

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Rakhim Rasulovich Shoimov v. Christopher Chestnut

No. 1:25-cv-1603 CSK (E.D. Cal. Jan. 6, 2026) · No. 1:25-cv-1603 CSK · Decided January 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California grants Rakhim Rasulovich Shoimov’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging his immigration detention. The court holds that 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), rather than the mandatory-detention provision in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), governs his re-detention and that due process required a pre-deprivation bond hearing. The court orders his immediate release and bars re-detention unless the government establishes by clear and convincing evidence at a hearing before a neutral decisionmaker that he is a flight risk or danger to the community.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Chi Soo Kim
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	January 6, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-1603 CSK
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging the legality of immigration re-detention.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the legality of custody under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and applied the Mathews v. Eldridge procedural due-process balancing test.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status unknown
PARTIES	Rakhim Rasulovich Shoimov v. Christopher Chestnut, Warden, California City Detention Facility

TOPICS

immigration detention

procedural due process

statutory interpretation

removal proceedings

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration

habeas corpus

immigration detention

constitutional law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Shoimov was subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) or discretionary detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).
2. Whether re-detaining Shoimov after his prior release without a pre-deprivation bond hearing violated the Due Process Clause.
3. Whether the facility warden was the proper respondent in a core habeas challenge to present physical confinement.

HOLDINGS

1. The warden of the facility where the petitioner is physically confined is the proper respondent in a core habeas challenge to present detention; the other named officials were dismissed.
2. Shoimov was detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), not mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), because he had resided in the United States for more than two years after being released under § 1226 and was not arrested upon arrival.
3. A noncitizen previously released under § 1226(a) has a protected liberty interest in continued release and must receive a pre-deprivation bond hearing before re-detention, where the government seeks to justify custody based on flight risk or danger to the community.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Because petitioner is currently detained at the California City Detention Facility, the Warden, Christopher Chestnut, is the proper respondent.” (at 3)

“This Court also rejects the new interpretation of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) by respondent, and finds that petitioner is detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and its implementing regulations” (at 8)

“An essential principle of due process is that a deprivation of life, liberty, or property be preceded by notice and opportunity for hearing appropriate to the nature of the case.” (at 13)

“Respondent is ENJOINED AND RESTRAINED from re-detaining petitioner unless the government demonstrates, 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 13)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Shoimov, a native of Uzbekistan, entered the United States in February 2023 and was placed in removal proceedings after being found near the United States-Mexico border. Immigration authorities detained him under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and released him on his own recognizance, allowing him to remain outside custody for more than two years. ICE re-detained him during a routine check-in on October 15, 2025, without providing an individualized bond hearing, and the government did not contend that he was a flight risk or danger to the community.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Shoimov entered the United States in February 2023, was detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226, and was released on his own recognizance. After ICE re-detained him on October 15, 2025, an immigration judge denied his custody-redetermination request. Shoimov filed this § 2241 habeas petition on November 20, 2025. The district court granted the petition, dismissed the improperly named respondents other than the facility warden, ordered immediate release, and barred re-detention absent a qualifying pre-deprivation bond hearing.

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The respondent must release Shoimov immediately. Respondent is enjoined and restrained from re-detaining him unless the government demonstrates, by clear and convincing evidence at a pre-deprivation bond hearing before a neutral decisionmaker, that he is a flight risk or danger to the community. The parties must file a joint status report within seven days.

CASES CITED

- *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 435 (2004)
- *Doe v. Garland*, 109 F.4th 1188, 1199 (9th Cir. 2024)
- *Preiser v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475, 484 (1973)
- *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 687, 690, 693 (2001)
- *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, 2025 WL 2782499, at *1, 21-22 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 30, 2025)
- *J.Y.L.C. v. Bostock*, 2025 WL 3169865, at *2 (D. Or. Nov. 12, 2025)
- *Cardona-Lozano v. Noem*, 2025 WL 3218244, at *6 (W.D. Tex. Nov. 14, 2025)
- *Faizyan v. Casey*, 2025 WL 3208844, at *5 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2025)
- *Josue I.C.A. v. Lyons*, 2025 WL 3496432, at 3 n.6 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 5, 2025)
- *Morales-Flores v. Lyons*, 2025 WL 3552841, at *3 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2025)
- *Salcedo Aceros v. Kaiser*, 2025 WL 2637503, at *8 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 12, 2025)
- *Guerro Lepe v. Andrews*, 2025 WL 2716910, at *3-9 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2025)
- *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507, 525 (2004)
- *I.N.S. v. St. Cyr*, 533 U.S. 289, 301 (2001)

- Young v. Harper, 520 U.S. 143, 147-49 (1997)
- Gagnon v. Scarpelli, 411 U.S. 778, 782 (1973)
- Morrissey v. Brewer, 408 U.S. 471, 480-86 (1972)
- Gonzalez-Fuentes v. Molina, 607 F.3d 864, 887 (1st Cir. 2010)
- Saravia v. Sessions, 280 F. Supp. 3d 1168, 1176 (N.D. Cal. 2017), *aff'd sub nom. Saravia for A.H. v. Sessions*, 905 F.3d 1137 (9th Cir. 2018)
- Perry v. Sindermann, 408 U.S. 593, 601-03 (1972)
- Aroldo Rodriguez Diaz v. Merrick Garland, Rodriguez Diaz v. Garland, 53 F.4th 1189, 1206-07 (9th Cir. 2022)
- Hernandez v. Sessions, 872 F.3d 976, 981, 993 (9th Cir. 2017)
- Ortega v. Bonnar, 415 F. Supp. 3d 963, 963, 970 (N.D. Cal. 2019)
- Cleveland Bd. of Educ. v. Loudermill, 470 U.S. 532, 542 (1985)

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/rakhim-rasulovich-shoimov-v-christopher-chestnut-qkrjf605>