

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
MISSOURI, SOUTHERN DIVISION

Carlos David Guaira Utrera v. Jim Arnott, et al.

Guaira Utrera v. Arnott · No. 6:26-cv-3051-MDH · Decided February 10, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri granted Carlos David Guaira Utrera's petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The court held that DHS revoked his immigration parole without demonstrating a sufficient change in circumstances or providing constitutionally adequate procedural protections, and ordered his immediate release subject to his prior parole conditions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Douglas Harpool
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri, Southern Division
DECIDED	February 10, 2026
DOCKET	6:26-cv-3051-MDH
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging immigration detention and revocation of parole without prior written notice. The district court granted the petition, ordered immediate release subject to the conditions of preexisting parole, and enjoined respondents from relocating petitioner outside the court's jurisdiction before complying with the order.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the procedural due process framework requiring a constitutionally protected liberty or property interest and denial of adequate procedural protections. For the requested temporary restraining order, the court applied the Dataphase four-factor test.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Carlos David Guaira Utrera v. Jim Arnott, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Acting Field Office Director for ICE Chicago,

TOPICS

immigration detention

federal habeas corpus

procedural due process

removal proceedings

injunctions

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration

federal habeas corpus

constitutional law

remedies

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether 8 U.S.C. §§ 1252(e)(3), 1252(g), or 1252(b)(9) deprived the district court of jurisdiction over petitioner's § 2241 challenge to allegedly unlawful immigration detention.
2. Whether revoking petitioner's parole and detaining him without prior written notice, a meaningful opportunity to be heard, a sufficient change in circumstances, or individualized legal justification violated procedural due process.
3. Whether limited injunctive relief was appropriate to prevent respondents from relocating petitioner outside the district before complying with the release order.
4. Whether petitioner could pursue attorneys' fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act.

HOLDINGS

1. The jurisdiction-stripping provisions in 8 U.S.C. §§ 1252(e)(3), 1252(g), and 1252(b)(9) did not deprive the district court of jurisdiction because petitioner challenged the lawfulness of his detention, not the validity of a statute, regulation, written policy, removal order, or removal decision.
2. The government violated petitioner's procedural due process rights by revoking his parole and detaining him without prior notice, a meaningful opportunity to be heard, a sufficient change in circumstances, or individualized legal justification.
3. A limited temporary restraining order was appropriate to prevent respondents from relocating petitioner outside the district before complying with the release order.
4. Petitioner may pursue reasonable attorneys' fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act because he prevailed and the government's position was not substantially justified, subject to statutory eligibility and application requirements.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that the [Due Process] Clause protects." (Discussion II)

"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 the opportunity to meet it.'" (Discussion II)

"In the immigration context, 'the Constitution requires the government to afford notice of any action against an alien [and] requires an opportunity for the alien to be heard. [] The opportunity to be heard must be

meaningful, that is, an opportunity granted at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner.”” (Discussion II)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner is a native and citizen of Venezuela who entered the United States in July 2022, had no criminal record, and was in removal proceedings before the Kansas City Immigration Court with an asylum application pending. He had previously been paroled into the United States. On October 31, 2025, ICE detained him while he was working as a landscaper and revoked his parole without prior written notice or an identified material change in circumstances. The court found no evidence that petitioner was a flight risk or that his conduct supplied an individualized legal justification for changing his parole status.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner, a Venezuelan citizen detained by ICE during pending removal proceedings, filed a verified § 2241 habeas petition seeking release or a hearing. Respondents argued that statutory provisions governing judicial review of removal matters deprived the district court of jurisdiction and that petitioner was not entitled to consideration for release. The court rejected the jurisdictional arguments, found that parole had been revoked without a sufficient change in circumstances or individualized justification and without adequate procedural protections, granted habeas relief, ordered immediate release, and issued limited injunctive relief against relocation.

