

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential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)