

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Henrikh Vardanyan v. Warden, Adelanto ICE Processing Center, et
al.

Vardanyan · No. 5:25-cv-03272-SVW (SK) · Decided January 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered respondents to show cause why the petitioner should not receive an immediate individualized bond hearing under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The court found the petitioner similarly situated to other detained noncitizens who had received bond hearings and directed respondents either to verify that a hearing had occurred or was scheduled, or to file a supplemental answer or consent judgment. The court also ordered that the petitioner not be transferred out of the district while the case remained active.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Steve Kim
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	January 6, 2026
DOCKET	5:25-cv-03272-SVW (SK)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner filed a 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition challenging his continued immigration detention and seeking an individualized bond hearing. After respondents filed an expedited answer asserting mandatory detention, the court issued an order to show cause rather than finally resolving the petition.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district-court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Henrikh Vardanyan v. Warden, Adelanto ICE Processing Center, et al.

TOPICS

- immigration detention
- due process
- injunctions
- civil procedure
- immigration

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether petitioner should receive an immediate individualized bond hearing under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 despite respondents' contention that immigration judges lack jurisdiction to conduct bond hearings for arriving aliens.
2. Whether respondents should be barred from transferring petitioner out of the Central District of California while the habeas action remains active.
3. Whether respondents should show cause why the petition should not be granted or provide written verification that petitioner received or was scheduled to receive a post-arrest or post-detention bond hearing.

HOLDINGS

1. For purposes of the order to show cause, the court found petitioner similarly situated to noncitizens who had received expedited individualized bond-hearing relief in other cases in the district and found those decisions persuasive.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The court finds those decisions persuasive enough (if nothing else for the sake of treating like cases alike) and would follow them absent new convincing reasons not already raised and considered in those orders.”

“Respondents are therefore ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE in writing by no later than 4:00 PM PT on January 9, 2026, why the § 2241 petition should not be granted to the extent it seeks an immediate individualized bond hearing for petitioner under the reasoning of the decisions in this district ordering such relief on an expedited basis.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner, a citizen of Armenia, entered the United States in December 2024, was initially inspected by ICE, and was released on temporary humanitarian parole subject to ICE check-ins. When he appeared for a scheduled check-in in June 2025, ICE arrested and detained him, and DHS reissued an amended Notice to Appear classifying him as an arriving alien without parole. An immigration judge later denied his request for custody redetermination for lack of jurisdiction, and petitioner remained detained at Adelanto Detention Facility.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner was arrested and detained after appearing for an ICE parole check-in. An immigration judge denied his request for redetermination on the ground that the immigration court lacked jurisdiction. Petitioner then filed this § 2241 petition. Following respondents' expedited answer and petitioner's reply, the court ordered respondents to show cause why the petition should not be granted to the extent it sought an immediate individualized bond hearing.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Matter of Q. Li, 29 I&N Dec. 66
- Padilla v. Bowen, 2025 WL 3251368 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2025)
- Mosqueda v. Noem, 2025 WL 2591530 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2025)
- Helal v. Janecka, 2025 WL 3190132 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2025)

OPINION

Henrikh Vardanyan v. Warden, Adelanto ICE Processing Center, et al.

PER CURIAM.

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 5:25-cv-03272-SVW (SK) Date: January 6, 2026 Title Henrikh Vardanyan v. Warden, Adelanto ICE Processing Center, et al. Present: The Honorable: Steve Kim, United States Magistrate Judge Connie Chung n/a Deputy Clerk Court Reporter / Recorder Attorneys Present for Plaintiff(s)/Petitioner(s): Defendant(s)/Respondent(s): None present None present Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE Petitioner is a citizen of Armenia who on arrival in the United States, in December 2024, was initially inspected by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) then released on temporary humanitarian parole and ordered to report for ICE check-ins. (ECF 1 at 3, 8, 15). When petitioner appeared for a scheduled ICE parole check-in in June 2025, he was arrested and detained. (Id. at 3). The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) reissued an amended Notice to Appear reclassifying petitioner as an arriving alien without parole. (Id. at 3, 10). On October 28, 2025, an immigration judge denied petitioner's redetermination request claiming lack of jurisdiction. (Id. at 4). Petitioner remains detained at Adelanto Detention Facility. Alleging that his continued detention is unlawful, petitioner seeks federal habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. In their answer to the petition, which the court ordered expedited, respondents argue petitioner's claim for relief fails because petitioner is subject to mandatory detention because immigration judges "lack jurisdiction to conduct bond hearings for arriving aliens." (ECF 6 at 6 (citing Matter of Q. Li, 29 I&N Dec. 66). Yet an overwhelming majority of courts within this district reject respondent's view that noncitizens in petitioner's position are subject to mandatory detention with no possibility of bond. See, e.g., Padilla v. Bowen, 2025 WL 3251368 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2025); Mosqueda v. Noem, 2025 WL 2591530 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2025); Helal v. Janecka, 2025 WL 3190132 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2025). Under this view, respondents cannot deny that similarly situated petitioners housed at Adelanto Detention Facility

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 5:25-cv-03272-SVW (SK) Date: January 6, 2026 Title Henrikh Vardanyan v. Warden,

Adelanto ICE Processing Center, et al. have been ordered to receive—and been promptly given—a bond hearing notwithstanding respondents’ contrary legal positions about the scope or interpretation of the applicable statutes or regulations under the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). For his part, petitioner replied to respondents’ answer on December 26, 2025, reiterating the same argument that he has been denied a meaningful redetermination hearing, and his continued detention violates due process. While petitioner did not raise arguments consistent with the prevailing view in this district, the court nonetheless finds petitioner to be similarly situated. The court finds those decisions persuasive enough (if nothing else for the sake of treating like cases alike) and would follow them absent new convincing reasons not already raised and considered in those orders. Respondents, however, raise no such new countervailing arguments here. Respondents are therefore ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE in writing by no later than 4:00 PM PT on January 9, 2026, why the § 2241 petition should not be granted to the extent it seeks an immediate individualized bond hearing for petitioner under the reasoning of the decisions in this district ordering such relief on an expedited basis. Respondents may discharge this order by or before the show-cause deadline with written verification that petitioner has received (or is scheduled to receive on a date certain) a post-arrest/post-detention bond hearing consistent with those given to similarly situated noncitizens under orders from this district. Meanwhile, respondents are ordered not to transfer petitioner out of this district while this case remains active. If petitioner is released on bond (or scheduled to receive a bond hearing on a date certain), petitioner’s counsel shall so confirm in writing and file a notice of voluntary dismissal without prejudice under Rule 41(a)(1) if petitioner’s release on bond (or scheduled bond hearing) moots this habeas action. If this action is not voluntarily dismissed before then, respondents must file by no later than January 16, 2026 either

(1) a supplemental answer addressing petitioner’s reply, or (2) a stipulation and consent judgment (consistent with others entered in this district) enjoining petitioner’s rearrest or detention without pre-deprivation notice and hearing. Such consent judgment, however, may preserve any of respondents’ arguments concerning the disputed applicability, interpretation, or scope of any INA statutes or regulations at issue.

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 5:25-cv-03272-SVW (SK) Date: January 6, 2026 Title Henrikh Vardanyan v. Warden, Adelanto ICE Processing Center, et al. The clerk of court is instructed to docket and email this order to all counsel of record forthwith. IT IS SO ORDERED.