

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Roberto Juarez Fernandez v. Jason Knight, et al.

Juarez Fernandez v. Knight · No. 2:25-cv-02341-RFB-DJA · Decided November 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada ordered the respondents to show cause why an immigration detainee’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and amended motion for a temporary restraining order should not be granted. The order required responsive filings and supporting detention documents, set a hearing, prohibited transfer of the petitioner outside the district, and directed service of the petition and order.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Richard F. Boulware, II
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	November 25, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-02341-RFB-DJA
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner filed a counseled petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and an amended motion for a temporary restraining order challenging his continued immigration detention. The court issued an order to show cause, scheduled a hearing, ordered production of detention-related documents, and temporarily barred respondents from transferring petitioner outside the District of Nevada.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	At the preliminary-relief stage, the court applied the factors governing issuance of preliminary relief and assessed whether petitioner had established a prima facie case for habeas relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Roberto Juarez Fernandez v. Jason Knight, et al.

TOPICS

- immigration detention
- injunctions
- civil procedure
- discovery dispute
- immigration

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration

federal habeas corpus

civil procedure

injunctive relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether respondents should be ordered to show cause why the § 2241 habeas petition and motion for temporary restraining order should not be granted.
2. Whether petitioner established a prima facie case warranting discovery of documents concerning the basis for his detention.
3. Whether the court could temporarily prohibit respondents from transferring petitioner outside the District of Nevada to preserve the court's jurisdiction over the habeas challenge.

HOLDINGS

1. The court ordered respondents to show cause why the petition and motion should not be granted and required them to file a notice of appearance and a return certifying the true cause of detention.
2. Because petitioner established a prima facie case for habeas relief, respondents were required to produce with their return documents referenced or relied upon in their responsive pleading and documents reflecting the asserted basis for detention, including any arrest warrant or Form-286 in their possession.
3. Respondents were prohibited from transferring petitioner outside the District of Nevada pending resolution of the merits because such a transfer could interfere with the court's jurisdiction over the habeas challenge.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“a district court, confronted by a petition for habeas corpus which establishes a prima facie case for relief, may use or authorize the use of suitable discovery procedures . . . reasonably fashioned to elicit facts necessary to help the court to ‘dispose of the matter as law and justice require.’” (at 2)

“Because transferring Petitioner outside of the District of Nevada would interfere with this Court’s jurisdiction over Petitioner’s habeas challenge to the lawfulness of his detention, the Court finds that this Order is warranted to maintain the status quo pending resolution on the merits” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Roberto Juarez Fernandez is an immigration detainee held at the Nevada Southern Detention Center in federal custody. He challenged the lawfulness of his continued detention through a § 2241 habeas petition and sought temporary injunctive relief. The court determined preliminarily that he had established a prima facie case for relief and that documents concerning the basis for his detention were necessary to resolve the habeas matter.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The matter was initiated in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada through a § 2241 habeas petition and amended motion for temporary restraining order. Before respondents filed a return, the court preliminarily found that petitioner likely could demonstrate entitlement to relief similar to relief previously

ordered in *Escobar Salgado v. Mattos*. The court ordered respondents to show cause, file a return and supporting detention documents, and appear at a hearing.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Escobar Salgado v. Mattos*, No. 2:25-CV-01872-RFB-EJY, 2025 WL 3205356 (D. Nev. Nov. 17, 2025)
- *Harris v. Nelson*, 394 U.S. 286, 290 (1969)
- *F.T.C. v. Dean Foods Co.*, 384 U.S. 597, 604 (1966)
- *Al Otro Lado v. Wolf*, 952 F.3d 999, 1007 n.6 (9th Cir. 2020)

OPINION

1 2 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 5 * * * 6 ROBERTO JUAREZ FERNANDEZ, Case No. 2:25-cv-02341-RFB-DJA 7 Petitioner, ORDER 8 v. 9 JASON KNIGHT, et al., 10 Respondents. 11 12 Petitioner Roberto Juarez Fernandez, immigration detainee, has filed a counseled Petition 13 for Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (ECF No. 1) and Amended Motion for 14 Temporary Restraining Order (ECF No. 3), challenging his continued detention at Nevada 15 Southern Detention Center in the custody of Federal Respondents.

The Court has reviewed the 16 Petition and Motion and preliminarily believes Petitioner likely can demonstrate that his 17 circumstances warrant the same relief as this Court ordered for Petitioners Mena-Vargas and 18 Reyes-Lopez in *Escobar Salgado v. Mattos*, No. 2:25-CV-01872-RFB-EJY, 2025 WL 3205356 19 (D. Nev. Nov. 17, 2025). 20 Thus, Respondents are ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE why the Motion and Writ should 21 not be granted.

See 28 U.S.C. § 2243. Respondents shall file, in writing, within three days, a (i) 22 notice of appearance and (ii) “a return certifying the true cause of detention” on or before 23 December 1, 2025. Id. Petitioner may file a traverse on or before December 3, 2025. 24 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Court sets a hearing on the (ECF No. 1) Petition and 25 (ECF No. 3) Motion for December 5, 2025 at 9:00 A.M. in Las Vegas Courtroom 7C, before the 26 undersigned Judge.

