

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
NEW YORK

Jose Timoteo Leon Galdamez v. Kenneth Genalo, et al.

No. 1:26-cv-1170-GHW, United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (February 12, 2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of New York issued an order in a 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas proceeding concerning the detention of Jose Timoteo Leon Galdamez. The court directed the respondents to provide information about the petitioner’s location, detention, authority for detention, removal order, and immigration proceedings, and set deadlines for filing a return and any reply.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of New York
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Gregory H. Woods
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of New York
DECIDED	February 12, 2026
DOCKET	1:26-cv-1170-GHW
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and an application for issuance of an order; the court issued an interim procedural order directing respondents to provide information and file a return.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Jose Timoteo Leon Galdamez v. Kenneth Genalo, et al.

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- immigration detention
- immigration
- removal proceedings
- administrative procedure act

PRACTICE AREAS

- immigration
- federal habeas corpus
- immigration detention
- administrative law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should require respondents to clarify petitioner's place of detention and the proper district for adjudication before proceeding with the habeas petition.
2. What information respondents must provide concerning petitioner's detention authority, removal order, and pending immigration proceedings.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner Jose Timoteo Leon Galdamez filed a § 2241 habeas petition challenging his immigration detention. The petition alleged that petitioner was located in the Southern District of New York when the petition was filed, but the court required respondents to confirm that allegation and provide information concerning his detention, removal status, and related immigration proceedings.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The petition was filed in the Southern District of New York. Before requiring a substantive response, the court ordered respondents to clarify petitioner's location at filing, detention information, statutory authority for detention, any final removal order, and the status of immigration proceedings, and set deadlines for a return and reply.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Öztürk v. Hyde, 136 F.4th 382 (2d Cir. 2025)
- Khalil v. Joyce, 771 F. Supp. 3d 268 (S.D.N.Y. 2025)