcedo Aceros v. Kaiser*, No. 25-CV-06924-EMC, 2025 WL 2637503 (N.D. 1 Cal. Sept 12, 2025):

2 1. Full Removal Proceedings and Discretionary Detention (§ 1226) 3

The "usual removal process" involves an evidentiary hearing before 4 an immigration judge. *Dep't of Homeland Sec. v. Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 108 (2020). Proceedings are initiated under 8 U.S.C. 5 § 1229(a), also known as "full removal," by filing a Notice to Appear with the Immigration Court. *Matter of E-R-M- & L-R-M-*, 25 I. & N. 6 Dec. 520, 520 (BIA 2011). Section § 1226 provides that while removal proceedings are pending, a noncitizen "may be arrested and 7 detained" and that the government "may release the alien on ... conditional parole." § 1226(a)(2); accord *Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 8 108 (during removal proceedings, applicant may either be "detained" or "allowed to reside in this country"). When a person is apprehended 9 under § 1226(a), an ICE officer makes the initial custody determination. *Diaz v. Garland*, 53 F.4th 1189, 1196 (9th Cir. 2022) 10 (citing 8 C.F.R. § 236.1(c)(8)). A noncitizen will be released if he or she "demonstrate[s] to the satisfaction of the officer that such release 11 would not pose a danger to property or persons, and that the alien is likely to appear for any future proceeding." *Id.* (citing 8 C.F.R. 12 § 236.1(c)(8)). 13 "Federal regulations provide that aliens detained under § 1226(a) receive bond hearings at the outset of detention." *Jennings v. 14 Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 306 (2018) (citing 8 CFR §§ 236.1(d)(1)). If, at this hearing, the detainee demonstrates by the preponderance of 15 the evidence that he or she is not "a threat to national security, a danger to the community at large, likely to abscond, or otherwise a 16 poor bail risk," the IJ will order his or his release. *Diaz*, 53 F.4th at 1197 (citing *Matter of Guerra*, 24 I. & N. Dec. 37, 40 (B.I.A. 2006)). 17 Once released, the noncitizen's bond is subject to revocation. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(b), "the DHS has authority to

revoke a noncitizen's 18 bond or parole 'at any time,' even if that individual has previously been released." *Ortega v. Bonnar*, 415 F. Supp. 3d 963, 968 (N.D.

19 Cal. 2019). However, if an immigration judge has determined the noncitizen should be released, the DHS may not re-arrest that 20 noncitizen absent a change in circumstance. See *Panosyan v. Mayorkas*, 854 F. App'x 787, 788 (9th Cir. 2021). Where the release 21 decision was made by a DHS officer, not an immigration judge, the Government's practice has been to require a showing of changed 22 circumstances before re-arrest. See *Saravia v. Sessions*, 280 F. Supp. 3d 1168, 1197 (N.D. Cal. 2017). 23

2. Expedited Removal and Mandatory Detention (§ 1225)

24 While "§ 1226 applies to aliens already present in the United States," 25 U.S. immigration law also "authorizes the Government to detain certain aliens seeking admission into the country under 26 §§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2)," a process that provides for expedited 27 2 The Court incorporates and adopts herein the legal framework set forth in the Court's 28 order granting in part Petitioner's motion for preliminary injunction. See (Doc. 12 at 4-10). 1 removal. *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 303 (2018). Under § 1225, a noncitizen "who has not been admitted or who arrives in the United 2 States" is considered "an applicant for admission." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1). For certain applicants for admission, 8 U.S.C. § 1225 3 authorizes "expedited removal." § 1225(b)(1). § 1225(b)(1) provides that: 4 "If an immigration officer determines that an alien 5 (other than an alien described in subparagraph (F)) who is arriving in the United States or is described in 6 clause (iii) is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C) or 212(a)(7) [8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C) 7 or 1182(a)(7)], the officer shall order the alien removed from the United States without further 8 hearing or review unless the alien indicates either an intention to apply for asylum under section 208 [8 9 USCS § 1158] or a fear of persecution."

10 Sections 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C) and 1182(a)(7) respectively refer to noncitizens who are inadmissible due to misrepresentation or 11 failure to meet document requirements. Clause (iii) of § 1225(b)(1) allows the Attorney General (who has since delegated the 12 responsibility to the Department of Homeland Security Secretary) to designate for expedited removal noncitizens "who ha[ve] not been 13 admitted or paroled into the United States, and who ha[ve] not affirmatively shown, to the satisfaction of an immigration officer, 14 that the alien has been physically present in the United States continuously for the 2-year period immediately prior to the date of 15 the determination of inadmissibility under this subparagraph." § 1225(b)(1)(A)(iii)(II). 16 To summarize, under § 1225(b)(1), two groups of noncitizens are 17 subject to expedited removal. First, there are "arriving" noncitizens who are inadmissible due to misrepresentation or failure to meet 18 document requirements. The implementing agency regulations define "arriving alien" as applicants for admission "coming or 19 attempting to come into the United States at a port-of-entry." 8 C.F.R. § 1.2. The second group –designated noncitizens –includes 20 noncitizens who meet all of the following criteria: (1) they are inadmissible due to lack of a valid entry document or 21 misrepresentation; (2) they have not