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

CASES CITED

- Munoz Materano v. Arteta, 2025 WL 2630826, at *10 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 12, 2025)
- Mata Velasquez v. Kurzdorfer, No. 25-CV-493-LJV, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 135986, 2025 WL 1953796, at *7 (W.D.N.Y. July 16, 2025)
- Hernandez-Cuevas v. Olson, No. 4:25-cv-00830-BP, at 3 (W.D. Mo. Nov. 5, 2025)
- Cifuentes Rivera v. Arnott, et al., 25-cv-00570-RK1, Doc. 19 at 7 (W.D. Mo. Oct. 7, 2025)
- Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi, Case No. 25-20496 (5th Cir. Feb. 6, 2026)
- Sanchez v. LaRose, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 190593, at *6-*9
- Miranda v. City of Casa Grande, 15 F.4th 1219, 1225 (9th Cir. 2021)
- Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001)
- Hernandez v. Sessions, 872 F.3d 976, 981
- Alegria Palma v. LaRose, No. 25-cv-1942, ECF No. 14 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 11, 2025)
- Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319, 348 (1976)
- Joint Anti-Fascist Committee v. McGrath, 341 U.S. 123, 171-172 (1951) (Frankfurter, J., concurring)
- Ying Fong v. Ashcroft, 317 F. Supp. 2d 398, 403 (S.D.N.Y. 2004)

- Mohammed H. v. Trump, No. 25-1576 (JWB/DTS), 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 117197, 2025 WL 1692739, at *5 (D. Minn. June 17, 2025)
- Matter of Sugay, 17 I. & N. Dec. 637, 640 (BIA 1981)
- Ortega v. Bonnar, 415 F. Supp. 3d 963, 968 (N.D. Cal. 2019)
- Dataphase Systems, Inc. v. C L Systems, Inc., 640 F.2d 109, 114 (8th Cir. 1981) (en banc)
- Calvin Klein Cosmetics Corp. v. Lenox Laboratories, Inc., 815 F.2d 500, 503 (8th Cir. 1987)
- Commissioner, I.N.S. v. Jean, 496 U.S. 154, 163 (1990)
- Boudin v. Thomas, 732 F.2d 1107, 1114 (2d Cir. 1984)

OPINION

Noem

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CARLOS DAVID GUAIRA UTRERA,)

) Petitioner,)) v.) Case No. 6:26-cv-3051-MDH) JIM ARNOTT, et. al.,)) Respondents.)

ORDER GRANTING PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner has been detained by the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) and parole has been terminated without prior written notice. Pending is his Verified Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus in which he argues federal statutes and the Due Process Clause require that he be released or granted a hearing. The Court agrees with Petitioner’s statutory arguments, and on that basis, it concludes the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus should be GRANTED.

BACKGROUND

Petitioner is a native and citizen of Venezuela. Respondent last entered the United States in July 2022, over 3 years ago. Petitioner does not have a criminal record. Petitioner is currently in removal proceedings before the Kansas City Immigration Court. He is scheduled for a final hearing March 2, 2026, before the Immigration Judge. Petitioner was previously in removal proceedings and had submitted an application for asylum (Form I-589) before the Immigration Judge. On October 31, 2025, Petitioner was taken into custody by ICE/ERO officials. He was working as a landscaper when he was detained. Petitioner is currently detained at Greene County Jail in Springfield, Missouri. Petitioner brought this proceeding, seeking a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, against (1) the acting field office director for ICE Chicago, (2) the Secretary of DHS, and

(3) the Greene County Sheriff, all in their official capacities.¹ He asserts his detention violates the Immigration Nationality Act (INA), and the Due Process Clause. Respondents argue that Petitioner is not entitled to be considered for release, and the Court resolves the parties’ arguments below.

