

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Ingerman Javier P.S. v. Timothy S. Robbins, et al.

No. 1:26-cv-00128-KES-SKO (HC), Doc. 5 · No. No. 1:26-cv-00128-KES-SKO (HC) · Decided January 9,
2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California converted petitioner Ingerman Javier P.S.’s motion for a temporary restraining order into a motion for a preliminary injunction and granted it. The court ordered respondents to release petitioner immediately and barred re-detention absent clear and convincing evidence at a pre-deprivation bond hearing that petitioner is a flight risk or danger to the community.

OPINION

Robbins

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4

5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

6 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

7

8 INGERMAN JAVIER P.S., No. 1:26-cv-00128-KES-SKO (HC)

9 Petitioner, ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR

10 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

v.

11 Doc. 5

TIMOTHY S. ROBBINS, Field Office 12 Director of the Los Angeles Field Office of U.S.
Immigration and Customs 13 Enforcement; TODD LYONS, Acting Director of United States
Immigration and 14 Customs Enforcement; U.S.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND

15 SECURITY; KRISTI NOEM, Secretary of the United States Department of Homeland 16
Security; CHRISTOPHER CHESTNUT, Warden of California City Detention 17 Facility; and
PAMELA BONDI, Attorney General of the United States, 18 Respondents. 19 20 21 Before the
Court is petitioner Ingerman Javier P.S.’s motion for temporary restraining 22 order.1 Doc. 5. The
Court has addressed the legal issues raised by petitioner’s motion for 23 temporary restraining
order in prior cases. See, e.g., Clene C.D. v. Robbins, No. 1:25-CV-01463- 24 KES-SKO (HC),
2025 WL 3492118 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 4, 2025); Carmen G.C. v. Robbins, No. 1:25- 25 1 As

recommended by the Committee on Court Administration and Case Management of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Court omits petitioner's full name, using only his 26 first name and last initial, to protect sensitive personal information. See Memorandum re: Privacy 27 Concern Regarding Social Security and Immigration Opinions, Committee on Court Administration and Case Management, Judicial Conference of the United States (May 1, 2018), 28 https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/18-cv-l-suggestion_cacm_0.pdf. 1 CV-01648-KES-HBK (HC), 2025 WL 3521304 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 8, 2025); Bilal A. v. Wofford, No. 2 1:25-CV-01715-KES-HBK (HC), 2025 WL 3648366 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2025); W.V.S.M. v. 3 Wofford, No. 1:25-CV-01489-KES-HBK (HC), 2025 WL 3236521 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2025). 4 The Court ordered respondents to show cause as to whether there are any factual or legal 5 issues in this case that render it distinguishable from the Court's prior orders in Clene C.D. v. 6 Robbins, Carmen G.C. v. Robbins, Bilal A. v. Wofford, and W.V.S.M. v. Wofford, and that would 7 justify denying the motion. Doc. 6. The Court also ordered respondents to state their position on 8 whether the motion should be converted to a motion for preliminary injunction and whether they 9 request a hearing. Id. Respondents did not identify any factual or legal issues in this case that 10 distinguish it from the cases cited in the Court's minute order, and they also did not object to 11 converting the motion or request a hearing. See Doc. 11. 12 As respondents have not identified any factual or legal issues in this case that render it 13 distinguishable from the Court's prior decisions in Clene C.D. v. Robbins, No. 1:25-CV-01463- 14 KES-SKO (HC), 2025 WL 3492118 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 4, 2025); Carmen G.C. v. Robbins, No. 1:25- 15 CV-01648-KES-HBK (HC), 2025 WL 3521304 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 8, 2025); Bilal A. v. Wofford, No. 16 1:25-CV-01715-KES-HBK (HC), 2025 WL 3648366 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2025); W.V.S.M. v. 17 Wofford, No. 1:25-CV-01489-KES-HBK (HC), 2025 WL 3236521 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2025), 18 and for the reasons stated in those prior orders, petitioner's motion for temporary restraining order 19 is converted to a motion for a preliminary injunction and is GRANTED. 20 Respondents are ORDERED to release petitioner immediately. Respondents are 21 ENJOINED AND RESTRAINED from re-detaining petitioner unless they demonstrate, by clear 22 and convincing evidence at a pre-deprivation bond hearing before a neutral decisionmaker, that 23 petitioner is a flight risk or danger to the community such that his physical custody is legally 24 justified. 25 The bond requirement of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c) is waived. Courts 26 regularly waive security in cases like this one. See Diaz v. Brewer, 656 F.3d 1008, 1015 (9th Cir. 27 2011); Pinchi v. Noem, No. 25-CV-05632-RMI (RFL), 2025 WL 1853763, at *4 (N.D. Cal. July 28 4, 2025). 1 This matter is referred to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings including 2 | the preparation of findings and recommendations on the petition or other appropriate action. 3

4 | ISSO ORDERED. _

5 Dated: _ January 9, 2026 4h

‘ UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

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

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/ingerman-javier-p-s-v-timothy-s-robbins-et-al-9bejfxwg>