

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA

Grigoryan v. English

Grigoryan v. English · No. 3:26-CV-417-CCB-SJF · Decided May 14, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana granted Andranik Grigoryan’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition challenging his continued immigration detention after a final removal order. Applying *Zadvydas v. Davis*, the court held that the government had not shown that Grigoryan’s removal to Uzbekistan was reasonably foreseeable and ordered his release subject to appropriate conditions of supervised release.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Cristal C. Brisco
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana
DECIDED	May 14, 2026
DOCKET	3:26-CV-417-CCB-SJF
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging post-removal-order immigration detention; the respondent answered, and the petitioner declined to file a reply.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the § 2241 detention challenge and determined whether continued detention was authorized by 8 U.S.C. § 1231 and whether removal was reasonably foreseeable under <i>Zadvydas v. Davis</i> .
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion
PARTIES	Andranik Grigoryan v. Brian English

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- immigration detention
- removal proceedings
- deportation
- immigration

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court had subject-matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 to review Grigoryan's post-removal-order immigration detention despite 8 U.S.C. §§ 1252(g) and 1252(b)(9).
2. Whether continued detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1231 was lawful when Grigoryan had been detained for more than six months after the removal order became final and the government had not shown that removal was reasonably foreseeable.

HOLDINGS

1. The court had jurisdiction under § 2241 to review Grigoryan's challenge to his post-removal-order immigration detention; 8 U.S.C. §§ 1252(g) and 1252(b)(9) did not divest the court of jurisdiction over this detention claim.
2. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1231, continued detention after the removal period is authorized only for covered noncitizens and only while removal is reasonably foreseeable. When a detainee has provided good reason to believe that removal is not significantly likely in the reasonably foreseeable future, the government must produce evidence sufficient to rebut that showing.
3. Because the respondent failed to establish that Grigoryan's removal was reasonably foreseeable, the court was required to grant habeas relief and order his release subject to appropriate conditions of supervised release.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“once removal is no longer reasonably foreseeable, continued detention is no longer authorized by statute.”
(Merits)

“After this 6-month period, once the alien provides good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future, the Government must respond with evidence sufficient to rebut that showing.” (Merits)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Grigoryan, a citizen of Uzbekistan who entered the United States in 1999, was convicted in federal court in 2022 of possessing unauthorized access devices. He entered immigration detention in December 2023, and an immigration judge ordered him removed to Uzbekistan in April 2025; the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissed his appeal in September 2025. After more than six months of post-removal-order detention, the government had not obtained travel documents and offered only a vague representation that it was working to secure them.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Grigoryan filed a § 2241 habeas petition alleging that his immigration detention was unlawful. The respondent answered and argued that the court lacked jurisdiction and that detention was authorized under 8 U.S.C. § 1231.

The court rejected the jurisdictional challenge, found that removal was not reasonably foreseeable, granted the petition, and ordered Grigoryan released subject to appropriate conditions of supervised release.

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No remand was ordered. The respondent was ordered to release Grigoryan on appropriate conditions of supervised release and to certify compliance by filing a notice by May 18, 2026. The clerk was directed to email the order to the warden of the Miami Correctional Facility to secure release.

CASES CITED

- Liang v. English, No. 3:25CV1052 DRL-SJF, 2026 WL 835853, at *1 (N.D. Ind. Mar. 26, 2026)
- Pho v. Noem, No. 3:25-CV-977-CCB-SJF, 2025 WL 3750684, at *1-*4 (N.D. Ind. Dec. 29, 2025)
- Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678, 689, 699-701 (2001)