

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA, ALEXANDRIA DIVISION

Jorge Antonio Lopez Valasquez v. Judge S. Maurice Hicks, Jr., Brian
Acuna, et al.

Lopez Valasquez · No. 1:26-0024 · Decided January 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana denied Jorge Antonio Lopez Valasquez’s motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. The court declined to enjoin his removal or transfer while his habeas petition concerning immigration detention and a potential bond hearing proceeds on an expedited briefing schedule.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Alexandria Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Alexandria Division
DECIDED	January 6, 2026
DOCKET	1:26-0024
DISPOSITION	denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Habeas petitioner moved for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction barring his removal from the United States and transfer outside the court's jurisdiction while his habeas petition was pending.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Whether to grant or deny a temporary restraining order lies within the district court's discretion. The movant must demonstrate a substantial likelihood of success on the merits, a substantial threat of irreparable injury, that the threatened injury outweighs the threatened harm to the opposing party, and that the injunction will not disserve the public interest.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district-court order
PARTIES	Jorge Antonio Lopez Valasquez v. Judge S. Maurice Hicks, Jr., Brian Acuna, Department of Homeland Security, other Respondents

TOPICS

immigration detention

federal habeas corpus

injunctions

removal proceedings

immigration

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration law

federal habeas corpus

injunctive relief

immigration detention

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the petitioner was entitled to a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction prohibiting his removal from the United States during the pendency of his habeas petition.
2. Whether the petitioner was entitled to injunctive relief prohibiting his transfer to another immigration detention facility.
3. Whether injunctive relief duplicating the relief sought in the habeas petition could be used to obtain an expedited detention or bond hearing.

HOLDINGS

1. The motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction was denied because petitioner failed to establish the requirements for extraordinary injunctive relief, including a substantial likelihood of success and a substantial threat of irreparable injury.
2. Petitioner was not entitled to an injunction against transfer because speculation or conclusory allegations of irreparable injury are insufficient, and he had not shown a likelihood that he would be transferred.
3. The court would not use injunctive relief to bypass the habeas process or decide immediately the detention relief sought in the habeas petition.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“An applicant for a Temporary Restraining Order must demonstrate each of the following: (1) a substantial likelihood his cause will succeed on the merits, (2) a substantial threat of irreparable injury if the injunction is not granted, (3) the threatened injury outweighs the threatened harm the injunction may do to the opposing party, and (4) granting the injunction will not disserve the public interest.” (Order)

“Seeking injunctive relief that mirrors the relief requested in the habeas petition is nothing more than a motion to decide the habeas petition now.” (Order)

“Mere speculation or conclusory allegations of an irreparable injury are insufficient to entitle a movant to injunctive relief.” (Order)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jorge Antonio Lopez Valasquez was detained in immigration custody and sought relief as a member of the Bond Denial Class. He requested an order requiring his release or a bond hearing and separately sought to prevent the government from removing him from the United States or transferring him to another facility while the habeas action proceeded. The court found that he had not shown a likelihood of transfer or sufficient irreparable injury.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed a habeas petition on January 5, 2026, seeking release from immigration custody or, alternatively, a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). He filed the motion for temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction the following day. The district court denied the motion and directed that the habeas case proceed on an expedited briefing schedule after service on the respondents.

DISPOSITION

denied

CASES CITED

- *Misquitta v. Warden Pine Prairie ICE Processing Center*, 353 F. Supp. 518, 521 (W.D. La. Nov. 16, 2018)
- *Piedmont Heights Civic Club, Inc. v. Moreland*, 637 F.2d 430 (5th Cir. 1981)
- *Moore v. Brown*, 868 F.3d 398, 402 (5th Cir. 2017)
- *Albright v. City of New Orleans*, 46 F. Supp. 2d 523, 532 (E.D. La. 1999)
- *Suburban Propane, L.P. v. D & S GCTX LLC*, 2025 WL 2429087, at *2 (W.D. Tex. 2025)
- *Anderson v. Jackson*, 556 F.3d 351, 355–56 (5th Cir. 2009)
- *Garcia-Aleman v. Thompson*, No. 5:25-CV-00886, ECF No. 20 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 30, 2025)
- *Lotter v. Lyons*, 2025 WL 2946630, at *1 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 22, 2025)