

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

**Santos Orozco Valle v. Bruce Scott, Warden, Northwest ICE
Processing Center, et al.**

Orozco Valle v. Scott · No. 2:25-cv-02429 · Decided December 2, 2025

OPINION

Scott

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

AT SEATTLE

7

SANTOS OROZCO VALLE, CASE NO. 2:25-cv-02429

8 Petitioner, ORDER DENYING PETITIONER’S EX

9 PARTE EMERGENCY MOTION FOR

v. TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

10 AND STAY OF REMOVAL

BRUCE SCOTT, Warden, Northwest 11 ICE Processing Center; CAMMILLA WAMSLEY,
Director of Enforcement 12 and Removal Operations, Seattle Field Office, Immigration and
Customs 13 Enforcement; KRISTI NOEM, Secretary of U.S. Department of 14 Homeland
Security; PAMELA BONDI, United States Attorney General, 15 Respondents. 16 17 This matter
comes before the Court on Petitioner Santos Orozco Valle’s Ex 18 Parte Emergency Motion for
Temporary Restraining Order and Stay of Removal. 19 Dkt. No. 2. He asks the Court to enjoin
Respondents from removing him from the 20 United States pending resolution of his Petition for
Writ of Habeas Corpus. See Dkt.

21 No. 1.

22 23 1 Petitioner styles his motion as an ex parte request, seeking relief before 2 Respondents
have an opportunity to respond. But ex parte relief is extraordinary, 3 and the motion does not
address the applicable standard. Federal Rule of Civil

4 Procedure 65(b)(1) permits a court to issue a TRO without notice to the adverse

5 party only if the movant provides “specific facts in an affidavit or a verified 6 complaint”
demonstrating “that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage 7 will result to the movant
before the adverse party can be heard in opposition.” Fed. 8 R. Civ. P. 65(b)(1)(A). The movant’s
attorney must also certify in writing “any 9 efforts made to give notice and the reasons why it

should not be required.” Fed. R. 10 Civ. P. 65(b)(1)(B). This district’s Local Civil Rules reinforce this rule, noting that 11 motions for TROs “without notice to and an opportunity to be heard by the adverse 12 party are disfavored and will rarely be granted.” LCR 65(b)(1). 13 Petitioner’s motion does not address this heightened standard. While the 14 motion articulates Petitioner’s claims and the traditional TRO factors, it does not 15 explain why relief is necessary before Respondents have an opportunity to respond, 16 nor does it certify any efforts to provide notice or explain why notice should not be 17 required. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b)(1). On this record, the Court does not find that 18 Petitioner’s case falls within those “very few circumstances justifying the issuance 19 of an ex parte TRO.” *Reno Air Racing Ass’n, Inc. v. McCord*, 452 F.3d 1126, 1131 20 (9th Cir. 2006); see also *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 24 (2008) 21 (preliminary injunctive relief is an “extraordinary remedy never awarded as of 22 right.”). 23 1 The Court recognizes that Petitioner raises serious concerns about the 2 prospect of removal to a third country before he can present his claims to this Court. 3 If circumstances warrant immediate relief before Respondents can respond, 4 Petitioner may refile with the certification required by Rule 65(b)(1)(B). 5 Alternatively, Petitioner may proceed under this district’s standard TRO 6 procedures, see LCR 65(b), which require service on Respondents and provide for an 7 expedited response, see LCR 65(b)(5) (requiring response within 48 hours of service). 8 Accordingly, Petitioner’s Ex Parte Emergency Motion for Temporary 9 Restraining Order and Stay of Removal, Dkt. No. 2, is DENIED WITHOUT 10 PREJUDICE. 11 Dated this 2nd day of December, 2025. 12 a Jamal N. Whitehead 13 United States District Judge 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23