

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Aida Amanda A. A. v. Christopher Chestnut, et al.

Aida Amanda A. A. · No. 1:25-cv-01994-TLN-SCR · Decided December 23, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California grants Petitioner Aida Amanda A. A.’s motion for a temporary restraining order concerning her immigration detention. The court concludes that Petitioner demonstrated likely success on a due process claim, irreparable harm, and favorable equitable and public-interest factors. The order directs her immediate release, restricts re-arrest or re-detention absent specified constitutional protections, and requires Respondents to show cause why the TRO should not be converted into a preliminary injunction.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Troy L. Nunley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 23, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-01994-TLN-SCR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought a temporary restraining order in connection with a habeas corpus petition challenging her civil immigration detention.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	To obtain a temporary restraining order, the movant must show likelihood of success on the merits, likely irreparable harm absent relief, that the balance of equities favors relief, and that an injunction is in the public interest. The court may apply the Ninth Circuit’s sliding-scale approach, but a showing of serious questions on the merits requires that the balance of hardships tip sharply in the movant’s favor.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Aida Amanda A. A. v. Christopher Chestnut, et al.

TOPICS

immigration detention

procedural due process

due process

injunctions

removal proceedings

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration

constitutional law

civil procedure

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Petitioner was likely to succeed on a procedural due process claim based on her detention without a bond or custody redetermination hearing.
2. Whether Petitioner satisfied the four requirements for a temporary restraining order.
3. What procedural protections were required before the Government could re-arrest or re-detain Petitioner.

HOLDINGS

1. Petitioner raised serious questions, and the court found a clear interest, as to whether her continued freedom was a protected liberty interest under the Due Process Clause after she had been released into the community for two and a half years and had complied with required appointments and check-ins.
2. Petitioner was likely denied procedural due process because she had been detained for nearly two months without a bond or custody redetermination hearing, despite having no criminal history and having complied with required check-ins.
3. Petitioner satisfied the TRO requirements by showing likely success on her due process claim, irreparable harm from continued detention and separation from her family, favorable equities, and that relief served the public interest.
4. Respondents were enjoined from re-arresting or re-detaining Petitioner absent seven days' notice and a pre-deprivation or custody hearing before a neutral decisionmaker, at which the Government must prove by clear and convincing evidence that she presents a danger to the community or a flight risk and must allow counsel to be present.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Due Process Clause applies to all “persons” within the borders of the United States, regardless of immigration status.” (Analysis III.A)

“Respondents are ENJOINED AND RESTRAINED from re-arresting or re-detaining Petitioner absent compliance with constitutional protections, including seven-day notice and a pre-deprivation/custody hearing before a neutral decisionmaker” (Conclusion, paragraph 4)

“the Government shall bear the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, that Petitioner poses a danger to the community or a flight risk, and Petitioner shall be allowed to have her counsel present.”
(Conclusion, paragraph 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner, a native and citizen of Peru, entered the United States with inspection on May 27, 2023, seeking asylum. Federal agents initially detained and then released her on her own recognizance after determining that she was not a flight risk or danger to the community. She alleges that she attended all required ICE and USCIS appointments and check-ins, had no criminal record, and had no deportation order when ICE detained her during a routine visit on October 20, 2025. At the time of the order, she had been detained for nearly two months without a bond or custody redetermination hearing.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner entered the United States after inspection, was released on her own recognizance, and remained in the community while pursuing asylum and attending required immigration appointments. ICE detained her during a routine visit on October 20, 2025. She filed a habeas petition and moved for a temporary restraining order on December 23, 2025. The court granted the TRO without notice, ordered her immediate release, enjoined re-arrest or re-detention absent specified constitutional protections, and issued an order to show cause concerning conversion of the TRO into a preliminary injunction.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)
- Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell, 632 F.3d 1127, 1134-35 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Hernandez v. Sessions, 872 F.3d 976, 990, 995 (9th Cir. 2017)
- Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678, 693-94 (2001)
- Kentucky Department of Corrections v. Thompson, 490 U.S. 454, 460 (1989)
- Rico-Tapia v. Smith, No. CV 25-00379 SASP-KJM, 2025 WL 2950089, at *8 (D. Haw. Oct. 10, 2025)
- Doe v. Becerra, 787 F. Supp. 3d 1083, 1093 (E.D. Cal. 2025)
- Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319, 335 (1976)
- R.D.T.M. v. Wofford, No. 1:25-CV-01141-KES-SKO (HC), 2025 WL 2617255, at *3-*4 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025)
- Manzanarez v. Bondi, No. 1:25-CV-01536-DC-CKD (HC), 2025 WL 3247258, at *4 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2025)
- Garcia v. Andrews, No. 2:25-CV-01884-TLN-SCR, 2025 WL 1927596, at *5 (E.D. Cal. July 14, 2025)
- Melendres v. Arpaio, 695 F.3d 990, 1002 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Nat'l Urban League v. Ross, 484 F. Supp. 3d 802, 807 (N.D. Cal. 2020)
- Drakes Bay Oyster Co. v. Jewell, 747 F.3d 1073, 1092 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Zepeda v. U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, 753 F.2d 719, 727 (9th Cir. 1985)
- Diaz v. Kaiser, No. 3:25-CV-05071, 2025 WL 1676854, at *3 (N.D. Cal. June 14, 2025)
- Diaz v. Brewer, 656 F.3d 1008, 1015 (9th Cir. 2011)