“been physically present in the United States continuously for the 2-year period immediately prior 22 to the date of the determination of inadmissibility”; and (3) they are among those whom the Secretary of Homeland Security has 23 designated for expedited removal. *Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 109; § 1225(b)(1). 24 “Initially, DHS’s predecessor agency did not make any designation 25 [under (3)], thereby limiting expedited removal only to ‘arriving aliens,’” that is, noncitizens encountered at ports of entry. *Make the 26 Rd. N.Y. v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-190 (JMC), 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 169432, at *14 (D.D.C. Aug. 29, 2025). In the following years, DHS 27 extended by designation expedited removal to noncitizens who arrive by sea and who have been present for fewer than two years, and to 28 noncitizens apprehended within 100 air miles of any U.S. 1 international land border who entered within the last 14 days. *Id.* This was the status quo until January 2025, when the Department of 2 Homeland Security revised its § 1225 designation to “apply expedited removal to the fullest extent authorized by statute.” 3 *Designating Aliens for Expedited Removal*, 90 Fed. Reg. 8139 (Jan. 24, 2025). Under this designation, expedited removal applies to 4 noncitizens encountered anywhere within the United States, who have been in the United States for less than two years and are 5 inadmissible for lack of valid documentation or misrepresentation. In short, expedited removal was expanded to apply for the first time to 6 vast numbers of noncitizens present in the interior of the United States. 7 Under the expedited removal statute § 1225(b)(1), if an applicant 8 “indicates either an intention to apply for asylum” or “a fear of persecution,” the immigration officer “shall refer the alien for an 9 interview by an asylum officer.” §§ 1225(b)(1)(A)(i)–(ii). If the asylum officer determines that the applicant has a “credible fear,” the 10 applicant “receive[s] ‘full consideration’ of his asylum claim in a standard removal hearing.” *Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 110. If the 11 officer determines there is no “credible fear,” the officer “shall order the alien removed from the United States without further hearing or 12 review.” § 1225(b)(1)(B)(iii). However, the officer’s decision may be appealed by the applicant to an immigration judge, who must 13 conduct the review “to the maximum extent practicable within 24 hours, but in no case later than 7 days after the date of the 14 determination.” *Id.* Detention under § 1225(b)(1) is “mandatory” “pending a final determination of credible fear of persecution and if 15 found not to have such a fear, until removed.” *Id.* (citing § 1225(b)(1)(B)(iii) (IV) (“Any alien subject to the procedures under 16 this clause shall be detained pending a final determination of credible fear of persecution and, if found not to have such a fear, until 17 removed.”)) 18 [Section] 1225 also contains a provision that applies to applicants for admission not covered by § 1225(b)(1). *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287. 19 This provision, 1225(b)(2), states that, subject to statutory exceptions, “in the case of an alien who is an applicant for admission, 20 if the examining immigration officer determines that an alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, 21 the alien shall be detained for a proceeding under section 1229a [full removal proceedings] of this title.” § 1225(b)(2). In other words, 22 noncitizens subject to 1225(b)(2) are not eligible for expedited removal but are subject to mandatory detention while their full 23 removal proceedings are pending. This is in contrast to the

default detention regime under § 1226(a), which allows for discretionary 24 release and review of detention through a bond hearing. 25 3. The Government’s Recent Change in Position 26 Until this year, the DHS has applied § 1226(a) and its discretionary release and review of detention to the vast majority of noncitizens 27 allegedly in this country without valid documentation. This practice was codified by regulation. The regulations implementing the Illegal 28 Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 1 (“IIRIRA”) state that “Despite being applicants for admission, aliens who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly 2 referred to as aliens who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination.” 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 3 (Mar. 6, 1997). In fact, the government has conceded in other contexts that “DHS’s long-standing interpretation has been that 4 1226(a) [discretionary detention] applies to those who have crossed the border between ports of entry and are shortly thereafter 5 apprehended.” Dkt. No. 17 (citing Solicitor General, Transcript of Oral Argument at 44:24–45:2, *Biden v. Texas*, 597 U.S. 785 6 (2022) (No. 21-954)) . . .

