

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Miriam Francisca Ruiz Diaz v. Christopher J. Larose, et al.

Ruiz Diaz v. Larose · No. 3:25-cv-3517-CAB-SBC · Decided December 22, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California grants Miriam Francisca Ruiz Diaz's petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The court holds that her re-detention by immigration officials after release on her own recognizance, without notice or a pre-detention hearing, violated the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, and orders her immediate release subject to the prior release conditions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	December 22, 2025
DOCKET	3:25-cv-3517-CAB-SBC
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging immigration detention.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, the court determined whether Petitioner was in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States; Petitioner bore the burden of demonstrating illegal custody.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district court order; precedential status is unknown.
PARTIES	Miriam Francisca Ruiz Diaz v. Christopher J. Larose, et al.

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- immigration detention
- procedural due process
- due process
- removal proceedings

PRACTICE AREAS

- immigration
- habeas corpus
- constitutional law
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Petitioner had a protectable liberty interest in remaining out of immigration custody after being released on her own recognizance.
2. Whether re-detaining Petitioner without notice or a pre-detention hearing violated the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.
3. Whether Petitioner was entitled to habeas relief and an order requiring release from custody.

HOLDINGS

1. A person released from immigration custody on her own recognizance has a protectable liberty interest in remaining out of custody.
2. Re-detaining a person who had been released from immigration custody on her own recognizance, without notice or a pre-detention hearing, violated the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.
3. Petitioner was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus because her detention violated the Fifth Amendment.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that Clause protects.” (at 2)

“the government’s decision to release an individual from custody creates an implicit promise, upon which that individual may rely, that their liberty will be revoked only if they fail to live up to the conditions of release.” (at 2)

“Petitioner was detained by immigration officials, released on her own recognizance, and then re-detained without notice or a hearing, which violates the due process to which she is entitled.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner, a Mexican national who entered the United States in 1990, was detained by ICE in 2014 and released on her own recognizance subject to conditions. Her removal proceedings were administratively closed in 2015. After ICE directed her to appear for a check-in on October 9, 2025, masked ICE officers detained her without notice, and she remained in custody without an explanation for revocation of her release.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed a habeas petition on December 10, 2025, challenging her continued detention by immigration authorities after she was re-detained without notice or a hearing. The parties submitted briefing, and the court decided the matter on the papers. The court granted the writ and ordered her immediate release under the prior conditions of release, while enjoining re-detention without notice and a pre-detention hearing before a neutral decisionmaker.

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Respondents were ordered to immediately release Petitioner under the same conditions as her prior release on recognizance and were enjoined from re-detaining her without notice and a pre-detention hearing before a neutral decisionmaker.

CASES CITED

- *Martinez v. Noem*, No. 25-CV-2740-BJC-BJW, 2025 WL 3171738, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2025)
- *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001)
- *Wong Wing v. United States*, 163 U.S. 228, 238 (1896)
- *Valencia Zapata v. Kaiser*, No. 25-CV-07492-RFL, 2025 WL 2578207, at *2-*3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 5, 2025)
- *Pinchi v. Noem*, 792 F. Supp. 3d 1025, 1032, 1036 (N.D. Cal. 2025)
- *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471, 482 (1972)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 MIRIAM FRANCISCA RUIZ DIAZ, Case No.: 3:25-cv-3517-CAB-SBC 12
Petitioner, ORDER GRANTING WRIT OF 13 v. HABEAS CORPUS 14 CHRISTOPHER J.
LAROSE, et al., 15 Respondents. 16 17 On December 10, 2025, Petitioner Miriam Francisca Ruiz
Diaz filed a petition for a 18 writ of habeas corpus.

[Doc. No. 1.] The parties filed briefings addressing the issues in 19 this case. [Doc. Nos. 4–5.] The
Court finds it appropriate for determination on the papers. 20 See CivLR 7.1.(d)(1). For the
reasons below, the Court GRANTS the writ of habeas 21 corpus and orders Respondents to
immediately RELEASE Petitioner from custody under 22 the same conditions as her previous
order of release on recognizance.

