

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Jameurahman Noori v. Christopher LaRose, et al.

Noori · No. 25-cv-03006-BAS-MMP · Decided November 26, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California grants Jameurahman Noori’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The court holds that revoking his humanitarian parole without notice, individualized consideration, reasoning, or an opportunity to be heard violated the Fifth Amendment and that the Government also failed to comply with the applicable parole regulations under the Administrative Procedure Act. The court orders Respondents to release Noori from immigration custody on the same humanitarian-parole conditions previously granted while his asylum claim proceeds.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Cynthia Bashant
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	November 26, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-03006-BAS-MMP
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging the revocation of humanitarian parole and resulting immigration detention.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the legality of Petitioner’s custody under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, assessed the asserted jurisdictional bars narrowly in light of the presumption favoring judicial review, applied the Mathews v. Eldridge procedural due process framework, and reviewed the parole revocation under the Administrative Procedure Act’s arbitrary-and-capricious standard.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion
PARTIES	Jameurahman Noori v. Christopher LaRose, et al.

TOPICS

federal habeas corpus immigration detention procedural due process administrative procedure act
judicial review of agency action

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration habeas corpus administrative law constitutional law immigration detention

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Petitioner's challenge to the revocation of humanitarian parole and resulting detention was cognizable under 28 U.S.C. § 2241.
2. Whether 8 U.S.C. §§ 1252(g) or 1252(b)(9) deprived the district court of jurisdiction over Petitioner's challenge to his detention.
3. Whether revoking Petitioner's humanitarian parole without notice, reasons, individual consideration, or an opportunity to be heard violated the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.
4. Whether the Government violated the Administrative Procedure Act and its own regulations by revoking humanitarian parole without satisfying the regulatory termination criteria and written-notice requirement.
5. Whether Petitioner was entitled to release from immigration custody on the same humanitarian-parole conditions previously granted.

HOLDINGS

1. A § 2241 habeas petition is an appropriate vehicle for challenging detention resulting from the revocation of humanitarian parole when the petitioner challenges the legality of his custody rather than the underlying removal proceedings.
2. Section 1252(g) does not strip jurisdiction over an independent challenge to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) when the petitioner is not challenging the commencement of proceedings, adjudication of a case, or execution of a removal order.
3. Section 1252(b)(9) does not bar habeas jurisdiction over a challenge to the revocation of humanitarian parole and resulting detention when the petitioner does not seek review of a removal order or challenge the process by which removability will be determined.
4. The Government violated the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause by revoking Petitioner's humanitarian parole without notice, individual consideration, reasons, or an opportunity to be heard.
5. The Government's revocation of Petitioner's humanitarian parole violated the APA and governing regulations because the Government did not show that a regulatory basis for termination existed and did not provide the required written notice.
6. Petitioner was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus and release from immigration custody on the same humanitarian-parole conditions granted on June 17, 2024, while pursuing his asylum claim.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court ORDERS Respondents to release Petitioner Jameurahman Noori (A244-5 85-606) from immigration custody on the same conditions of humanitarian parole that were granted on June 17, 2024, while he advances his asylum claim.” (at 1)

“The Due Process clause generally ‘requires some kind of a hearing before the State deprives a person of liberty.’” (at 3)

“The Court finds all three factors support a finding that the Government’s revocation of Petitioner’s humanitarian parole without notification, individual consideration, reasoning, or an opportunity to be heard violated his Due Process rights.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jameurahman Noori, an Afghan citizen whose family had worked with the U.S. military, fled Afghanistan after Taliban threats related to his application to become a military translator. The United States granted him humanitarian parole on June 17, 2024, for two years so that he could pursue asylum, and he received work authorization while developing community ties. ICE detained him on October 3, 2025, and his parole was revoked three days later without notification, individual consideration, stated reasoning, or an opportunity to be heard. The Government thereafter treated him as subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner, an Afghan citizen paroled into the United States to pursue asylum, was detained by ICE and had his humanitarian parole revoked without stated reasons or written notice. He filed a § 2241 habeas petition seeking release. The Government opposed the petition, arguing that the jurisdiction-stripping provisions of 8 U.S.C. §§ 1252(g) and 1252(b)(9) applied and that detention was mandatory under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). The district court rejected those arguments, granted the petition, ordered release on the prior parole conditions, and directed the Clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

CASES CITED

- Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, 542 U.S. 507, 525 (2004)
- Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 484 (1973)
- Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678, 687, 690 (2001)
- Ibarra-Perez v. United States, 154 F.4th 989, 995, 997 (9th Cir. 2025)
- Arce v. United States, 899 F.3d 796, 801 (9th Cir. 2018)
- Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm., 525 U.S. 471, 482 (1999)
- Jennings v. Rodriguez, 583 U.S. 281, 294 (2018)
- J.E.F.M. v. Lynch, 837 F.3d 1026, 1032 (9th Cir. 2016)

- *Nielsen v. Preap*, 586 U.S. 392, 402 (2019)
- *Boumediene v. Bush*, 553 U.S. 723, 766 (2008)
- *Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 306 (1993)
- *Salazar v. Casey*, No. 25-CV-2784 JLS (VET), 2025 WL 3063629, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 3, 2025)
- *Zinerman v. Burch*, 494 U.S. 113, 127 (1990)
- *Pinchi v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-5632-PCP, 2025 WL 2084921, at *3 (N.D. Cal. July 25, 2025)
- *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 334–35 (1976)
- *Noori v. LaRose*, No. 25-CV-1824-GPC-MSB, 2025 WL 2800149, at *8–9 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 1, 2025)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-ca/2025/jameurahman-noori-v-christopher-larose-et-al-8egn6u15>