

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
MISSOURI, SOUTHERN DIVISION

Cristian Paul Pallo Bolanos v. Jim C. Arnott, et al.

Pallo Bolanos · No. 6:25-cv-3380-MDH · Decided December 16, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri granted Cristian Paul Pallo Bolanos’s motion for a temporary restraining order in a habeas proceeding challenging repeated transfers during his immigration proceedings. Applying Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b)(1) and the Dataphase factors, the court found likely violations of his due process and statutory rights to challenge removal with assistance of counsel. Respondents were enjoined from transferring him outside the Western District of Missouri during the pendency of the habeas petition, without disrupting his scheduled immigration-court hearing.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Douglas Harpool
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri, Southern Division
DECIDED	December 16, 2025
DOCKET	6:25-cv-3380-MDH
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought a temporary restraining order without notice in connection with his federal habeas petition, asking the court to prevent his transfer outside the Western District of Missouri while his immigration-removal proceedings were pending.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b)(1) and the four Dataphase preliminary-injunction factors: likelihood of success on the merits, irreparable harm, balance of harms, and the public interest.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Cristian Paul Pallo Bolanos v. Jim C. Arnott, et al.

TOPICS

immigration detention

removal proceedings

injunctions

due process

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration detention

removal proceedings

constitutional law

civil procedure

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Petitioner satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b)(1)'s requirements for a temporary restraining order without notice.
2. Whether the Dataphase factors supported enjoining Respondents from transferring Petitioner outside the Western District of Missouri during the habeas proceeding.
3. Whether Petitioner demonstrated a sufficient likelihood that repeated transfers would violate his statutory and constitutional rights to challenge removal with the assistance of counsel.

HOLDINGS

1. The court held that Petitioner satisfied Rule 65(b)(1)(A) by showing immediate and irreparable injury before Respondents could be heard and satisfied Rule 65(b)(1)(B) through the notice efforts presented to the court; notice therefore was not required.
2. The court held that a TRO was appropriate because Petitioner demonstrated a sufficient likelihood of success, a high threat of irreparable harm, a favorable balance of harms, and a public interest in preserving a fair removal proceeding.
3. The court enjoined Respondents from transferring Petitioner outside the Western District of Missouri during the pendency of the habeas petition, until the Government could respond and the court could be fully briefed on the merits.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Respondents are enjoined from transferring Petitioner outside the Western District of Missouri during the pendency of his habeas petition.” (Conclusion)

“Nothing in this Order shall prevent, disrupt, or delay the scheduled hearing before the Immigration Court scheduled for December 23, 2025.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner had lived in the United States since 2022 and was detained by DHS on November 5, 2025, to facilitate his removal. While his individual hearing on asylum, withholding of removal, and Convention Against Torture claims was scheduled for January 9, 2026, he was transferred from Minnesota to Missouri and placed in the Greene County Jail. DHS then sought to transfer his immigration proceedings to Kansas City, and the immigration court granted the transfer without giving Petitioner or his counsel a reasonable opportunity to respond; his individual hearing was vacated and replaced with a master hearing scheduled for December 23,

2025. Petitioner alleged that further physical and procedural transfers would impair his ability to challenge removal with the assistance of counsel and would violate due process.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner was detained by DHS and transferred from Minnesota to Missouri while his individual immigration hearing was pending. DHS attorneys moved to transfer his immigration proceedings to the Kansas City Immigration Court, and that motion was granted before Petitioner or his counsel had a reasonable opportunity to respond; the immigration hearing was then vacated and reset. In this habeas action, Petitioner moved for a TRO. The district court granted the motion without requiring notice and enjoined Respondents from transferring him outside the Western District of Missouri during the pendency of the habeas petition.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Dadfar v. Arnott, 2025 WL 3452372 (W.D. Mo. Dec. 1, 2025)
- Dataphase Sys., Inc. v. C L Sys., Inc., 640 F.2d 109, 114 (8th Cir. 1981) (en banc)