DISCUSSION

I. Jurisdiction Respondents argue that three statutory provisions—8 U.S.C. §§ 1252(e)(3), 1252(g) and (b)(9) deprive this Court of jurisdiction to consider Petitioner’s claims. The Court disagrees. Section 1252(e)(3), entitled “Challenges on validity of the system,” limits the scope of judicial review of “orders under Section 1225(b)(1)” and limits venue to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Petitioner is “not challenging the lawfulness of any particular statute, regulation, or written policy or procedure.” Thus, § 1252(e)(3) does not strip this Court of jurisdiction. See *Munoz Materano v. Arteta*, 2025 WL 2630826 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 12, 2025), at *10. Further, this statute only bars jurisdiction based on those held under 8 U.S.C. § 1225. However, the Court adopts its ruling in similar cases² and finds that Petitioner is being held under 8 U.S.C. § 1226. Therefore, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(e)(3) does not deprive the Court of Jurisdiction.³ 1 Petitioner’s Petition lists Sheriff Arnott as a party by virtue of his administration of the Ozark County Jail where Petitioner is currently detained. While Sheriff Arnott was not served in this case as of the date of this Order, the Court construes the proper party holding Petitioner in custody as the Department of Homeland Security through Immigration and Customs Enforcement. As DHS and ICE are utilizing the Greene County Jail to hold Petitioner and other detainees, the Court expects its ruling to apply to the Government and those aiding the Government regarding this specific case. 2 *Andres v. Noem*, et al., No. 25-03321-CV-S-MDH, *Eshdavlatov v. Olson*, et al. No. 25-00844-CV-S-MDH, *Hernandez-Cuevas v. Olson*, et al., No. 25-00830-CV-W-BP, *Ifante v. Noem*, et al., No. 25-03322-CV-S-MDH, *Morales-Rodriguez v. Arnott*, et al., No. 25-00836-CV-S-MDH, *Pozos-Ramirez v. Noem*, et al., No. 25-03316-CV- S- MDH. 3 As of the date of this Order the Court is not aware of any appellate decisions from this Circuit. The Court however will highlight cases from District Courts in this Circuit as supporting the analysis in this case: *Barrajas v. Noem*, Sections 1252(g) and (b)(9) apply narrowly to systemic challenges to regulations implementing expedited removal, review of an order of removal, the decision to seek removal, or the process by which removability will be determined, not to constitutional or statutory claims which precede and are collateral to that process, including, as relevant here, unlawful arrest or detention. See *Mata Velasquez v. Kurzdorfer*, No. 25-CV-493-LJV, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 135986, 2025 WL 1953796, at *7 (W.D.N.Y. July 16, 2025); see also *Hernandez-Cuevas v. Olson*, No. 4:25-cv-00830-BP, at 3 (W.D. Mo. Nov. 05, 2025) (citing 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(2)); *Cifuentes Rivera v. Arnott*, et al, 25-cv-00570-RK1, Doc.19 at 7 (W.D. Mo. Oct. 07, 2025) (“the narrow scope of § 1252(g) does not cover “claims [that] are collateral to the Government’s decision to execute the final order of removal,” for instance, claims seeking relief based upon the Government’s alleged failure to comply with its own regulations regarding the required administrative processes after an alien is detained.”). Petitioner is challenging his unlawful detention, not any removal decisions or actions, so the above provisions do not deprive the Court of jurisdiction. For those reasons, this Court concludes it has jurisdiction over Petitioner’s habeas petition. II. The Due Process Clause "A procedural due process claim has two elements: (1) a deprivation of a constitutionally protected liberty or property

