

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

Aman Poya v. Kristi Noem et al.

No. C25-2576JLR (W.D. Wash. Jan. 29, 2026) · No. C25-2576JLR · Decided January 29, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Washington grants Aman Poya’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The court concludes that his prolonged mandatory immigration detention requires an individualized bond hearing under the Due Process Clause and orders Respondents to conduct the hearing within 14 calendar days. The court declines to reach claims concerning potential third-country removal because those claims are not ripe.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	James L. Robart
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
DECIDED	January 29, 2026
DOCKET	C25-2576JLR
DISPOSITION	granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and request for injunctive relief challenging immigration detention and related prospective removal claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the § 2241 petition and related injunctive request under applicable habeas and constitutional due-process principles; the opinion does not state a separate formal standard of review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Aman Poya v. Kristi Noem, Pamela Bondi, United States Department of Homeland Security, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Laura Hermosillo

TOPICS

- immigration detention
- removal proceedings
- procedural due process
- due process
- injunctions

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration

habeas corpus

constitutional law

administrative law

civil procedure

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Poya's prolonged mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), without a bond hearing, had become unreasonable and violated the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause.
2. Whether the court should require the government to provide Poya with a bond hearing and release him if the hearing was not timely conducted.
3. Whether Poya's claims concerning possible removal to a third country were ripe for judicial review.

HOLDINGS

1. Poya's detention had become unreasonable, and due process required the government to provide him with a bond hearing.
2. Poya's claims based on the possibility of removal to a third country were not ripe for review.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The court thus finds that the factor pertaining to Mr. Poya being subject to a final order of removal is neutral and the other five factors weigh in Mr. Poya’s favor.” (at 4-5)

“The court finds that Mr. Poya’s detention has become unreasonable, and that due process requires the Government to provide him with a bond hearing.” (at 5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Aman Poya, an Afghan citizen and member of the Hazara ethnic minority, was detained after CBP determined that he had entered the United States without inspection or admission and placed him in expedited removal proceedings. He claimed fear of return to Afghanistan based on threats from Taliban fighters, but USCIS issued a negative credible-fear determination that an immigration judge affirmed. He remained detained for more than 12 months while removal awaited an Afghan government travel letter, and the government acknowledged that Poya had not intentionally delayed the expedited removal process.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Poya was encountered by Customs and Border Protection, placed in expedited removal proceedings, and became subject to a final order of removal. After USCIS issued a negative credible-fear determination that an immigration judge affirmed, Poya filed this § 2241 petition challenging his detention and asserting related statutory and constitutional claims. The district court granted the petition, ordered a bond hearing within 14 days, provided for release under appropriate conditions if the hearing was not timely held, and denied as moot his request to bar removal from the district.

DISPOSITION

granted

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Respondents were ordered to hold a bond hearing within 14 calendar days. If the hearing was not conducted by February 19, 2026, respondents were ordered to immediately release Poya under appropriate conditions of release until his detention was determined to be warranted under the INA and consistent with the order. The parties were also ordered to file a status report by February 19, 2026.

CASES CITED

- Jennings v. Rodriguez, 583 U.S. 281, 297, 303 (2018)
- Padilla v. U.S. Immigration & Customs Enforcement, 704 F. Supp. 3d 1163, 1168 (W.D. Wash. 2023)
- Rodriguez v. Marin, 909 F.3d 252, 256 (9th Cir. 2018)
- Toktosunov v. Wamsley, C25-1724TL, 2025 WL 3492858, at *4, *6 (W.D. Wash. Dec. 5, 2025)
- Banda v. McAleenan, 385 F. Supp. 3d 1099, 1117, 1120 (W.D. Wash. 2019)
- Jamal A. v. Whitaker, 358 F. Supp. 3d 853, 858-59 (D. Minn. 2019)
- Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678, 689 (2001)
- Thomas v. Union Carbide Agricultural Products Co., 473 U.S. 568, 580 (1985)
- Thomas v. Anchorage Equal Rights Commission, 220 F.3d 1134, 1138 (9th Cir. 2000)