

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA**

**Jose Ivar Pineda Campos v. Sergio Albarran, et al.**

Pineda Campos · No. 25-cv-06920-JD · Decided November 5, 2025

---

**OPINION**

1 2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 3 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 4 5  
JOSE IVAR PINEDA CAMPOS, Case No. 25-cv-06920-JD 6 Plaintiff, ORDER RE  
PRELIMINARY 7 v. INJUNCTION 8 SERGIO ALBARRAN, et al., Defendants. 9 10 Petitioner  
Jose Ivar Pineda Campos, an asylum seeker from Nicaragua, filed a writ of 11 habeas corpus  
against respondents Sergio Albarran<sup>1</sup>, Field Office Director of the San Francisco 12 Immigration  
and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Office; Todd Lyons, Acting Director of ICE; Kristi 13 Noem,  
Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security; and Pam Bondi, U.S. Attorney 14  
General, all named in their official capacities.

See Dkt. No. 1. Pineda Campos filed an application 15 for a temporary restraining order for  
release from detention, Dkt. No. 2, which the duty judge 16 granted, Dkt. No. 4. He asks for a  
preliminary injunction barring detention by respondents 17 without a prior hearing before a  
neutral decisionmaker. See Dkt. No. 15.

The parties' familiarity 18 with the record is assumed and an injunction is granted. 19 The salient  
facts are undisputed, and the government has not indicated that any material 20 facts have  
changed since the TRO was granted. Pineda Campos has raised a serious legal 21 question, and  
demonstrated a likelihood of success, with respect to the merits of whether he may 22 be detained  
in the circumstances presented here, and has also made a sufficient showing on the 23 other  
factors that the Court considers when granting a preliminary injunction.

See Am. Fed'n of 24 Gov't Emps., *AFL-CIO v. Trump*, No. 25-CV-03070-JD, 2025 WL 1755442,  
at \*8 (N.D. Cal. 25 June 24, 2025) (citing *Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127,  
1131 (9th Cir. 26 2011)); Dkt. No. 4 at 12-19.

The government's contentions to the contrary have been addressed 27 1 and disallowed by the  
Court in cases substantively identical to this one. See *Caicedo Hinestroza 2 et al. v. Kaiser et al.*,  
25-cv-07559-JD, Dkt. No. 8 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025). That discussion and 3 reasoning are  
incorporated here.

The government has not presented a good reason to reach a 4 || different conclusion at this time. 5  
Consequently, a preliminary injunction is granted on the ensuing terms. If circumstances 6 ||  
change materially, the government may request a modification of the injunction. 7 (1)

Respondents, and their officers, agents, employees, attorneys, and any person acting in 8 concert with them, or at their behest, and who has knowledge of this injunction, are enjoined from 9 detaining petitioner Jose Ivar Pineda Campos without a pre-detention hearing before a neutral 10 || decisionmaker.

11 (2) Respondents, and their officers, agents, employees, attorneys, and any person acting in 12 concert with them, or at their behest, and who has knowledge of this injunction, are enjoined from 5 13 || transferring petitioner Jose Ivar Pineda Campos out of the District without the Court's prior 14 approval. 15 There is no realistic likelihood of harm to respondents from enjoining their conduct, and so 16 || Pineda Campos need not give security under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c).

See 3 17 Jorgensen v. Cassiday, 320 F.3d 906, 919-20 (9th Cir. 2003); Barahona-Gomez v. Reno, 18 167 F.3d 1228, 1237 (9th Cir. 1999). 19 The parties are directed to jointly propose by November 28, 2025, a briefing schedule on 20 || the petition for a writ of habeas corpus. 21 IT IS SO ORDERED. 22 Dated: November 5, 2025 23 24 25 JAMES/#!/ONATO United ftates District Judge 26 27 28