7 In 2025, however, the Government’s policy changed dramatically.

The DHS revised its § 1225 designation to “apply expedited removal 8 to the fullest extent authorized by statute.” Designating Aliens for Expedited Removal, 90 Fed. Reg. 8139 (Jan. 24, 2025) (emphasis 9 added). The Secretary of Homeland Security memorandum directed federal immigration officers to “consider ... whether to apply 10 expedited removal” to “any alien DHS is aware of who is amenable to expedited removal but to whom expedited removal has not been 11 applied.” Dkt. No. 1 at ¶ 33. Officers are encouraged to “take steps to terminate any ongoing removal proceeding and/or any active 12 parole status.” *Id.* The memorandum states that DHS shall take the actions contemplated by the memorandum “in a manner that takes 13 account of legitimate reliance interests,” but states that “the expedited removal process includes asylum screening, which is 14 sufficient to protect the reliance interests of any alien who has applied for asylum or planned to do so in a timely manner.” Huffman 15 Memorandum (Jan. 23, 2025). 16 Since mid-May of 2025, the Department of Homeland Security has made a practice of appearing at regular removal proceedings in 17 immigration court, moving to dismiss the proceedings, and then re- arresting the individual in order to place them in expedited removal 18 proceedings. Dkt. No. 1 at ¶¶ 35–40. If the immigration judge does not dismiss the full removal proceedings, ICE still makes an arrest, 19 apparently in reliance on § 1225(b)(2)’s detention provision. 20 *Salcedo Aceros*, 2025 WL 2637503 at *1-4 (internal footnotes omitted). 21 *B. Parole Revocation* 22 In *Y-Z-H-L v. Bostock*, 2025 WL 1898025, at *10–12 (D. Or. July 9, 2025), the court 23 explained the parole process in immigration cases and noted that before parole may be revoked, the 24 parolee must be given written notice of the impending revocation, which must include a cogent 25 description of the reasons supporting the revocation decision. The court held:

26 Section 1182 . . . has a subsection titled “Temporary admission of nonimmigrants,” which allows noncitizens, even those in required 27 detention, to be “paroled” into the United States. This provision, at issue in this case, states: 28 1 The Secretary of Homeland

Security may, except as provided in subparagraph (B) or in section 1184(f) of this title, in his discretion parole into the United States temporarily under such conditions as he may prescribe only on a case-by-case basis for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit any alien applying for admission to the United States, but such parole of such alien shall not be regarded as an admission of the alien and when the purposes of such parole shall, in the opinion of the Secretary of Homeland Security, have been served the alien shall forthwith return or be returned to the custody from which he was paroled and thereafter his case shall continue to be dealt with in the same manner as that of any other applicant for admission to the United States. 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A). *Y-Z-H-L v. Bostock*, 2025 WL 1898025, at *3 (emphasis added). *Y-Z-H-L* determined that under the Administrative Procedure Act, immigration parolees are entitled to determinations related to their parole revocations that are not arbitrary, capricious or an abuse of discretion. *Id.* at *10. An agency acts arbitrarily and capriciously by failing to make a reasoned determination or where the agency fails to “articulate[] a satisfactory explanation for its action including a rational connection between the facts found and the choice made.” *Id.* Parole revocations in the context of the INA must occur on a case-by-case basis and may occur “when the purposes of such parole shall, in the opinion of the Secretary of Homeland Security, have been served the alien shall forthwith return or be returned to the custody from which he was paroled.” *Id.* at *12 (quoting 8 C.F.R. § 212.5(e)). 8 C.F.R. § 212.5(e) requires written notice of the termination of parole except where the immigrant has departed or when the specified period of parole has expired. Applying *Y-Z-H-L* and § 212.5(e), in *Mata Velasquez v. Kurzdorfer*, No. 25-CV-493-LJV, 2025 WL 1953796, at *11 (W.D.N.Y. July 16, 2025), the court found that the INA requires a case-by-case analysis as to the decision to revoke humanitarian parole: This Court agrees that both common sense and the words of the statute require parole revocation to be analyzed on a case-by-case basis and that a decision to revoke parole “must attend to the reasons an individual [noncitizen] received parole.” See *id.* There is no indication in the record that the government conducted any such analysis here. On the contrary, the letter *Mata Velasquez* received merely stated summarily that DHS had “revoked [his] parole.” Docket Item 62-1 at 5. Thus, there is no indication that—as required by the statute and regulations—an official with authority made a determination specific to *Mata Velasquez* that either “the purpose for which [his] parole was authorized” has been “accomplish[ed]” or that “neither humanitarian reasons nor public benefit warrants [his] continued presence...in the United States.” See 8 C.F.R. § 212.5(e)(2)(i). As a result, DHS's revocation of *Mata Velasquez*'s parole violated his rights under the statute and regulations. See *Y-Z- L-H*, 2025 WL 1898025, at *13. In *Pinchi v. Noem*, 792 F. Supp. 3d 1025, 1032 (N.D. Cal. 2025), the court reached a similar conclusion relying on the Due Process Clause: . . . even when ICE has the initial discretion to detain or release a noncitizen pending removal proceedings, after that individual is released from custody she has a protected liberty interest in remaining out of custody. See *Romero v. Kaiser*, No. 22-cv-02508, 2022 WL 1443250, at *2 (N.D. Cal. May 6, 2022) (“[T]his Court