interest, and (2) a denial of adequate procedural protections." *Sanchez v. LaRose*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 190593, *6-7 (citing *Miranda v. City of Casa Grande*, 15 F.4th 1219, 1225 (9th Cir. 2021) (internal quotations and citation omitted)). 2025 WL 2717650, at *3 (S.D. Iowa Sep. 23, 2025); *Giron Reyes v. Lyons*, 2025 WL 2712427, at *4 (N.D. Iowa Sept. 23, 2025); *Jose J.O.E. v. Bondi*, 2025 WL 2466670, at *6-7 (D. Minn. Aug. 27, 2025). The Court is aware that the Fifth Circuit issued a 2-1 decision from a 3-judge panel agreeing with the Respondents' position and rejecting Petitioner's arguments and hundreds of district court decisions across the country. See *Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi*, Case No. 25-20496 (5th Circuit, 02/06/2026). The Fifth Circuit's decision does not bind this Court. "Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that the [Due Process] Clause protects." *Sanchez v. LaRose* at *7 (citing *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. at 690). Although immigration detention is administrative, it is still subject to due process clause review. *Id.* (citing *Hernandez v. Sessions*, 872 F.3d at 981 ("the government's discretion to incarcerate noncitizens is always constrained by the requirements of due process.")). When the government grants an alien parole into the country, it creates a liberty interest intimately tied to freedom from imprisonment. *Id.* (citing *Alegria Palma v. LaRose*, 25-cv-1942, ECF No.14 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 11, 2025) (finding that "continued freedom after release on own recognizance" was a core liberty interest)). Here, Petitioner was deprived of his liberty interest in his prior parole status when Respondents revoked that parole and placed him in detention. Respondents also denied petitioner due process in the revocation of his parole. "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 the opportunity to meet it.'" *Sanchez* at *8 (citing *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 348, 96 S. Ct. 893, 47 L. Ed. 2d 18 (1976) (quoting *Joint Anti-Fascist Comm. v. McGrath*, 341 U.S. 123, 171-72, 71 S. Ct. 624, 95 L. Ed. 817 (Frankfurter, J., concurring))). In the immigration context, "the Constitution requires the government to afford notice of any action against an alien [and] requires an opportunity for the alien to be heard. [] The opportunity to be heard must be meaningful, that is, an opportunity granted at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner." *Id.* (citing *Ying Fong v. Ashcroft*, 317 F.Supp.2d 398, 403 (S.D.N.Y. 2004) (internal quotations and citations omitted)). An alien's opportunity to be heard regarding the revocation of his parole is only meaningful if the government comports with its own internal standards regarding parole revocation. DHS has the authority to revoke an alien's parole "at any time" on a discretionary, but not unlimited, basis. *Id.* at *8. (citing 8 U.S.C. § 1226(b); *Mohammed H. v. Trump*, No. 25-1576 (JWB/DTS), 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 117197, 2025 WL 1692739, at *5 (D. Minn. June 17, 2025) ("The Government has wide—but not unlimited—discretion in the immigration realm.")). The Board of Immigration Appeals ("BIA") has held that DHS may change the conditions of an alien's parole only when there is a sufficient change of circumstances to justify that change. *Id.* (citing *Matter of Sugay*, 17 I. & N. Dec. 637, 640 (BIA 1981) (as cited in *Alegria Palma*, No. 25-cv-1942-BJC-MMP, ECF No.14 at 3)). "In practice, the DHS re-arrests individuals only after a 'material' change in

circumstances." Id. at *9. (citing *Ortega v. Bonnar*, 415 F.Supp.3d 963, 968 (N.D. Cal. 2019)). To satisfy due process, those changed circumstances must represent individualized legal justification for detention. Id. at *9 (citing *Mohammed H.*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 117197, 2025 WL 1692739 at

*5 (granting a writ of habeas corpus on due process grounds due to a lack of individualized legal justification for changing the petitioner's status)). Here, Respondents revoked Petitioner's parole without a showing of change in circumstances related to his case. Respondents do not dispute the facts as Petitioner presents them. They only argue this Court lacks jurisdiction and their interpretation of the relevant statutes is correct. In their briefing, Respondents do not state a "sufficient change in circumstances" to justify revoking Petitioner's parole, or any individualized justification at all. Id. at *9 (citing *Matter of Sugay*, 17 I. & N. Dec. at 640). Petitioner was previously in removal proceedings and had submitted an application for asylum before the Immigration Judge, the underlying facts of which have not changed. At the time of his detainment, he was working as a landscaper and awaiting further immigration proceedings. There was no evidence from his conduct that he was a flight risk. He was simply performing his duties as a landscaper. Thus, Respondents did not satisfy the requirement of due process in revoking Petitioner's parole.

