

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

**Bobirjon Baturov Bokhodurovich v. Christopher Chestnut, Warden
of the California City Detention Center; Kristi Noem, Secretary of
the Department of Homeland Security; Pamela Bondi, U.S. Attorney
General; Moises Becerra, in his official capacity as Field Office
Director of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Enforcement
and Removal Operations**

No. 1:26-cv-00006-KES-EPG (HC) · No. No. 1:26-cv-00006-KES-EPG (HC) · Decided January 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California converted petitioner Bobirjon Baturov Bokhodurovich’s motion for a temporary restraining order into a motion for a preliminary injunction and granted it. The court ordered respondents to release petitioner immediately and prohibited his re-detention unless, after a pre-deprivation bond hearing before a neutral decisionmaker, they establish by clear and convincing evidence that he is a flight risk or danger to the community. The court waived the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c) security requirement and referred the matter for further proceedings.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	January 8, 2026
DOCKET	No. 1:26-cv-00006-KES-EPG (HC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner moved for a temporary restraining order in a habeas proceeding. The court converted the motion to one for a preliminary injunction and granted it.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Bobirjon Baturov Bokhodurovich v. Christopher Chestnut, Warden of the California City Detention Center, Kristi Noem, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Pamela Bondi, U.S. Attorney

General, Moises Becerra, in his official capacity as Field Office
Director of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Enforcement and
Removal Operations

TOPICS

immigration detention injunctions equitable relief remedies civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration law habeas corpus civil procedure equitable relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether petitioner's motion for a temporary restraining order should be converted to a motion for a preliminary injunction.
2. Whether petitioner was entitled to immediate release and protection against re-detention absent a pre-deprivation bond hearing establishing by clear and convincing evidence that he was a flight risk or danger to the community.
3. Whether the security requirement under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c) should be waived.

HOLDINGS

1. A motion styled as a motion for a temporary restraining order may be converted to a motion for a preliminary injunction when the parties have been given an opportunity to address conversion and do not object.
2. Petitioner was entitled to immediate release, and respondents were enjoined from re-detaining him unless they first demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence at a pre-deprivation bond hearing before a neutral decisionmaker that he was a flight risk or danger to the community such that physical custody was legally justified.
3. The security requirement of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c) was waived.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Respondents are ORDERED to release petitioner immediately. Respondents are ENJOINED AND RESTRAINED from re-detaining petitioner unless they demonstrate, by clear and convincing evidence at a pre-deprivation bond hearing before a neutral decisionmaker, that petitioner is a flight risk or danger to the community such that his physical custody is legally justified.” (at 1)

“The bond requirement of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c) is waived.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Bobirjon Baturov Bokhodurovich was held in immigration detention by the respondent officials. He alleged that his continued or possible renewed detention was unlawful and sought emergency injunctive relief. The court

found no factual or legal issue distinguishing this case from its prior decisions involving similar detention claims.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner sought emergency relief from immigration detention. The court ordered respondents to show cause why relief should not be denied based on prior orders addressing the same legal issues. Respondents identified no factual or legal distinction and did not oppose conversion of the motion or request a hearing. The court granted a preliminary injunction and referred the matter to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings, including findings and recommendations on the habeas petition.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The matter was referred to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings, including preparation of findings and recommendations on the habeas petition or other appropriate action.

CASES CITED

- R.I. v. Wofford, No. 1:25-CV-01637-KES-SKO (HC), 2025 WL 3768205 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 31, 2025)
- Ramazan M. v. Andrews, No. 1:25-CV-01356-KES-SKO (HC), 2025 WL 3145562 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 10, 2025)
- Diaz v. Brewer, 656 F.3d 1008, 1015 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Pinchi v. Noem, No. 25-CV-05632-RMI (RFL), 2025 WL 1853763, at *4 (N.D. Cal. July 21, 2025)

OPINION

Chestnut

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4

5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

6 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

7

8 BOBIRJON BATUROV No. 1:26-cv-00006-KES-EPG (HC)

BOKHODUROVICH,

9 Petitioner, ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR

10 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

v.

