

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

Tra Bi Jean v. Pamela Bondi, et al.

Jean · No. 2:25-cv-02487 · Decided December 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Washington grants Tra Bi Jean’s ex parte motion for a temporary restraining order in his habeas proceedings. The order prohibits immigration authorities from transferring him from the Northwest Immigration and Customs Enforcement Processing Center during the proceedings, subject to specified exceptions, and expires on December 19, 2025 unless extended.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
DECIDED	December 5, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-02487
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging mandatory immigration detention and moved ex parte for a temporary restraining order prohibiting his transfer from the Northwest Immigration and Customs Enforcement Processing Center during the habeas proceedings.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A party seeking a temporary restraining order must show a likelihood of success on the merits, a likelihood of irreparable harm absent relief, that the balance of equities favors relief, and that an injunction is in the public interest. In a TRO against the government, the balance-of-equities and public-interest factors merge. The Ninth Circuit also permits relief under the serious-questions-and-sliding-scale formulation if the other equitable requirements are satisfied.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished federal district court interlocutory order; persuasive value only.

TOPICS

immigration detention

federal habeas corpus

injunctions

removal proceedings

immigration

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration

federal habeas corpus

civil procedure

injunctions

immigration detention

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Petitioner was entitled to an ex parte temporary restraining order preventing Respondents from transferring him from the Northwest Immigration and Customs Enforcement Processing Center during the habeas proceedings.
2. Whether Petitioner demonstrated a likelihood of success on his claim that he was subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), rather than mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2), and therefore was entitled to consideration for release on bond.
3. Whether the threatened transfer would cause imminent irreparable harm by impairing Petitioner's access to counsel and participation in bond hearings.

HOLDINGS

1. A federal district court may use its authority under the All Writs Act and its inherent authority to protect the integrity of habeas proceedings by prohibiting the government from transferring a petitioner outside the district while those proceedings are pending.
2. Petitioner satisfied the requirements for a temporary restraining order by showing a likelihood of success on the merits, imminent irreparable harm, and that the balance of hardships and public interest favored relief.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court therefore GRANTS Petitioner’s Motion for TRO.” (at 2)

“Under this authority, a court may order injunctive relief prohibiting the government from transferring a petitioner out of the district while habeas corpus proceedings are ongoing.” (at 2)

“The Court concludes that a TRO prohibiting the transfer of Petitioner out of NWIPC is warranted to protect the integrity of these habeas proceedings and GRANTS the motion for TRO.” (at 5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner was apprehended by immigration authorities on November 21, 2025 after entering the United States more than twenty years earlier and not being apprehended upon arrival. He alleged that he was detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), although he was not detained under § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231, and that he was likely a member of a class entitled to bond consideration under § 1226(a). Petitioner also presented evidence that his commissary account had been emptied and that transfer or removal might occur within twenty-four hours, creating an imminent risk that transfer would impair his access to counsel and participation in bond proceedings.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On December 5, 2025, Petitioner commenced a federal habeas proceeding alleging that Respondents unlawfully subjected him to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). He moved for an ex parte temporary restraining order to prevent transfer out of the Western District of Washington. The district court granted the TRO, subject to expiration on December 19, 2025 unless extended or converted into a preliminary injunction.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Ozturk v. Trump*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 462, 496 (D. Vt. 2025), amended sub nom. *Ozturk v. Hyde*, 136 F.4th 382 (2d Cir. 2025)
- *Oliveros v. Kaiser*, No. 25-CV-07117-BLF, 2025 WL 2677125, at *8–9 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 18, 2025)
- *Reyna ex rel. J.F.G. v. Hott*, 921 F.3d 204, 209 (4th Cir. 2019)
- *Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)
- *United States v. City of Seattle*, 474 F. Supp. 3d 1181, 1185, 1185–87 (W.D. Wash. 2020)
- *Drakes Bay Oyster Co. v. Jewell*, 747 F.3d 1073, 1092 (9th Cir. 2014)
- *Fraihat v. U.S. Immigration & Customs Enforcement*, 16 F.4th 613, 635 (9th Cir. 2021)
- *Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127, 1135 (9th Cir. 2011)
- *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, 2025 WL 3289861, at *10–11 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2025)
- *L.A.E. v. Wamsley*, No. 3:25-CV-01975-AN, 2025 WL 3037856, at *5 (D. Or. Oct. 30, 2025)
- *Arroyo v. U.S. Department of Homeland Security*, No. SACV19815JGBSHKX, 2019 WL 2912848, at *22 (C.D. Cal. June 20, 2019)