

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Peejman Shadalo v. John Mattos, et al.

Shadalo · No. 2:25-cv-02076-RFB-BNW · Decided November 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada issued an order to show cause in Peejman Shadalo’s habeas corpus action under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The court expedited briefing on Shadalo’s motion for a temporary restraining order, required respondents to submit detention-related documents, and prohibited transfer of Shadalo out of the district. The order also directed service of the petition and motion and set deadlines for the respondents’ return and Shadalo’s traverse.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Richard F. Boulware, II
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	November 25, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-02076-RFB-BNW
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner filed a counseled amended petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and a motion for a temporary restraining order. The district court issued an order to show cause, expedited consideration of the motion, directed production of detention-related documents, and temporarily prohibited transfer of petitioner out of the district.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For the order to show cause and discovery directive, the court applied the prima-facie-case standard under 28 U.S.C. § 2243. For the interim restraint, the court found that petitioner satisfied the factors governing preliminary relief and that maintaining the status quo was necessary to preserve jurisdiction.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential interlocutory district-court order
PARTIES	Peejman Shadalo v. John Mattos, et al.

TOPICS

immigration detention

federal habeas corpus

injunctions

discovery dispute

removal proceedings

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration

federal habeas corpus

civil procedure

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether respondents should be required to show cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not issue under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241 and 2243.
2. Whether petitioner established a prima facie case warranting discovery of documents supporting the asserted basis for his detention.
3. Whether the court could temporarily prohibit respondents from transferring petitioner out of the District of Nevada under the All Writs Act to preserve the court's jurisdiction and maintain the status quo.
4. Whether petitioner's motion for a temporary restraining order warranted expedited consideration.

HOLDINGS

1. Respondents must show cause why the writ of habeas corpus should not be granted and must file a notice of appearance and a return certifying the true cause of detention.
2. When a habeas petition establishes a prima facie case for relief, the court may require respondents to produce documents reflecting and supporting the asserted basis for detention.
3. Respondents may not transfer petitioner out of the District of Nevada while the court resolves the petition and motion.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“a district court, confronted by a petition for habeas corpus which establishes a prima facie case for relief, may use or authorize the use of suitable discovery procedures . . . reasonably fashioned to elicit facts necessary to help the court to ‘dispose of the matter as law and justice require.’” (2)

“express authority under the All Writs Act to issue such temporary injunctions as may be necessary to protect its own jurisdiction.” (3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Peejman Shadalo is an immigration detainee held at Nevada Southern Detention Center. He challenged his continued detention and the procedures connected with his potential removal to an undesignated third country. The court concluded that he had established a prima facie case for relief and that documents concerning the asserted basis for his detention were necessary to resolve the habeas matter.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Shadalo challenged his ongoing immigration detention and the procedures underlying his potential removal to an undesignated third country. Before respondents had answered, the court found that petitioner could likely

demonstrate entitlement to relief comparable to relief previously ordered in *Candido-Bolanos v. Lyons*, found a prima facie case for habeas relief, and ordered respondents to show cause why the writ should not issue.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Candido-Bolanos v. Lyons*, No. 2:25-cv-01359-RFB-RJY (D. Nev. Oct. 8, 2025) (No. 39)
- *Harris v. Nelson*, 394 U.S. 286, 290 (1969)
- *F.T.C. v. Dean Foods Co.*, 384 U.S. 597, 601 (1966)
- *Al Otro Lado v. Wolf*, 952 F.3d 999, 1007 n.6 (9th Cir. 2020)

OPINION

1 2 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 5 * * * 6 PEEJMAN SHADALO, 7 Petitioner, Case No. 2:25-cv-02076-RFB-BNW 8 v. ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE 9 JOHN MATTOS, et al., 10 Respondents. 11 Petitioner Peejman Shadalo, an immigration detainee, has filed a counseled, amended 12 Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (ECF No. 10). Simultaneously, he has 13 filed a Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (ECF No. 12).

Through them, Petitioner 14 challenges (a.) his ongoing detention at Nevada Southern Detention Center in the custody of 15 Respondents and (b.) the procedures underlying his potential removal to an undesignated third 16 country.

The Court has reviewed the Petition and Motion, and it believes that Petitioner can likely 17 demonstrate that his circumstances warrant the same relief ordered by this Court for Petitioner 18 Candido Bolanos in *Candido-Bolanos v. Lyons*, No. 2:25-cv-01359-RFB-RJY (D. Nev. Oct. 8, 19 2025) (No. 39), and related orders. 20 Thus, Respondents are ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE why the Writ should not be 21 granted.

See 28 U.S.C. § 2243. Respondents shall file, in writing, a (i) notice of appearance and 22 (ii) “a return certifying the true cause of detention” on or before December 9, 2025. Petitioner 23 may file a traverse on or before December 14, 2025. 24 For the same reasons described above, the Court finds that Petitioner’s Motion for 25 Temporary Restraining Order (ECF No. 12) warrants expedited consideration.

Respondents have 26 up to, and including, December 2, 2025, to file a response to the Motion. Petitioner has up to, and 27 including, December 9, 2025, to reply. 28 1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED the Parties shall indicate in their briefing whether they 2 request oral argument, or an evidentiary hearing, on the Petition and/or Motion.