joins other courts of this district facing facts similar to the present 11 case and finds Petitioner raised serious questions going to the merits of his claim that due process requires a hearing before an IJ prior to 12 re-detention.”); *Jorge M. F. v. Wilkinson*, No. 21-cv-01434, 2021 WL 783561, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 1, 2021); *Ortiz Vargas v. 13 Jennings*, No. 20-cv-5785, 2020 WL 5074312, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 2020); *Ortega*, 415 F. Supp. 3d at 969 (“Just as people on 14 parole, parole, and probation status have a liberty interest, so too does [a noncitizen released from immigration detention] have a 15 liberty interest in remaining out of custody on bond.”). 16 *Id.* (emphasis added). Other courts, including this Court, have held similarly. *Doe v. Becerra*, No. 17 2:25-CV-00647-DJC-DMC, 2025 WL 691664, at *4 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 3, 2025); see *Padilla v. U.S. 18 Immigr. & Customs Enf’t*, 704 F. Supp. 3d 1163, 1172 (W.D. Wash. 2023) (“The Supreme Court 19 has consistently held that non-punitive detention violates the Constitution unless it is strictly 20 limited, and, typically, accompanied by a prompt individualized hearing before a neutral 21 decisionmaker to ensure that the imprisonment serves the government’s legitimate goals.”). 22

III. Exhaustion 23 A. Governing Authority 24 “Section 2241 ... ‘does not specifically require petitioners to exhaust direct appeals before 25 filing petitions for habeas corpus.’” *Laing v. Ashcroft*, 370 F.3d 994, 997 (9th Cir. 2004) (citing 26 *Castro-Cortez v. INS*, 239 F.3d 1037, 1047 (9th Cir. 2001)). The Ninth Circuit, however, requires 27 that, “as a prudential matter, that habeas petitioners exhaust available judicial and administrative 28 remedies before seeking relief under § 2241.” *Castro-Cortez*, 239 F.3d at 1047 (citing *United 1 States v. Pirro*, 104 F.3d 297, 299 (9th Cir. 1997)). “Under the doctrine of exhaustion, ‘no one is 2 entitled to judicial relief for a supposed or threatened injury until the prescribed ... remedy has been 3 exhausted.’” *Laing*, 370 F.3d at 997-98 (citing *McKart v. United States*, 395 U.S. 185, 193 (1969)). 4 “Exhaustion can be either statutorily or judicially required. If exhaustion is required by statute, it 5 may be mandatory and jurisdictional, but courts have discretion to waive a prudential requirement.” 6 *Id.* at 998 (citing *El Rescate Legal Servs., Inc. v. Executive Office of Immigration Review*, 959 F.2d 7 742, 746 (9th Cir. 1991); *Stratman v. Watt*, 656 F.2d 1321, 1325-26 (9th Cir. 1981)). “Although 8 courts have discretion to waive the exhaustion requirement when it is prudentially required, this 9 discretion is not unfettered.... Lower courts ... [must] first determin[e whether] the exhaustion 10 requirement has been satisfied or properly waived.” *Id.* (internal citations omitted); see *Murillo v. 11 Mathews*, 588 F.2d 759, 762, n.8 (9th Cir. 1978) (“Although the application of the rule requiring 12 exhaustion is not jurisdictional, but calls for the sound exercise of judicial discretion, it is not lightly 13 to be disregarded.”). 14 B. Analysis 15 Petitioner contends in his petition that it would be futile to seek a bond hearing from an 16 immigration judge as his request would be summarily denied based on the government’s current 17 interpretation of the Board of Immigration Appeal’s (“BIA”) recent decisions in *Matter of Q. Li*, 18 19 I&N Dec. 66 (B.I.A. 2025) and *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (B.I.A. 2025). 19 (Doc. 1 ¶ 35). Petitioner argues that no statutory exhaustion requirements apply to his claims of 20 unlawful custody in

