

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Julio Cesar Pomboza Pinto v. Pamela Bondi, Attorney General, et al.

Pomboza Pinto v. Bondi · No. 0:26-CV-622 · Decided January 29, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Minnesota granted the government's motion to transfer a pending habeas corpus petition to the Western District of Texas. The court held that habeas jurisdiction generally lies in the district of confinement and found that the petitioner was located in Texas when the petition was filed; it denied the petitioner's motion for an order to show cause.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Minnesota
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John M. Gerrard
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Minnesota
DECIDED	January 29, 2026
DOCKET	0:26-CV-622
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The government moved to dismiss the pending petition for a writ of habeas corpus or, alternatively, to transfer the case to the Western District of Texas. The petitioner opposed transfer and moved for an order to show cause.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Julio Cesar Pomboza Pinto v. Pamela Bondi, Attorney General, et al.

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- venue
- subject matter jurisdiction
- immigration
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- federal habeas corpus
- immigration
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the habeas petition should be dismissed or transferred because the petitioner was confined in the Western District of Texas when the petition was filed.

2. Whether circumstances surrounding the petitioner's transfer to Texas justified an exception to the district-of-confinement rule.

HOLDINGS

1. Because the petitioner was confined in El Paso, Texas, and counsel knew his location when the petition was filed, the district-of-confinement rule applied and the case was properly transferred to the Western District of Texas.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“There is no indication that the Government refused to tell [petitioner's] lawyer where he had been taken. The original petition demonstrates that the lawyer knew where [petitioner] was being held at that time... In these circumstances, the basic rules apply” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The petitioner was confined in El Paso, Texas, when the habeas petition was filed. The petition indicated that counsel knew the petitioner had been transferred to Texas at the time of filing, although the petitioner argued that exceptions to the district-of-confinement rule applied.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Pomboza Pinto filed a federal habeas petition in the District of Minnesota while confined in El Paso, Texas. The court determined that the petitioner's known place of confinement was in Texas when the petition was filed, granted the government's motion to transfer, denied the petitioner's motion for an order to show cause, and directed transfer to the Western District of Texas.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The Clerk was directed to transfer the case to the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas for prompt resolution.

CASES CITED

- Trump v. J.G.G., 604 U.S. 670, 672 (2025)
- Rumsfeld v. Padilla, 542 U.S. 426, 443, 454 (2004)
- Ozturk v. Trump, 777 F. Supp. 3d 26, 31 (D. Mass. 2025)
- Suri v. Trump, 785 F. Supp. 3d 128, 136 (E.D. Va. 2025)
- Aleksander B. v. Trump, No. 26-cv-170, 2026 WL 172435, at *1 (D. Minn. Jan. 22, 2026)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA JULIO CESAR POMBOZA PINTO, Petitioner, 0:26-CV-622 vs. ORDER PAMELA BONDI, Attorney General, et al., Respondents. The government has moved to dismiss the pending petition for writ of habeas corpus, filing 1, or, in the alternative, to transfer the petition to the Western District of Texas. Filing 6.

The government relies on the general principle that habeas jurisdiction lies in the district of confinement, e.g., *Trump v. J.G.G.*, 604 U.S. 670, 672 (2025); *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 443 (2004), and the petitioner is located in El Paso, Texas. See filing 1.

The petitioner asserts exceptions to the so-called district of confinement rule apply in this case. Filing 8 at 4. The exceptions asserted have been applied where a petition is filed when the petitioner's location is unknown at the time of filing. E.g., *Ozturk v. Trump*, 777 F. Supp. 3d 26, 31 (D. Mass. 2025); *Suri v. Trump*, 785 F. Supp. 3d 128, 136 (E.D. Va. 2025); *Aleksander B. v. Trump*, No. 26-cv-170, 2026 WL 172435, at *1 (D.

Minn. Jan. 22, 2026). This petition, however, indicates that counsel knew the petitioner had been transferred to Texas at the time of filing. See filing 1 at 3. The circumstances under which the government relocated him are not a basis for this Court to exercise jurisdiction. See *Padilla*, 542 U.S. at 454 ("There is no indication that the Government refused to tell [petitioner's] lawyer where he had been taken.

The original petition demonstrates that the lawyer knew where [petitioner] was being held at that time... In these circumstances, the basic rules apply"). Instead, the appropriate action is to transfer this case to the Western District of Texas for prompt resolution.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED: 1. The government's motion to transfer (filing 6) is granted. 2. The petitioner's motion for an order to show cause (filing 5) is denied. 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to transfer this case to the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas. Dated this 29th day of January, 2026. BY. THE COURT: John M. Gerrard nior United States District Judge