11 Doc. 2

CHRISTOPHER CHESTNUT, Warden of 12 the California City Detention Center; KRISTI NOEM, Secretary of the 13 Department of Homeland Security; PAMELA BONDI, U.S. Attorney

General; 14 MOISES BECERRA, in his official capacity as Field Office Director of Immigration and 15 Customs Enforcement, Enforcement and Removal Operations, 16 Respondents. 17 18 19 Before the Court is petitioner Bobirjon Baturov Bokhodurovich's motion for temporary 20 restraining order.1 Doc. 2. The Court has addressed the legal issues raised by petitioner's motion 21 for temporary restraining order on previous occasions. See, e.g., R.I. v. Wofford, No. 1:25-CV-22 01637-KES-SKO (HC), 2025 WL 3768205 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 31, 2025); Ramazan M. v. Andrews,

23 No. 1:25-CV-01356-KES-SKO (HC), 2025 WL 3145562 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 10, 2025).

24 The Court ordered respondents to show cause as to whether there are any factual or legal 25 issues in this case that render it distinguishable from the Court's prior orders in R.I. v. Wofford, 26 1 Petitioner filed a notice stating that Department of Homeland Security records incorrectly 27 indicate that his name is Bobirjon Baturov Bokhodurovich, but his true name is Baturov Bobirjon. Doc. 10. Petitioner requests that the Court include both names in this Order, as well as his alien 28 registration number: A 216-904-905. Id. 1 |} No. 1:25-CV-01637-KES-SKO (HC), 2025 WL 3768205 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 31, 2025), 2 | and Ramazan M. v. Andrews, No. 1:25-CV-01356-KES-SKO (HC), 2025 WL 3145562 (E.D. Cal. 3 || Nov. 10, 2025), and that would justify denying the motion. Doc. 6. The Court also ordered 4 || respondents to state their position on whether the motion should be converted to a motion for 5 || preliminary injunction and whether they request a hearing. /d. Respondents did not identify any 6 || factual or legal issues in this case that render it distinct from the cases cited in the Court's minute 7 || order, and they also did not object to converting the motion or request a hearing. See Doc. 11. 8 As respondents have not identified any factual or legal issues in this case that render it 9 || distinguishable from the Court's prior decisions in R.J. v. Wofford, No. 1:25-CV-01637-KES- 10 | SKO (AC), 2025 WL 3768205 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 31, 2025), and Ramazan M. v. Andrews, No. 1:25- 11 || CV-01356-KES-SKO (HC), 2025 WL 3145562 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 10, 2025), and for the reasons 12 || stated in those prior orders, petitioner's motion for temporary restraining order is converted to a 13 | motion for a preliminary injunction and is GRANTED. Respondents are ORDERED to release 14 | petitioner immediately. Respondents are ENJOINED AND RESTRAINED from re-detaining 15 || petitioner unless they demonstrate, by clear and convincing evidence at a pre-deprivation bond 16 | hearing before a neutral decisionmaker, that petitioner is a flight risk or danger to the community 17 || such that his physical custody is legally justified. 18 The bond requirement of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c) is waived. Courts 19 || regularly waive security in cases like this one. See Diaz v. Brewer, 656 F.3d 1008, 1015 (9th Cir. 20 | 2011); Pinchi v. Noem, No. 25-CV-05632-RMI (RFL), 2025 WL 1853763, at *4 (N.D. Cal. July 21 | 4, 2025). 22 This matter is referred to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings including 23 || the preparation of findings and recommendations on the petition or other appropriate action. 24

95 | ISSO ORDERED. _

26 Dated: _ January 8, 2026 4h

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

28 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2026/bobirjon-baturov-bokhodurovich-v-christopher-chestnut-nz435kv8>