violation of his due process rights and that there are no administrative remedies 21 that he needs to exhaust. Id. ¶ 36. 22 Respondents do not address exhaustion of administrative remedies in their opposition to the 23 motion for preliminary injunction and, as noted above, have elected not to further brief this issue. 24 See (Docs. 10, 18). 25 The Court finds that the prudential exhaustion requirement should be waived as it would be 26 futile to seek release by administrative means. Specifically, because Respondents contend that 27 Petitioner is subject to indefinite mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) (see Doc. 10 at 28 6), under that framework, Petitioner has no statutory right to a bond hearing during his course of 1 detention and therefore lacks recourse through statutory or administrative means. See *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 282 (2018) (“§§ 1225(b) ... do[e]s not give detained aliens the right to 3 periodic bond hearings during the course of their detention.”); *Rodriguez Diaz v. Garland*, 53 F. 4 4th 1189, 1201 (9th Cir. 2022). Further, the BIA has recently held that all noncitizens present 5 within the country without admission are seeking admission pursuant to § 1225, rendering any 6 administrative relief futile. See *J.A.C.P. v. Wofford*, No. 1:25-CV-01354-KES-SKO (HC), 2025 7 WL 3013328, at *7 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 27, 2025) (“In addition, pursuit of administrative remedies 8 would almost certainly be futile given the BIA’s recent holding that all noncitizens present in the 9 United States without admission are ‘seeking admission’ for purposes of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) 10 and must be detained.”) (citing *Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216). 11 For these reasons and because Respondents do not object to and do not otherwise address 12 Petitioner’s arguments that exhaustion should be waived, the Court will waive the prudential 13 exhaustion requirement for Petitioner’s claim for habeas corpus relief. See *Chavez v. Noem*, No. 14 3:25-CV-02325-CAB-SBC, 2025 WL 2730228, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2025) (waiving 15 prudential exhaustion requirement because the BIA “already applied its expertise in deciding and 16 designating” *Hurtado* as precedential, pursuant to which detainees are subject to mandatory 17 detention without bond under § 1225(b)(2)); e.g., *Rodriguez v. Bostock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239, 1253 18 (W.D. Wash. 2025) (“The Ninth Circuit has recognized ‘the irreparable harms imposed on anyone 19 subject to immigration detention.’”) (citing *Hernandez v. Sessions*, 872 F.3d 976, 995 (9th Cir. 20 2017)); *Beltran v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-2650-LL-DEB, 2025 WL 3078837, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 21 2025); *Kuzmenko v. Phillips*, No. 25-cv-00663-DJC-AC, 2025 WL 779743, at *4 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 22 10, 2025)). 23 IV. Discussion 24 Petitioner asserts two causes of action in his petition: the “First Cause of Action” alleges a 25 violation of procedural due process and the “Second Cause of Action” alleges a violation of 26 substantive due process. Both causes of action invoke the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. 27 Constitution. 28 “The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment mandates that ‘[n]o person shall ... be 1 deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.’” *United States v. Quintero*, 995 2 F.3d 1044, 1051 (9th Cir. 2021) (citing U.S. Const. amend. V). “The Due Process Clause ‘protects 3 individuals against two types of government action’: violations of substantive due process and 4 procedural due process.” Id. (citing *United States v. Salerno*, 481 U.S. 739, 746 (1987)). 5 A. Procedural Due Process 6 1. Governing Authority 7 “Procedural due process imposes

constraints on governmental decisions which deprive 8 individuals of ‘liberty’ or ‘property’ interests within the meaning of the Due Process Clause of the 9 Fifth ... Amendment.” *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 333 (1976). “[F]reedom from 10 imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at 11 the heart of the liberty that Clause protects.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001). 12 “Procedural due process requires that, even where a deprivation of liberty survives substantive due 13 process scrutiny, the action ‘be implemented in a fair manner.’” *Quintero*, 995 F.3d at 1051-52 14 (citing *Salerno*, 481 U.S. at 746). “The ‘right to be heard before being condemned to suffer 15 grievous loss of any kind, even though it may not involve the stigma and hardships of a criminal 16 conviction, is a principle basic to our society.’” *Mathews*, 424 U.S. at 902 (citation omitted). “The 17 fundamental requirement of due process is the opportunity to be heard ‘at a meaningful time and in 18 a meaningful manner.’” *Id.* (citing *Armstrong v. Manzo*, 380 U.S. 545, 552 (1965)). “[D]ue process 19 is flexible and calls for such procedural protections as the particular situation demands.” *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471, 481 (1972). 21 “[T]he Due Process Clause applies to all ‘persons’ within the United States, including 22 aliens, whether their presence here is lawful, unlawful, temporary, or permanent.” *Zadvydas*, 533 23 U.S. at 693 (citations omitted); see *Hernandez*, 872 F.3d at 990 (“[I]t is well-established that the 24 Due Process Clause stands as a significant constraint on the manner in which the political branches 25 may exercise their plenary authority.”). “In the context of immigration detention, it is well-settled 26 that ‘due process requires adequate procedural protections to ensure that the government’s asserted 27 justification for physical confinement outweighs the individual’s constitutionally protected interest 28 in avoiding physical restraint.’” *Hernandez*, 872 F.3d at 990 (quoting *Singh v. Holder*, 638 F.3d 1196, 1203 (9th Cir. 2011)). 2 2. Analysis 3 The undersigned finds that, given the government stands solely on its arguments already 4 considered by the Court in its order granting in part Petitioner’s motion for a preliminary injunction, 5 and for the same reasons the Court found that Petitioner is likely to succeed on the merits of his 6 procedural due process claims, the undersigned recommends the Court grant Petitioner’s petition 7 for writ of habeas corpus as to his procedural due process claim. 8 In the Court’s order granting in part Petitioner’s motion for a preliminary injunction, the 9 Court found that Petitioner demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits of his procedural 10 due process claim. (Doc. 12 at 17). The Court reasoned that because Petitioner has been present 11 in the United States for approximately four years and was released on his own recognizance by ICE 12 pending completion of Section 240 removal proceedings before Respondents adopted a new 13 interpretation of the governing statutes, § 1225(b)(2) and § 1226, the government’s new 14 interpretation does not apply here such that Petitioner’s detention is not “mandatory” in this action.

