

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Ines H.O. v. Christopher Chestnut, et al.

Ines H.O. · No. 1:25-cv-01878-TLN-JDP · Decided December 22, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California granted Ines H.O.’s motion for a temporary restraining order challenging her prolonged immigration detention without a bond or custody redetermination hearing. The court ordered her immediate release and enjoined respondents from re-arresting or re-detaining her absent specified constitutional protections, including notice and a hearing. The court also waived the security requirement and ordered respondents to show cause why the TRO should not be converted into a preliminary injunction.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Troy L. Nunley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 22, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-01878-TLN-JDP
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought a temporary restraining order in a habeas corpus action challenging her civil immigration detention.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Temporary restraining order standard under Winter: likelihood of success on the merits, likelihood of irreparable harm absent relief, balance of equities favoring the movant, and consistency with the public interest. The court also applied the Ninth Circuit’s sliding-scale approach, requiring a likelihood of irreparable injury and a sharply tipped balance of hardships when only serious questions on the merits are shown.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district-court order
PARTIES	Ines H.O. v. Christopher Chestnut, et al.

TOPICS

immigration detention

procedural due process

injunctions

removal proceedings

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration

civil rights

constitutional law

civil procedure

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Petitioner was likely to succeed on a procedural due process claim based on prolonged immigration detention without notice or a bond or custody-redetermination hearing.
2. Whether Petitioner established the four requirements for a temporary restraining order.
3. Whether the court should waive the security requirement under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c) and order immediate release subject to constitutional safeguards.

HOLDINGS

1. Petitioner demonstrated a likelihood of success on her due process claim because her prolonged detention without a bond or custody-redetermination hearing likely deprived her of a protected liberty interest without constitutionally adequate procedures.
2. Petitioner satisfied the Winter factors and was entitled to a temporary restraining order.
3. The court ordered Petitioner's immediate release and prohibited Respondents from re-arresting or re-detaining her absent notice, a hearing before a neutral fact-finder, and proof of specified changed circumstances, danger, or flight risk.
4. The court waived the bond requirement under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“For a TRO, courts consider whether Petitioner has established: “[1] that [s]he is likely to succeed on the merits, [2] that [s]he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, [3] that the balance of equities tips in [her] favor, and [4] that an injunction is in the public interest.”” (at 2)

“Civil immigration detention, which is nonpunitive in purpose and effect is justified when a noncitizen presents a risk of flight or danger to the community.” (at 4)

“Respondents are enjoined and restrained from re-arresting or re-detaining Petitioner absent compliance with constitutional protections, including notice and a hearing before a neutral fact-finder” (at 7)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner was trafficked into the United States in November 2022 after fleeing domestic and gender-based violence in Peru, was placed in removal proceedings, and was released on her own recognizance to pursue asylum. In July 2025, she was detained without notice, an immigration-judge hearing, or a determination that she posed a flight risk or danger to public safety. She had no criminal convictions, had complied with supervisory check-ins, and had built a life and community in California while supporting her children, including a child with a terminal illness. At the time of the motion, she had been detained for several months without a bond or custody-redetermination hearing.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner was detained in July 2025 after having been released on her own recognizance during removal proceedings. She filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus on December 12, 2025, and moved for a temporary restraining order on December 20, 2025. The district court granted the motion, ordered her immediate release, restrained re-arrest or re-detention absent specified constitutional protections, waived security, and ordered Respondents to show cause why the TRO should not be converted into a preliminary injunction.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)
- Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell, 632 F.3d 1127, 1134-35 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Hernandez v. Sessions, 872 F.3d 976, 990, 995 (9th Cir. 2017)
- Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678, 693-94 (2001)
- Kentucky Department of Corrections v. Thompson, 490 U.S. 454, 460 (1989)
- Rico-Tapia v. Smith, No. CV 25-00379 SASP-KJM, 2025 WL 2950089, at *8 (D. Haw. Oct. 10, 2025)
- Doe v. Becerra, 787 F. Supp. 3d 1083, 1093 (E.D. Cal. 2025)
- Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319, 335 (1976)
- Manzanarez v. Bondi, No. 1:25-CV-01536-DC-CKD (HC), 2025 WL 3247258, at *4 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2025)
- R.D.T.M. v. Wofford, No. 1:25-CV-01141-KES-SKO (HC), 2025 WL 2617255, at *4 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025)
- Garcia v. Andrews, No. 2:25-CV-01884-TLN-SCR, 2025 WL 1927596, at *5 (E.D. Cal. July 14, 2025)
- Melendres v. Arpaio, 695 F.3d 990, 1002 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Elrod v. Burns, 427 U.S. 347, 373 (1976)
- National Urban League v. Ross, 484 F. Supp. 3d 802, 807 (N.D. Cal. 2020)
- Drakes Bay Oyster Co. v. Jewell, 747 F.3d 1073, 1092 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Zepeda v. U.S. Immigration & Naturalization Service, 753 F.2d 719, 727 (9th Cir. 1985)
- Diaz v. Kaiser, No. 3:25-CV-05071, 2025 WL 1676854, at *3 (N.D. Cal. June 14, 2025)
- Diaz v. Brewer, 656 F.3d 1008, 1015 (9th Cir. 2011)