27 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Respondents have no new arguments to offer that have 28 not already been addressed by the Court, they may so indicate by reference to their previous 1 briefing, while reserving appellate rights. They may not, however, incorporate briefing in a manner 2 that would circumvent the page limits under Local Rule 7-3 without leave.

Respondents should 3 file the referenced briefing as an attachment for Petitioner’s counsel’s review. 4 Additionally, the Court finds Petitioner has established a prima facie case for relief and 5

that ordering Respondents to produce documents reflecting the basis for their detention of 6
Petitioner is necessary for the Court to “dispose of the matter as law and justice require.” See 7
Harris v. Nelson, 394 U.S. 286, 290 (1969) (holding that “a district court, confronted by a petition
8 for habeas corpus which establishes a prima facie case for relief, may use or authorize the use of
9 suitable discovery procedures... reasonably fashioned to elicit facts necessary to help the court
10 to ‘dispose of the matter as law and justice require.’”) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 2243).

Therefore, IT IS 11 FURTHER ORDERED that Respondents must file with their return any
documents referenced 12 or relied upon in their responsive pleading. If Respondents’ asserted
basis for detention is reflected 13 in any documents in their possession which have not been
provided to Petitioner, including, but 14 not limited to, an arrest warrant and/or Form-286,
Respondents must so indicate and file said 15 documents with their pleading.

If no such documents exist to support the asserted basis for 16 detention, Respondents must
indicate that in their return. 17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Local Rules 7-2, 7-3, and 7-4
will govern the 18 requirements and scheduling of all other motions filed by either party. 19 IT IS
FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall file all documents and exhibits in 20 accordance with
Local Rules LR IA 10-1 through 10-5.

21 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties must meet and confer regarding any requests 22
for an extension of time or continuance and must stipulate to the extension if possible. Any motion
23 for extension must certify efforts taken to meet and confer and indicate the opposing party’s 24
position regarding the extension. Any motion or stipulation must comply with Federal Rule of 25
Civil Procedure 6(b) and Local Rules IA 6-1, 6-2.

26 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondents shall not transfer Petitioner out of this 27
District. See *F.T.C. v. Dean Foods Co.*, 384 U.S. 597, 604 (1966) (noting the court’s “express 28
authority under the All Writs Act to issue such temporary injunctions as may be necessary to 1
protect its own jurisdiction”); see also *Al Otro Lado v. Wolf*, 952 F.3d 999, 1007 n.6 (9th Cir.

2 2020) (“Having concluded that [agency action] would interfere with the court’s jurisdiction..., 3
the district court properly issued an injunction under the All Writs Act.”) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 4
1651(a)). Because transferring Petitioner outside of the District of Nevada would interfere with 5
this Court’s jurisdiction over Petitioner’s habeas challenge to the lawfulness of his detention, the 6
Court finds that this Order is warranted to maintain the status quo pending resolution on the merits
7 and finds that Petitioner has satisfied the factors governing the issuance of such preliminary
relief.

8 IT IS FURTHER KINDLY ORDERED that the Clerk of Court: 9 1. DELIVER a copy of the
Petition (ECF No. 1), Amended Motion (ECF No. 3) and this 10 Order to the U.S. Marshal for
service. 11 2. ADD the United States Attorney for the District of Nevada to the docket as an

Interested 12 Party. 13 3. SEND, through CM/ECF, a copy of the Petition (ECF No. 1), Amended Motion (ECF 14 No. 3) and this Order to the United States Attorney for the District of Nevada at 15 Sigal.Chattah@usdoj.gov, Veronica.criste@usdoj.gov, summer.johnson@usdoj.gov, and 16 caseview.ecf@usdoj.gov. in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5(b)(2)(E).

17 4. MAIL a copy of the Petition (ECF No. 1), Amended Motion (ECF No. 3) and this Order 18 pursuant to Rule 4(i)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to: 19 1) Kristi Noem, Secretary, United States Department of Homeland 20 Security, 245 Murray Lane SW, Washington, DC 20528 21 2) Pamela Bondi, Attorney General of the United States, 950 Pennsylvania 22 Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, 20530 23 3) Jason Knight, Acting Las Vegas Field Office Director, 2975 Decker 24 Lake Drive Suite 100, West Valley City, UT 84119-6096 25 4) John Mattos, Warden, Nevada Southern Center, 2190 E. Mesquite Ave. 26 Pahrump, NV 89060 27 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the U.S. Marshal SERVE a copy of the Petition (ECF 28 No. 1), Amended Motion (ECF No. 3) and this Order on the United States Attorney for the District 1 | of Nevada or on an Assistant United States Attorney or clerical employee designated by the United States Attorney pursuant to Rule 4(i)(1)(A)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

3 DATED: November 25, 2025. 4 AS 6 RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 7 8 9 10 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 -4-