15 *Id.* at 13. As to Petitioner’s arguments that his continued detention violates his due process rights,

16 the Court reasoned that Respondents failed to contend with the liberty interest created by the

fact 17 that Petitioner was released on his own recognizance in November 2021 before the government 18 adopted its recent interpretation of the governing statutes. *Id.* at 14-15; see *Pinchi*, 792 F. Supp. 3d 19 at 1032 (“...even when ICE has the initial discretion to detain or release a noncitizen pending 20 removal proceedings, after that individual is released from custody[,] she has a protected liberty 21 interest in remaining out of custody[.]”) (citations omitted); *Doe*, 2025 WL 691664, at *4; see also 22 *Padilla*, 704 F. Supp. 3d at 1172 (“The Supreme Court has consistently held that non-punitive 23 detention violates the Constitution unless it is strictly limited, and, typically, accompanied by a 24 prompt individualized hearing before a neutral decisionmaker to ensure that the imprisonment 25 serves the government’s legitimate goals.”). 26 In applying the three-part test articulated in *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 334-35 27 (1976)—which “requires consideration of three distinct factors: [(1)] the private interest that will 28 be affected by the official action; [(2)] the risk of an erroneous deprivation of such interest through 1 the procedures used, and the probable value, if any, of additional or substitute procedural 2 safeguards; and [(3)] the Government’s interest, including the function involved and the fiscal and 3 administrative burdens that the additional or substitute procedural requirement would entail”—the 4 Court found that Petitioner has a substantial private interest in being out of custody. The Court 5 reasoned that during his approximately four years on parole, Petitioner pursued gainful 6 employment, fostered relationships within his community, and kept a clean criminal record within 7 the terms of that parole such that his detention denies that liberty interest. *Id.* at 15. Further, the 8 Court found that there is at least some risk of erroneous deprivation given the record suggested 9 several reasons why Petitioner’s detention may not be justified, including Petitioner’s release on 10 parole in 2021 wherein DHS necessarily concluded that Petitioner was not a flight risk or a danger 11 to the community, and the question of whether Petitioner’s missed biometric check-ins constitute 12 changed circumstances sufficient to convince an immigration judge that detention is required, in 13 light of rapidly evolving caselaw, necessitated that some pre-deprivation process was required here 14 to justify Petitioner’s re-detention. See *id.* at 16. In consideration of the last *Mathews* factor, the 15 Court concluded that the government’s interest in detaining Petitioner without proper process is 16 slight. *Id.* at 17. Therefore, under *Mathews*, because Petitioner has shown the procedures or lack 17 thereof as applied to Petitioner are not sufficient to protect his liberty interest, the Court concluded 18 that Petitioner has demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits of his procedural due process 19 claim. *Id.* 20 Because the government does not raise any new argument in response to the Court’s 21 findings on Petitioner’s procedural due process claim and, thus, does not rebut that the merits of 22 Petitioner’s procedural due process claim are likely to succeed, the undersigned will recommend 23 that the Court grant Petitioner’s petition as to his procedural due process claim. 24