23 I. BACKGROUND 24 Petitioner, a Mexican national, entered the United States in 1990 when
she was ten 25 years old with her mother. [Doc. No. 1 at 4, 6; Doc. No. 1-5 at 1.] In 2014,
Petitioner was 26 detained by ICE and placed into removal proceedings pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §
1229(a). 27 [Doc. No. 1 at 7.] ICE subsequently released Petitioner on her own recognizance with
28 conditions including appearing at immigration hearings, notifying ICE of any address 1
changes, and not violating any laws.

[Id.] In 2015, Petitioner and the government filed a 2 joint motion to administratively close
Petitioner’s removal proceedings, which was 3 granted. [Doc. No. 1-7 at 5; Doc. No. 1-8.] On
September 26, 2025, Petitioner received a 4 letter from ICE telling her to appear for a check in and
information update on October 9, 5 2025. [Doc. No. 1-9.] When Petitioner appeared that day, two
masked ICE officers 6 detained her without notice.

[Doc. No. 1 at 8.] Petitioner has remained in ICE custody 7 since without an explanation for the revocation of her release. [Id.] 8 II. DISCUSSION 9 A writ of habeas corpus challenges the legality of petitioner’s custody and seeks to 10 secure release from that illegal custody.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, a district court may grant 11 a writ of habeas corpus when the petitioner “is in custody in violation of the Constitution 12 or laws or treaties of the United States.” The petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating 13 that she is in illegal custody. See *Martinez v. Noem*, No. 25-CV-2740-BJC-BJW, 2025 14 WL 3171738, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Nov.

13, 2025). 15 Petitioner argues that, inter alia, her detention violates the Due Process Clause of 16 the Fifth Amendment. [Doc. No. 1 at 13–15.] The Due Process Clause of the Fifth 17 Amendment provides that no person shall be “deprived of life, liberty, or property, without 18 due process of law.” U.S. Const. amend.

V. “Freedom from imprisonment—from 19 government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the 20 liberty that Clause protects.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001). This protection 21 applies to aliens as it does U.S. citizens. See *Wong Wing v. United States*, 163 U.S. 228, 22 238 (1896) (“[E]ven aliens shall not... be deprived of life, liberty, or property without 23 due process of law.”).

24 “Courts have previously found that individuals released from immigration custody 25 on bond have a protectable liberty interest in remaining out of custody[.]” *Valencia Zapata* 26 v. *Kaiser*, No. 25-CV-07492-RFL, 2025 WL 2578207, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 5, 2025) 27 (listing cases). Indeed, “the government’s decision to release an individual from custody 28 creates an implicit promise, upon which that individual may rely, that their liberty will be ||revoked only if they fail to live up to the conditions of release.” *Pinchi v. Noem*, 792 F. 2 ||Supp.

3d 1025, 1032 (N.D. Cal. 2025) (cleaned up) (internal quotation marks omitted) 3 (citing *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471, 482 (1972)). 4 In *Valencia Zapata*, the Northern District of California granted a TRO for a group 5 aliens who were detained by U.S. immigration officials, released on their own 6 || recognizance, and then re-detained by ICE without explanation.

2025 WL 2578207, at *2. 7 || The court held that the petitioners had a protectable liberty in remaining out of custody and 8 had to be given notice and a hearing prior to being taken back into custody. /d. at *3. 9 || The operative facts here are identical. Petitioner was detained by immigration officials, 10 |released on her own recognizance, and then re-detained without notice or a hearing, which 11 || violates the due process to which she is entitled.

See *Pinchi*, 792 F. Supp. 3d at 1036 12 || (finding likelihood of success where petitioner was released on her own recognizance then 13 ||re-detained by ICE agents without notice nor pre-detention hearing). Accordingly, as 14 || Petitioner has demonstrated that her detention is unlawful

pursuant to the Due Process 15 || Clause of the Fifth Amendment, the Court finds she is entitled to relief.

16 Ht. CONCLUSION 17 The Court GRANTS the writ of habeas corpus and orders Respondents to 18 /immediately RELEASE Petitioner from custody under the same conditions as her previous 19 || order of release on recognizance. Respondents are further ENJOINED from re-detaining 20 || her without notice and a pre-detention hearing before a neutral decisionmaker. 21 It is SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: December 22, 2025 € 23 Hon. Cathy Ann Bencivengo 24 United States District Judge 25 26 27 28