

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Pierre Osama Zarif Hanna v. Ernesto Santacruz Jr. et al.

Hanna · No. 5:26-cv-00267-ODW (KSx) · Decided January 29, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California denied Pierre Osama Zarif Hanna’s ex parte application for a temporary restraining order seeking to prevent his removal from the United States and relocation outside California. The court held that 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) barred judicial review of the requested challenge to execution of a removal order. Alternatively, the court concluded that Hanna failed to show a likelihood of success on his Zadvydas-based detention claim because his detention had lasted only 26 days and he had not shown that removal was not reasonably foreseeable.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Otis D. Wright II
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	January 29, 2026
DOCKET	5:26-cv-00267-ODW (KSx)
DISPOSITION	denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner filed a 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition challenging immigration detention and then sought an ex parte temporary restraining order prohibiting his removal and relocation outside California. The court denied the TRO.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A TRO is an extraordinary remedy requiring a clear showing of entitlement. The standard is substantially identical to the preliminary-injunction standard, requiring consideration of the Winter factors: likelihood of success on the merits, likelihood of irreparable harm, balance of equities, and the public interest.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Pierre Osama Zarif Hanna v. Ernesto Santacruz Jr., Todd M. Lyons, James Janecka, Kristi Noem, Pamela Bondi

TOPICS

immigration detention

injunctions

federal habeas corpus

subject matter jurisdiction

removal proceedings

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration law

federal habeas corpus

civil procedure

constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) deprived the district court of jurisdiction over Hanna's request to enjoin execution of a removal order.
2. Whether Hanna established a likelihood of success on his claim that his immigration detention violated *Zadvydas v. Davis* and therefore satisfied the first Winter factor for a temporary restraining order.

HOLDINGS

1. Section 1252(g) bars the district court from reviewing Hanna's request to restrain the government from executing a removal order.
2. Hanna did not establish a likelihood of success on his *Zadvydas* claim because his detention had lasted only twenty-six days, was within the presumptively reasonable six-month period, and he did not show that removal was not reasonably foreseeable.
3. The TRO must be denied because Hanna failed to show a likelihood of success on the merits, the threshold and most important Winter factor.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"A temporary restraining order ("TRO") is an "extraordinary remedy that may only be awarded upon a clear showing that the plaintiff is entitled to such relief." (2)

"First, the Supreme Court held that the government does not have the power to "hold indefinitely in confinement an alien ordered removed." (3)

"After six months, if "the alien provides good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future, the Government must respond with evidence sufficient to rebut that showing." (3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Hanna, an Egyptian citizen who entered the United States on a visitor visa in August 2023, applied for asylum based on alleged harm related to his Coptic Christian faith. Law enforcement arrested him on December 31, 2025, after a fight at his girlfriend's building, charging him with resisting arrest; he asserted that he was not involved in the altercation. He was detained by immigration authorities and sought to prevent his removal and relocation while his asylum application and habeas petition were pending.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Hanna filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus on January 21, 2026, alleging that his immigration detention violated due process and statutory protections. On January 26, 2026, he filed an ex parte application for a TRO

barring removal to Egypt or another country and relocation outside California pending adjudication of the habeas petition. Respondents did not oppose the application, and the district court denied it.

DISPOSITION

denied

CASES CITED

- Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20, 22 (2008)
- Stuhlberg International Sales Co. v. John D. Brush & Co., 240 F.3d 832, 839 n.7 (9th Cir. 2001)
- American Trucking Ass'ns, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles, 559 F.3d 1046, 1052 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678, 680, 687, 697, 701 (2001)
- Rauda v. Jennings, 55 F.4th 773, 778 (9th Cir. 2022)
- Ndandu v. Noem, No. 3:25-cv-02939-RBM-MSB, 2026 WL 25848, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2026)
- Kumar v. Gonzales, 555 F. Supp. 2d 1061, 1064 (N.D. Cal. 2008)
- Environmental Protection Information Center v. Carlson, 968 F.3d 985, 989 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Baird v. Bonta, 81 F.4th 1036, 1040, 1042 (9th Cir. 2023)