B. Substantive Due Process 25

1. Governing Authority 26

“[S]ubstantive due process prevents the government from engaging in conduct that shocks 27 the conscience, or interferes with rights implicit in the concept of ordered liberty.” *Salerno*, 481 28 U.S. at 746 (citations omitted). 1 In the criminal context, the Ninth Circuit has held that “[a] due

process violation occurs 2 when detention becomes punitive rather than regulatory, meaning there is no regulatory purpose 3 that can rationally be assigned to the detention or the detention appears excessive in relation to its 4 regulatory purpose.” *United States v. Torres*, 995 F.3d 695, 708 (9th Cir. 2021) (citing *Salerno*, 548 U.S. at 747). “[W]hile the existence of some threshold of per se due process violation may be 6 ‘undisputed,’ it has also never been clearly delineated in the context of immigration detention.” 7 *Doe v. Becerra*, 704 F. Supp. 3d 1006, 1020 (N.D. Cal. 2023) (internal citation omitted), abrogated 8 on other grounds by *Doe v. Garland*, 109 F.4th 1188 (9th Cir. 2024). 9 2. Analysis 10 Petitioner’s substantive due process claim largely mirrors his procedural due process claim 11 addressed above. Cf. (Doc. 1 ¶¶ 98-102) with (id. ¶¶ 103-08). Specifically, he alleges that the 12 government may not unjustifiably deprive him of his vested liberty interest in conditional release 13 on parole and that his continued detention is punitive in nature given he attended all of his court 14 hearings and appointments. Id. ¶ 105. 15 Similarly, in both his moving papers and his reply brief in support of the motion for 16 preliminary injunction, Petitioner argues that immigration detention, which is civil in nature, must 17 be justified by a finding of dangerousness or a flight risk and that absent these rationales, the 18 detention serves no legitimate purpose and becomes impermissibly punitive in violation of 19 substantive due process. (Doc. 2 at 9-10; Doc. 11 at 8) (citing inter alia *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690; 20 *Hernandez*, 872 F.3d at 994; *Jackson v. Indiana*, 406 U.S. 715, 738 (1972)). In opposing the motion 21 for preliminary injunction, Respondents did not directly address the substantive due process claim 22 aside from arguing generally that Petitioner is unlikely to prevail because he is an applicant for 23 admission subject to mandatory detention pending his removal proceedings. (Doc. 10 at 5-7). 24 As the Court found in its order granting in part Petitioner’s motion for preliminary 25 injunction, Respondents rely on an incorrect interpretation of § 1225 for the authority to detain 26 Petitioner. (Doc. 12 at 12-13). The Court noted the various legal arguments relied upon by the 27 government to support the assertion that Petitioner’s detention is “mandatory” under § 1225(b) 28 while his removal proceedings are pending have been rejected by this Court in other proceedings. 1 Id. (citing, e.g., *Ortiz Donis v. Chestnut*, 1:25-cv-01228-JLT, 2025 WL 2879514 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 9, 2025); *M.R.R. v. Chestnut*, No. 1:25-cv-01517-JLT, 2025 WL 3265446 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 24, 2025)). 3 Because Petitioner was processed by immigration officials and was released on recognizance 4 pending completion of Section 240 removal proceedings, the Court noted how Petitioner’s 5 circumstances are materially different from cases upon which Respondents relied where individuals 6 who had been living in the United States for nearly 30 years remained noncitizen applicants for 7 admission under § 1225(b)(2) and were therefore subject to mandatory detention without a pre- 8 deprivation hearing. Id. at 13. And as noted above, the Court rejected Respondents’ argument in 9 finding that, assuming arguendo Respondents’ recent interpretation of § 1225(b)(2) is proper and 10 may be applied to applicants for admission going forward, that interpretation does not apply here 11 because the government placed Petitioner in Section 240 removal proceedings such that Petitioner’s 12 detention is not mandatory. Id. at 13-14. 13

Notwithstanding the undersigned's finding above that Petitioner's procedural due process 14 rights were violated, the undersigned finds Petitioner fails to establish that his detention served "no 15 regulatory purpose that can rationally be assigned to the detention" or that his detention was 16 "excessive in relation to its regulatory purpose" such that the Court may conclude the detention 17 was punitive. *Torres*, 995 F.3d at 708 (citing *Salerno*, 481 U.S. at 747). Petitioner does not allege 18 in his petition that his detention was motivated by any intent of Respondents to punish him. Rather, 19 he pleads that his continued detention is punitive in nature given that he attended all of his court 20 hearings and appointments, undermining any inference that his detention is permissible due to flight 21 and/or danger considerations. 22 However, Petitioner's allegations are at least partially contradicted by the record evidence. 23 First, in connection with his supervised release, Petitioner concedes that he submitted late check- 24 in photos to DHS on three occasions. (Doc. 1-2 at 3). Second, Petitioner does not persuasively 25 refute Respondents' evidence that during his supervised release, Petitioner did not comply with his 26 reporting requirements on numerous occasions: August 4, 2025, (Missed Biometric Check-in); 27 August 8, 2025 (Missed Virtual Office Visit); August 11, 2025, (Missed Biometric Check-in); 28 August 25, 2025 (Missed Biometric Check-in); and October 6, 2025 (Missed Biometric Check-in).

