

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district-court order; nonprecedential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)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2026/henrikh-varpanyan-v-warden-adelanto-ice-processing-center-nuur835s>