III. Temporary Restraining Order

In the Petition, Petitioner seeks an order enjoining Respondents' continued detention of Petitioner or a temporary restraining order directing Respondents to conduct a bond hearing to ensure his due process rights. Petitioner also requests this Court grant any further relief this Court deems just and proper. The Court below orders release and will not issue a TRO or permanent injunction specifically for those matters. However, under similar circumstances, this Court has granted temporary injunctive relief to habeas petitioners to enjoin Respondents from relocating petitioners outside the jurisdiction of this Court prior to compliance with this Order. The Courts finds that such relief is just and proper in this case. In analyzing a request for a TRO, the Court weighs: 1) probability movant will succeed on the merits; 2) threat of irreparable harm to the movant absent injunction; 3) balance between threatened harm to the movant and harm the injunction would inflict on other interested parties; and 4) the public interest. *Dataphase Sys., Inc. v. C L Syst., Inc.*, 640 F.2d 109, 114 (8th Cir.1981) (en banc). "No single factor is dispositive;" rather, the court must consider all factors to determine whether on balance they weigh towards granting the remedy. *Calvin Klein Cosmetics Corp. v. Lenox Labs., Inc.*, 815 F.2d 500, 503 (8th Cir. 1987). The Court finds that a TRO in this case is appropriate. As discussed above, the Court has already found that movant will succeed on his Petition for Habeas Corpus by virtue of his Due Process argument. Further, the threat of irreparable harm to the movant absent injunction is high as any move from this district prior to a bond hearing would render this Order and Petitioner right to a hearing as meaningless. As to the balance between the threatened harm to the movant and the harm the injunction would inflict on other interested parties, the balance tips in favor of Petitioner. Respondents and other interested parties would not suffer by allowing Petitioner to have a hearing. Lastly, there is a public interest in allowing those

who are detained in violation of the Due Process Clause to be released and given hearing as expressed and determined by Congress. For these reasons, the Court finds a TRO is appropriate.

IV. Attorneys' Fees Petitioner requests an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. Pursuant to the EAJA, a court shall award to a prevailing party fees and other expenses incurred by that party in any civil action, brought by or against the United States, unless the court finds that the position of the United States was substantially justified or that special circumstances make an award unjust. 28 U.S.C § 2412(d)(1)(A). To be eligible for fees under the EAJA, a petitioner must submit an application within thirty days of final judgment, and the petitioner's net worth must be less than two million dollars at the time the civil action was filed. See *id.* §§ (d)(1)(B), (d)(2)(B) (i). The EAJA was enacted with the purpose of removing the financial disincentive for individuals challenging or defending against government action and encouraging challenges to improper government action as a means of helping formulate better public policy. See, e.g., *Comm'r, I.N.S. v. Jean*, 496 U.S. 154, 163 (1990) (“[T]he specific purpose of the EAJA is to eliminate for the average person the financial disincentive to challenge unreasonable governmental actions.” (citation omitted)); *Boudin v. Thomas*, 732 F.2d 1107, 1114 (2d Cir. 1984) (“The EAJA was passed partly to encourage challenges to improper actions by government agencies. The drafters perceived legal actions as helping to formulate public policy.” (citations omitted)). As explained throughout, the Court finds the position of the United States is not substantially justified. Respondents revoked Petitioner's parole without a showing of change in circumstances related to his case. Respondents do not dispute the facts of Petitioner's status, arrest, or detention. Yet, Respondents revoked Petitioner's parole without prior written notice. Thus, Petitioner may pursue an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to the Equal Access to Justice Act.

CONCLUSION

The Court concludes Respondents revoked Petitioner's parole without a showing of change in circumstances, his right to procedural due process has been violated, and he is entitled to immediate release. Accordingly, the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is GRANTED as follows.

1. Respondents are ORDERED to immediately release Petitioner from custody, subject to the conditions of his preexisting parole.
2. Petitioner must be immediately released from detention and returned to a reasonable proximity of the geographical location of his residence.
3. All property must be returned to him (including his ID, work permit, or any other documentation that was in his possession when he was detained by ICE).
4. Petitioner shall promptly report to the Court any failure to comply with this Order by Respondent.
5. Petitioner may submit an application for fees under the EAJA within thirty days of the entry of final judgment.
6. It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondents are enjoined from relocating Petitioner outside the jurisdiction of this Court prior to compliance with this Order. IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: February 10, 2026 /s/ Douglas Harpool
DOUGLAS HARPOOL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-western-district-of-missouri-southern-division-united-states-di/2026/carlos-david-guaira-utrra-v-jim-arnott-et-al-io88iq1g>