The Court would be amenable to ruling on the papers if the Parties indicate that they are willing to waive a hearing. If Respondents have no new arguments to offer that have not already been addressed by the Court, they may so indicate by reference to their previous briefing, while reserving appellate rights. They may not, however, incorporate briefing in a manner that would circumvent the page limits under Local Rule 7-3 without leave of this Court.

Respondents should file the referenced briefing as an attachment for Petitioner's counsel's review. Additionally, the Court finds Petitioner has established a prima facie case for relief and that ordering Respondents to produce documents reflecting the basis for their detention of Petitioner is necessary for the Court to "dispose of the matter as law and justice require." See *Harris v. Nelson*, 394 U.S. 286, 290 (1969) (holding that "a district court, confronted by a petition for habeas corpus which establishes a prima facie case for relief, may use or authorize the use of suitable discovery procedures... reasonably fashioned to elicit facts necessary to help the court to 'dispose of the matter as law and justice require.'") (citing 28 U.S.C. § 2243).

Therefore, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondents must file any documents referenced or relied upon in their responsive pleading. If Respondents' asserted basis for detention is reflected in any documents in their possession, including, but not limited to, an arrest warrant, notice to appear, Form-286, and/or Form I-213 relevant to Petitioner's arrest, detention, and/or removal proceedings, Respondents must so indicate and file said documents with their pleading(s).

Respondents are granted leave to file any documents containing sensitive personal identifying information or sensitive law enforcement information with redactions or under seal, in accordance with Local Rule IA 10-5. If no such documents exist to support the asserted basis for detention, Respondents must indicate. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Local Rules 7-2, 7-3, and 7-4 will govern the requirements and scheduling of all other motions filed by either party.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Parties shall file all documents and exhibits in accordance with Local Rules LR IA 10-1, 10-2, and 10-3. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Parties must meet and confer regarding any requests for an extension of deadlines and stipulate to the extension if possible. Any motion for extension must certify efforts taken to meet and confer and indicate the opposing party's position regarding the extension.

Any motion or stipulation must comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b) and Local Rules IA 6-1, 6-2. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondents shall not transfer Petitioner out of this District. This Court has "express authority under the All Writs Act to issue such temporary injunctions as may be necessary to protect its own jurisdiction." *F.T.C. v. Dean Foods Co.*, 384 U.S. 597, 601 (1966); see also *Al Otro Lado v. Wolf*, 952 F.3d 999, 1007 n.6 (9th Cir.

2020) 10 (“Having concluded that [agency action] would interfere with the court’s jurisdiction..., the 11 district court properly issued an injunction under the All Writs Act.”) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)). 12 Were Petitioner prematurely removed from the United States District of Nevada, or more broadly 13 the United States, this Court could be deprived of jurisdiction over his claims.

Given the exigent 14 circumstances surrounding Petitioner, the Court finds that this Order is warranted to maintain the 15 status quo pending resolution on the merits, and the Court finds that Petitioner has satisfied the 16 factors governing the issuance of such preliminary relief. 17 IT IS FURTHER KINDLY ORDERED that the Clerk of Court: 18 1. REVISE the docket in this case to reflect the proper parties, as updated by the Amended 19 Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (ECF No. 10).

20 2. DELIVER a copy of the Petition (ECF No. 10), Motion (ECF No. 12), attachments 21 (ECF Nos. 11-1, 11-2, 11-3, 11-4, 11-5), and this Order to the U.S. Marshal for service. 22 3. ADD the United States Attorney for the District of Nevada to the docket as an Interested 23 Party. 24 4. SEND, through CM/ECF, a copy of the Petition (ECF No. 10), Motion (ECF No. 12), 25 attachments (ECF Nos. 11-1, 11-2, 11-3, 11-4, 11-5), and this Order to the United States Attorney 26 for the District of Nevada at Sigal.Chattah@usdoj.gov, Veronica.criste@usdoj.gov, 27 summer.johnson@usdoj.gov, and caseview.ecf@usdoj.gov. in accordance with Federal Rule of 28 Civil Procedure 5(b)(2)(E).

1 5. MAIL a copy of the Petition (ECF No. 10), Motion (ECF No. 12), attachments (ECF 2| Nos. 11-1, 11-2, 11-3, 11-4, 11-5), and this Order pursuant to Rule 4(1)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to: 4 1) John Mattos, Warden, Nevada Southern Detention Center, 2190 E. Mesquite 5 Ave. Pahrump, NV 89060. 6 2) Jason Knight, Acting Las Vegas Field Office Director, 2975 Decker Lake Drive 7 Suite 100, West Valley City, UT 84119-6096.

8 3) Todd Lyons, Acting Director and Senior Official Performing the Duties of the 9 Director for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, 500 12th Street, SW, 10 Washington, DC 20536. 11 4) Kristi Noem, Secretary, United States Department of Homeland Security, 245 12 Murray Lane SW, Washington, DC 20528. 13 5) Pamela Bondi, Attorney General of the United States, 950 Pennsylvania 14 Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20530.

15 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the U.S. Marshal SERVE a copy of the Petition (ECF 16 | No. 10), Motion (ECF No. 12), attachments (ECF Nos. 11-1, 11-2, 11-3, 11-4, 11-5), and this 17 | Order on the United States Attorney for the District of Nevada or on an Assistant United States 18 Attorney or clerical employee designated by the United States Attorney pursuant to Rule 19) 4(73) (1)(A)Q@ of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

20 21 DATED: November 25, 2025. AS 22 23 RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 25 26 27 28 -4-

