

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA, LAFAYETTE DIVISION

**Annerys Mariana Cano Alvarez v. South Louisiana Ice Processing
Center, Et Al.**

Cano Alvarez · No. Civil Action No. 26-0696 · Decided March 9, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana referred the petition for a writ of habeas corpus to the magistrate judge for consideration and disposition. The court denied the accompanying application for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction, concluding that the requested release or bond hearing duplicated the ultimate habeas relief sought and that the petitioner was not entitled to bypass habeas procedures through a TRO.

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA LAFAYETTE DIVISION ANNERY'S MARIANA CANO CIVIL ACTION NO. 26-0696 ALVAREZ VERSUS JUDGE ALEXANDER C. VAN HOOK SOUTH LOUISIANA ICE PROCESSING CENTER, ET AL. MAGISTRATE JUDGE HORNSBY ORDER The Petitioner, Annerys Mariana Cano Alvarez, simultaneously filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, R. Doc. 1, and an application for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction, R. Doc.

2. The habeas petition, R. Doc. 1, is REFERRED to the Magistrate Judge for consideration and disposition. Furthermore, because the preliminary relief sought, release or a bond hearing, mirrors the ultimate relief sought in the habeas petition, the application for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction is DENIED.

The Petitioner's request for immediate release is improper because one cannot skip the line by dressing a habeas petition in TRO clothes. See *Rodriguez v. Lyons*, No. CV 25-1926, 2025 WL 3553742, at *1 (W.D. La. Dec. 8, 2025) (denying a "motion to decide my habeas petition now."); *Peters v. Davis*, No. 6:17-cv-595, 2018 WL 11463602, at *2 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 27, 2018) (explaining that a TRO is not purposed "to give a plaintiff the ultimate relief he seeks"); *Lindell v. United States*, 82 F.4th 614, 618 (8th Cir.

2023) ("[T]he purpose of injunctive relief is to preserve the status quo; it is not to give the movant the ultimate relief he seeks."). The Petitioner's demand for a bond hearing is unavailing because the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit has held that illegal aliens are not entitled to such a hearing, even if they have resided in the United States for years.

Victor Buenrostro-Mendez v. Pamela Bondi, et al., 166 F.4th 494 (5th Cir. Feb. 6, 2026). DONE
AND SIGNED at Shreveport, Louisiana, this 9th day of March, 2026. Ci Vor ah — UNITED
STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-western-district-of-louisiana-lafayette-division-united-states/2026/annerys-mariana-cano-alvarez-v-south-louisiana-ice-fv3gs515>