

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Rohit K. v. Kristi Noem, et al.

No. 1:26-cv-00232-TLN-CSK · No. No. 1:26-cv-00232-TLN-CSK · Decided January 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California grants Rohit K.’s motion for a temporary restraining order concerning his immigration detention. The court finds that Petitioner demonstrated likely success on a procedural due process claim, irreparable harm, and favorable equitable and public-interest factors. Respondents are ordered to release Petitioner immediately, are restrained from re-detaining him absent specified procedural protections, and must show cause why a preliminary injunction should not issue.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	January 13, 2026
DOCKET	No. 1:26-cv-00232-TLN-CSK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner moved for a temporary restraining order in connection with a habeas corpus petition challenging his continued immigration detention. The court granted the TRO without notice, ordered his immediate release, imposed conditions on any future re-detention, and ordered respondents to show cause why a preliminary injunction should not issue.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	To obtain a TRO, the movant must show a likelihood of success on the merits, a likelihood of irreparable harm absent relief, that the balance of equities tips in the movant's favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest. The court may apply a sliding-scale approach, but a showing is required on all four Winter factors; serious questions on the merits may suffice only if the balance of hardships tips sharply in the movant's favor and irreparable injury and public interest are also shown.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

PARTIES

Rohit K. v. Kristi Noem, et al.

TOPICS

immigration detention

procedural due process

injunctions

removal proceedings

civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration

constitutional law

civil procedure

remedies

civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether petitioner was entitled to a temporary restraining order under the four Winter factors.
2. Whether petitioner's prolonged immigration detention without a bond or custody-redetermination hearing likely violated procedural due process.
3. Whether the court could grant a TRO without notice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b).
4. What relief and procedural protections should govern any future re-arrest or re-detention.

HOLDINGS

1. Petitioner demonstrated a likelihood of success on his claim that continued immigration detention without a bond or custody-redetermination hearing violated procedural due process.
2. Petitioner satisfied the TRO standard because he showed likely success on the merits, irreparable harm, favorable equities, and that injunctive relief served the public interest.
3. The court found the requirements for issuing a TRO without notice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b) were satisfied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“On balance, the Court finds the Matthews factors demonstrate Petitioner is entitled to due process – a hearing to determine whether his detention was warranted.” (Section III.A)

“Respondents are ENJOINED and RESTRAINED from re-arresting or re-detaining Petitioner absent compliance with constitutional protections, including seven-days’ notice and a hearing before a neutral fact-finder” (Conclusion ¶ 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner, an Indian citizen, entered the United States without inspection on November 22, 2021, claimed fear of political persecution in India, and was detained by ICE. He was released in 2021, remained in the community for more than three years, developed a life and community in California, and pursued a pending asylum claim. ICE re-detained him on June 14, 2025, and he remained detained for more than seven months without a bond or custody-redetermination hearing.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Rohit K. filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus and the instant TRO motion on January 12, 2026. The district court granted the TRO on January 13, 2026, waived the Rule 65(c) bond requirement, ordered immediate release, restrained re-arrest or re-detention absent specified constitutional protections, and set an order-to-show-cause briefing schedule.

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. Session, 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, 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 *3–4 (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. United States Immigration & Naturalization Service, 753 F.2d 719, 727 (9th Cir. 1983)
- 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)