

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)