

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA

Bhupinder Singh v. Scarlet Grant, et al.

Singh v. Grant · No. CIV-26-289-R · Decided May 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma reviews and adopts a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation concerning the revocation of Bhupinder Singh’s immigration bond. The court finds that Respondents failed to demonstrate compliance with applicable bond-revocation procedures and that the summary revocation violated Singh’s Fifth Amendment due process rights. The petition for habeas relief is granted, and Respondents are ordered to immediately release Singh under his prior bond conditions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
DECIDED	May 27, 2026
DOCKET	CIV-26-289-R
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner's immigration-detention habeas petition was granted in a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation ordering his release. Respondents objected, and the district court conducted de novo review of the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections were made.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) of portions of a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation to which timely and specific objections are made; issues not specifically objected to are waived. The court liberally construes a pro se filing but does not act as the litigant's advocate.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status unknown
PARTIES	Bhupinder Singh v. Scarlet Grant, et al.

TOPICS

immigration detention

removal proceedings

procedural due process

judicial review of agency action

administrative procedure act

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration

habeas corpus

constitutional law

administrative law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Singh's petition adequately raised claims that ICE violated its bond-revocation regulations and procedures.
2. Whether Respondents waived de novo review by failing to make timely and specific objections to the magistrate judge's findings concerning the authorized revocation of bond and the arrest warrant.
3. Whether revoking Singh's bond without notice or other procedural safeguards violated his Fifth Amendment due process rights.
4. Whether the alleged regulatory and constitutional violations were cognizable in habeas and warranted release from immigration detention.

HOLDINGS

1. Singh adequately raised claims that ICE violated applicable bond-revocation regulations and procedures and that his detention violated due process.
2. A party waives de novo and further appellate review of issues in a Report and Recommendation when it fails to make timely and specific objections to those issues.
3. Respondents failed to establish compliance with the procedures governing revocation of Singh's immigration bond, including the requirement that an authorized official exercise discretion and that the original warrant be used for the rearrest.
4. On the record before the court, Respondents violated Singh's Fifth Amendment due process rights by summarily revoking his bond without notice or other adequate procedural safeguards.
5. The regulatory and due process violations alleged in this case were cognizable in habeas and warranted Singh's release from immigration detention.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The essence of due process is the requirement that a person in jeopardy of a serious loss be given notice of the case against him and opportunity to meet it.”

“Accordingly, the Court adopts the findings of the well-reasoned Report and Recommendation. Petitioner’s Petition is GRANTED. Respondents are ordered to immediately release? Petitioner from their custody pursuant to his previous bond conditions and to submit a prompt declaration, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, affirming Petitioner’s release from custody.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Singh, a citizen of India, entered the United States without inspection in 2017 and was placed in removal proceedings. An immigration judge released him on a \$25,000 bond, and the record indicated that he complied with the conditions of release. After a final order of removal and dismissal of his appeal by the Board of Immigration Appeals, Singh was re-detained in December 2025, allegedly without notice or compliance with required bond-revocation procedures.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Singh was detained in immigration-removal proceedings after his previously granted bond was revoked. A magistrate judge found that Respondents failed to follow applicable bond-revocation procedures and violated Singh's Fifth Amendment due process rights, recommending release. Respondents objected, but the district court found the objections inadequate or waived as to several issues, adopted the Report and Recommendation, granted the petition, ordered immediate release under the prior bond conditions, and required a declaration confirming release.

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

CASES CITED

- Hall v. Miller, No. CIV-25-00518-JD, 2025 WL 2630738, at *1 (W.D. Okla. Sept. 12, 2025)
- United States v. 2121 E. 30th St., 73 F.3d 1057, 1059-60 (10th Cir. 1996)
- Hall v. Bellmon, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991)
- Ewere v. Cerna, No. CIV-26-320-SLP, 2026 WL 1207088, at *2 (W.D. Okla. May 4, 2026)
- Casanova v. Ulibarri, 595 F.3d 1120, 1123 (10th Cir. 2010)
- Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976)
- Kholmurodov v. Warden, Cimarron Correctional Facility, No. CIV-26-678-SLP, 2026 WL 1266124, at *4 (W.D. Okla. May 8, 2026)
- Li v. Bondi, No. CIV-25-1480-J, 2026 WL 475133, at *3 (W.D. Okla. Feb. 19, 2026)
- Nguyen v. Hyde, 788 F. Supp. 3d 144, 152 (D. Mass. 2025)
- Owdetallah v. Bondi, No. CIV-25-1546-SLP, 2026 WL 483648, at *4-5 (W.D. Okla. Feb. 20, 2026)