

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

I.E. v. Jeremy Casey, Warden, Imperial Regional Detention Facility, et al.

I.E. · No. 25cv3227 DMS (DDL) · Decided December 2, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California granted Petitioner’s motion for a temporary restraining order. The court directed Respondents to arrange an individualized bond hearing before an immigration court within fourteen days and required a joint status report regarding the hearing and potential mootness.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dana M. Sabraw
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	December 2, 2025
DOCKET	25cv3227 DMS (DDL)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought a temporary restraining order requiring an individualized bond hearing before an immigration court. Respondents opposed the motion, and Petitioner replied.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; persuasive value only.
PARTIES	I.E. v. Jeremy Casey, Warden, Imperial Regional Detention Facility; et al.

TOPICS

- immigration detention
- injunctions
- removal proceedings
- civil procedure
- remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

- immigration detention
- immigration
- civil procedure
- remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Petitioner was entitled to a temporary restraining order requiring an individualized bond hearing before an immigration court.
2. Whether Respondents' jurisdictional objection deprived the court of authority to grant the requested relief.

HOLDINGS

1. The court granted Petitioner's motion for a temporary restraining order and directed Respondents to arrange an individualized bond hearing before an immigration court within fourteen days.
2. The court rejected Respondents' jurisdictional argument and exercised jurisdiction to grant the temporary restraining order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Respondents are directed to arrange an individualized bond hearing for Petitioner before an immigration court within fourteen (14) days of this Order.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

I.E. was detained at the Imperial Regional Detention Facility and sought an individualized bond hearing before an immigration court. The motion presented facts, claims, and arguments similar to those in *Sadeqi v. LaRose*. Respondents also raised a jurisdictional objection that the court had previously rejected in related cases.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Southern District of California considered Petitioner's motion for a temporary restraining order. The court adopted the reasoning of *Sadeqi v. LaRose* and relied on its prior rejection of Respondents' jurisdictional argument in related cases. The court granted the motion and ordered Respondents to arrange an individualized bond hearing within fourteen days.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Respondents must arrange an individualized bond hearing for Petitioner before an immigration court within fourteen days of the order. By December 16, 2025, the parties must file a joint status report confirming that the hearing occurred and stating their positions on whether further relief is necessary or the case may be dismissed as moot.

CASES CITED

- *Sadeqi v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-2587-RSH-BJW, 2025 WL 3154520 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2025)
- *Soleimani v. LaRose*, Case No. 25-cv-3082-DMS-DEB, ECF No. 7 at 4
- *Jimenez Lopez v. Archambeault*, Case No. 25cv3029 DMS (BLM), ECF No. 7 at 3

- Vasquez Garcia v. Noem, ___ F.Supp.3d ___, Case No. 25-cv-02180-DMS-MMP, 2025 WL 2549431, at *3-4 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025)
- Medina-Ortiz v. Noem, No. 25-cv-02819-DMS-MMP, ECF No. 7 at 3-4

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 Case No.: 25cv3227 DMS (DDL) I.E., 11 Petitioner-Plaintiff, ORDER
GRANTING MOTION FOR 12 v. TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER 13 JEREMY
CASEY, Warden, Imperial Regional Detention Facility; et al., 14 Respondents-Defendants. 15 16
17 18 This case comes before the Court on Petitioner's motion for a temporary restraining 19
order.

Respondents filed an opposition to the motion, and Petitioner filed a reply. 20 The facts, claims,
and arguments in this case are similar to those presented in Sadeqi 21 v. LaRose, No. 25-cv-2587-
RSH-BJW, 2025 WL 3154520 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2025).

The 22 Court finds the reasoning of that case persuasive, and adopts and applies it wholesale to 23
this case. The only argument Respondents raise here that was not addressed in Sadeqi is 24
Respondents' jurisdictional argument, but the Court has already addressed and rejected that 25
argument in previous orders. See Soleimani v. LaRose, Case No. 25-cv-3082-DMS-DEB, 26 ECF
No. 7 at 4, Jimenez Lopez v. Archambeault, Case No. 25cv3029 DMS (BLM), ECF 27 No. 7 at 3;
Vasquez Garcia v. Noem, ___ F.Supp.3d ___, Case No. 25-cv-02180-DMS- 28 / / / 1 || MMP 2025
WL 2549431, at *3-4 (S.D.

Cal. Sept. 3, 2025); Medina-Ortiz v. Noem, No. 2 25-cv-02819-DMS-MMP, ECF No. 7 at 3-4. 3
Based on the reasoning of Sadeqi and this Court's orders in the cases cited above, 4 || Petitioner's
motion for a temporary restraining order is granted. Respondents are directed 5 || to arrange an
individualized bond hearing for Petitioner before an immigration court within 6 || fourteen (14)
days of this Order.

On or before December 16, 2025, the parties shall file a 7 || Joint Status Report confirming
Petitioner has been provided with that bond hearing. In that 8 Report, the parties shall also provide
their respective positions on whether a further order 9 the Petition is necessary or if the case may
be dismissed as moot. 10 IT IS SO ORDERED. 11 ||Dated: December 2, 2025 12 nm Bb 3 Hon.
Dana M. Sabraw United States District Judge 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28