

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Raul Sanchez Bueno v. Gregory J. Archambeault, et al.

Case No. 25-cv-2509-AGS-MMP · No. 25-cv-2509-AGS-MMP · Decided October 23, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California screened Raul Sanchez Bueno’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition challenging his immigration detention and found the claim sufficiently cognizable to require a government response. The court ordered respondents to answer by November 12, 2025, allowed petitioner to reply by November 26, 2025, and set oral argument for December 3, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Andrew G. Schopler
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	October 23, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-2509-AGS-MMP
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Screening order in a federal habeas corpus proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 concerning immigration detention.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	At the screening stage, the court may summarily dismiss a habeas petition if it plainly appears from the petition and attached exhibits that the petitioner is not entitled to relief; claims that are clearly not cognizable may also be summarily dismissed. A petition with any potential merit is not frivolous or incredible enough for summary dismissal.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Raul Sanchez Bueno, petitioner v. Gregory J. Archambeault, et al., respondents

TOPICS

- immigration detention
- federal habeas corpus
- removal proceedings
- immigration

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration

federal habeas corpus

immigration detention

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the § 2241 petition challenging prolonged immigration detention stated a sufficiently cognizable and nonfrivolous claim to require a response rather than summary dismissal at screening.

HOLDINGS

1. The petition stated a claim that was sufficiently cognizable and neither frivolous nor incredible to warrant summary dismissal; respondents were required to answer.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“But “as long as a petition has any potential merit, it is not so frivolous or incredible as to justify summary dismissal[.]”” (at 1)

“This claim is neither “frivolous” nor “incredible.” The government must respond.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner, a Mexican citizen, alleged that he had been subject to a final order of removal since June 14, 2013, and that after removal, unauthorized reentry, and reinstatement of the order, he was granted withholding of removal in November 2022. Immigration and Customs Enforcement took him into custody in May 2025 to attempt removal to a third country. At the time of the order, he alleged that he had been detained for 201 days, that no third country had been identified, and that there was no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed a § 2241 petition challenging his continued detention after a final order of removal. The court screened the petition under Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, applied through Rule 1(b), concluded that the claim was sufficiently cognizable and neither frivolous nor incredible, and ordered respondents to answer.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Neiss v. Blutworth, 114 F.4th 1038, 1045 (9th Cir. 2024)
- Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678, 690, 701 (2001)