1 (Doc. 10-1; ¶ 8). Finally, Petitioner signed an acknowledgement that his release was contingent on 2 enrollment and successful participation in his monitored release program, and that "[f]ailure to 3 comply with the requirements of the [release] program will result in a redetermination of your 4 release conditions or your arrest and detention." *Id.* at Exhibit 2 at 1, 2, 4. In light of this evidence, 5 Petitioner does not show that his detention was punitive or excessive in relation to the purpose of 6 the governing detention regime. 7 The only recent immigration-related case cited by Petitioner where the court addressed a 8 substantive due process violation in a habeas petitioner's detention (Doc. 2 at 9-10 & Doc. 11 at 8, 9 citing *Mahdawi v. Trump*, No. 2:25- CV-389, 781 F. Supp. 3d 214 (D. Vt. 2025), appeal filed, No. 10 25-1113 (2d Cir.)) presents starkly contrasting facts and illustrates how Petitioner's detention here 11 cannot be deemed punitive. In *Mahdawi*, the petitioner was a lawful permanent resident who 12 alleged he was arrested by immigration authorities in retaliation for his protected speech or to chill 13 the speech of others. The court granted his motion for release under *Mapp v. Reno* (241 F.3d 221 14 (2d Cir. 2001) pending resolution of the merits of his petition for habeas corpus, finding the 15 petitioner raised a substantial question concerning the constitutionality of his continued detention. 16 Importantly, while the *Mahdawi* court presumed a lawful permanent resident has a substantive due 17 process right to be free from punitive immigration detention, relevant here, the court reasoned, "[i]f 18 the Government detained Mr. Mahdawi as punishment for his speech, that purpose is not legitimate, 19 regardless of any alleged First Amendment violation. Immigration detention cannot be motivated 20 by a punitive purpose." *Id.* at 232. 21 There is no similar evidence here that Respondents' detention of Petitioner was motivated 22 by a punitive purpose. Notwithstanding the

Court's earlier finding that Petitioner is likely to succeed on the merits of his claims given Respondents' erroneous interpretation and application of the immigration detention regime under § 1225 and § 1226, the undersigned cannot find that no regulatory purpose may be assigned to his detention such as to constitute a substantive due process violation, particularly given the record evidence of his violations of release conditions and acknowledgement that such violations could result in his re-arrest. *Torres*, 995 F.3d at 708. Following the decision of a district court judge in the Northern District of California, other courts, including at least one judge of this Court, have applied a multi-factor test when considering a habeas claim of substantive due process violation brought by an immigration detainee. See generally, *Doe v. Chestnut*, -- F. Supp. 3d --, No. 1:24-cv-00943-EPG-HC, 2025 WL 3240400 4 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2025) (citing *Doe v. Becerra*, 732 F. Supp. 3d 1071 (N.D. Cal. 2024)). Cf. *Espinoza v. Wofford*, No. 1:24-cv-01118-SAB-HC, 2025 WL 1556590, at *7 n.7 (E.D. Cal. June 6 2, 2025) (acknowledging but declining to adopt and apply the *Doe v. Becerra* test). Because Petitioner here does not cite *Doe v. Becerra* and does not argue that the Court should consider the multi-factor test defined in that nonprecedential opinion, the undersigned does not undertake an analysis pursuant to *Doe* except to note that several of the *Doe* factors would seem to weigh in favor of finding no substantive due process violation. Specifically, the length of Petitioner's detention has been relatively brief and there is at least some evidence (specifically, evidence of noncompliance with release conditions) supporting the contention that Respondents' detention of Petitioner was motivated by concerns regarding his risk of flight. Accordingly, the undersigned will recommend that the Court deny Petitioner's petition as to his substantive due process claim.

V. Conclusion and Recommendation

Accordingly, IT IS RECOMMENDED that:

1. Petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus (Doc. 1) be GRANTED IN PART only as to "First Cause of Action – Procedural Due Process"; and
2. The Clerk of the Court be DIRECTED to close this case.

These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to this case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within 14 days after being served with a copy of these Findings and Recommendations, a party may file written objections with the Court. Local Rule 304(b). The document should be captioned, "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations" and shall not exceed 15 pages without leave of Court and good cause shown. The Court will not consider exhibits attached to the Objections, but a party may refer to exhibits in the record by CM/ECF document and page number. Any pages filed in excess of the 15-page limitation may be disregarded by the District Judge when reviewing these Findings and Recommendations under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). A party's failure to file any objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of certain rights on appeal. *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014).

IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: January 5, 2026

Ww Vv Ry

6 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 18

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2026/e-a-p-c-v-minga-wofford-et-al-66i5gdcw>