

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
KENTUCKY, OWENSBORO DIVISION

Marie Anne Souffrance v. Jason Woosley, et al.

Souffrance · No. 4:26-cv-222-RGJ · Decided April 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky grants Marie Anne Souffrance’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging her immigration detention. The court holds that 8 U.S.C. § 1226, rather than § 1225(b)(2), governs her detention and concludes that her continued detention without a bond hearing violates due process. The court orders her immediate release, subject to a neutral bond hearing before an immigration judge before any re-detention.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky, Owensboro Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky, Owensboro Division
DECIDED	April 15, 2026
DOCKET	4:26-cv-222-RGJ
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging immigration detention under 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225 and 1226 and alleging violation of the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the three-part Mathews v. Eldridge balancing test to determine whether continued civil detention violated due process.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Marie Anne Souffrance v. Jason Woosley, et al., United States

TOPICS

- immigration detention
- removal proceedings
- procedural due process
- due process
- statutory interpretation

PRACTICE AREAS

- immigration
- immigration detention
- habeas corpus
- constitutional law
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Souffrance's detention was governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) or 8 U.S.C. § 1226.
2. Whether Souffrance's continued detention without an individualized merits bond hearing violated the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause and the Immigration and Nationality Act.
3. Whether release followed by a bond hearing before a neutral immigration judge was the proper habeas remedy.

HOLDINGS

1. Section 1226, rather than § 1225(b)(2), governed Souffrance's detention because she had been present in the United States for approximately three years, was not seeking admission, was not designated as an arriving alien in her Notice to Appear, and was arrested under an I-200 warrant whose authority arose under § 1226.
2. Souffrance's continued detention violated the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause and the INA because she had been detained under § 1226 without a merits bond hearing before a neutral immigration judge.
3. The proper remedy was immediate release from the unlawful detention followed by a bond hearing on the merits before a neutral immigration judge before any re-detention.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Due Process Clause extends to all persons regardless of status.” (Section II.B)

“Habeas has traditionally been a means to secure release from unlawful detention.” (Section III)

“The United States is directed to release Petitioner Souffrance immediately because of the unlawful detention in violation of her due process rights.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Marie Anne Souffrance, a Haitian citizen who had lived in the United States since March 2023, entered without inspection, was released on recognizance, and was placed in removal proceedings. After a March 2026 altercation with her partner, she was arrested locally and transferred to ICE custody, where ICE issued an I-200 arrest warrant and detained her at the Grayson County Jail. She had a pending asylum application, had previously applied for Temporary Protected Status, had three minor children, and had not received a merits bond hearing before an immigration judge.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Souffrance was detained by Immigration and Customs Enforcement and filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The United States responded and incorporated arguments from related Sixth Circuit appeals; Souffrance replied. The parties agreed that no evidentiary hearing was necessary. The district court granted the petition, ordered immediate release, and required a bond hearing before a neutral immigration judge before any re-detention.

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The United States must immediately release Souffrance because of the unlawful detention, provide a bond hearing before a neutral immigration judge pursuant to § 1226 before any re-detention, and certify compliance on the docket by April 15, 2026.

CASES CITED

- Edahi v. Lewis, 2025 WL 3466682, at *2-3, *5-*13 (W.D. Ky. Nov. 27, 2025)
- Vicen v. Lewis, 2026 WL 541171, at *2-*9 (W.D. Ky. Feb. 26, 2026)
- Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft, Case No. 25-1965 (6th Cir. Oct. 27, 2025)
- Alvarez v. Noem, Case No. 25-1969 (6th Cir. Oct. 27, 2025)
- Contreras-Cervantes v. Raycraft, Case No. 25-1978 (6th Cir. Oct. 28, 2025)
- Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft, Case No. 25-1982 (6th Cir. Oct. 29, 2025)
- Loper Bright Enters., 603 U.S. at 413
- A.A.R.P. v. Trump, 605 U.S. 91, 94 (2025)
- Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319, 335 (1976)
- Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, 542 U.S. 507, 529 (2004)
- Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001)
- Munoz Materano, 2025 WL 2630826, at *15
- Sampiao, 2025 WL 2607924, at *12
- Hyppolite v. Noem, 2025 WL 2829511, at *15-*16 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 6, 2025)
- Günaydin v. Trump, 2025 WL 1459154, at *10 (D. Minn. May 21, 2025)
- Thuraissigiam, 591 U.S. at 107
- Lopez-Arevelo v. Ripa, 2025 WL 2691828, at *12 (W.D. Tex. Sep. 22, 2025)
- Black v. Decker, 103 F.4th 133, 149-150 (2d Cir. 2024)
- Matter of Guerra, 24 I. & N. 37, 40 (BIA 2006)
- Maldonado, 2025 WL 2968042, at *9-10
- Morales-Martinez v. Raycraft, 2025 WL 3124695, at *7 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 7, 2025)