

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

Carlos Didier Marroquin Escobar v. Kristi Noem et al.

Marroquin Escobar v. Noem · No. 1:26-cv-00590-PX · Decided April 24, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Maryland granted Carlos Didier Marroquin Escobar’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging his detention by Immigration and Customs Enforcement. The court held that ICE failed to comply with 8 C.F.R. § 241.4(l) and related procedural requirements governing revocation of release, violating the Accardi doctrine and due process. The court ordered his release under prior supervision conditions and enjoined re-detention absent adequate notice, an opportunity to be heard, and regulatory compliance.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Maryland
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Paula Xinis
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Maryland
DECIDED	April 24, 2026
DOCKET	1:26-cv-00590-PX
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging immigration detention and the revocation of an order of supervision.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the habeas challenge to the legality of immigration detention and determined whether ICE complied with its governing regulations and constitutional due-process requirements.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court decision; persuasive authority only
PARTIES	Carlos Didier Marroquin Escobar v. Kristi Noem et al.

TOPICS

- immigration detention
- procedural due process
- due process
- administrative law
- remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

- immigration
- administrative law
- constitutional law
- civil rights
- habeas corpus

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether ICE violated the Accardi doctrine and due process by revoking Marroquin Escobar's order of supervision and detaining him without complying with 8 C.F.R. § 241.4(l)'s requirements for authorization, notice, and an opportunity to be heard.
2. Whether the regulatory framework governing the revocation of Marroquin Escobar's release was 8 C.F.R. § 241.4(l), rather than 8 C.F.R. § 241.13(i).

HOLDINGS

1. The regulation governing ICE's revocation of Marroquin Escobar's release was 8 C.F.R. § 241.4(l), not § 241.13(i), because § 241.13(i) applies to noncitizens detained beyond the ninety-day removal period following a final order of removal.
2. ICE violated the Accardi doctrine and due process by detaining Marroquin Escobar without complying with the procedural safeguards required by 8 C.F.R. § 241.4(l).
3. Immediate release was the appropriate remedy for detention imposed without the process required by the governing regulations and the Fifth Amendment.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Upon revocation, the alien will be notified of the reasons for revocation of his or her release or parole.” (8 C.F.R. § 241.4(l)(1))

“As a result, Marroquin Escobar was detained without due process for which the remedy is immediate release.” (Disposition)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Marroquin Escobar, a Salvadoran citizen and lawful permanent resident since 1989, was ordered removed in 2019 but received withholding of removal based on the likelihood of persecution or torture. ICE released him on an order of supervision, and he complied with the conditions for years while holding category 18 employment authorization. ICE detained him on February 9, 2026, during a check-in and issued notices that were unsigned or improperly signed, misstated the applicable regulation and destination country, and failed to provide a timely and meaningful opportunity to contest the revocation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Marroquin Escobar filed a federal habeas petition after ICE detained him during a routine check-in and served notices revoking his release. After full briefing and a merits hearing, the court granted the petition, ordered his release under the prior supervision conditions, enjoined re-detention absent compliance with due-process requirements and 8 C.F.R. § 241.4(l), and retained jurisdiction.

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

CASES CITED

- *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001)
- *United States ex rel. Accardi v. Shaughnessy*, 347 U.S. 260, 268 (1954)
- *United States v. Morgan*, 193 F.3d 252, 266-67 (4th Cir. 1999)
- *Delgado-Corea v. Immigration & Naturalization Service*, 804 F.2d 261, 263 (4th Cir. 1986)
- *Santamaria Orellana v. Baker*, No. CV 25-1788-TDC, 2025 WL 2444087, at *6 (D. Md. Aug. 25, 2025)
- *Ceesay v. Kurzdorfer*, 781 F. Supp. 3d 137, 161-62 (W.D.N.Y. 2025)
- *Alcivar Lorenzo v. Raycraft*, No. 1:26-CV-77, 2026 WL 369349, at *6 (W.D. Mich. Feb. 10, 2026)
- *Vasquez Tejada v. Liggins et al.*, 8:26-cv-00952-PX, ECF No. 20 (D. Md. Apr. 20, 2026)
- *Samahn v. Noem et al.*, No. 25-CV-25618, 2026 WL 911290, at *6 (S.D. Fla. Apr. 2, 2026)
- *Ahmed v. Olson*, No. CV 26-89-DLB, 2026 WL 836123, at *5 (E.D. Ky. Mar. 26, 2026)
- *Sombuoune Virachak v. Juan Baltazar et al.*, No. 26-CV-00391-STV, 2026 WL 746285, at *4-5 (D. Colo. Mar. 17, 2026)
- *Rodriguez Romero v. Ladwig*, No. CV 25-1106-JWD-EWD, 2026 WL 321437, at *7-8 (M.D. La. Feb. 6, 2026)
- *Arman Kesheshian v. Kristi Noem et al.*, No. 5:25-CV-03478-MWC-DFM, 2025 WL 4227216, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 24, 2025)
- *N.A.L.R. v. Bondi*, No. 4:25-CV-00192-SEB-KMB, 2025 WL 2987239, at *2 (S.D. Ind. Oct. 23, 2025)
- *K.E.O. v. Woosley*, No. 4:25-CV-74-RGJ, 2025 WL 2553394, at *5 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 4, 2025)
- *M.S.L. v. Bostock*, No. 6:25-CV-01204-AA, 2025 WL 2430267, at *10 (D. Or. Aug. 21, 2025)