

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

Ruben MENDEZ DOMINGUEZ, et
al.,

Petitioners,

v.

Laura HERMOSILLO et al.,

Respondents.

Case No. 2:25-cv-2337

**EX PARTE MOTION FOR ORDER
TO SHOW CAUSE AND INTERIM
RELIEF PREVENTING
TRANSFER**

Note on Motion Calendar:
November 20, 2025

INTRODUCTION

Petitioners are members of the certified Bond Denial Class in *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, No. 3:25-cv-05240-TMC (W.D. Wash. filed Mar. 20, 2025). On September 30, 2025, this Court entered final judgment declaring that class members are detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and thus entitled to a bond hearing before an immigration judge (IJ). *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, No. 3:25-cv-05240-TMC, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 2782499 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 30, 2025). Despite that ruling, Respondents continue applying their unlawful bond policy to detain Petitioners. Petitioners therefore seek an order to show cause under 28 U.S.C. § 2243 requiring Respondents to explain, within three days, why each Petitioner is not a member of the Bond Denial Class; failing such a showing, the Court should immediately grant the petition.

For Petitioner Mendez, who has received an alternative bond order, the Court should order release unless Respondents, within one day of the Court's order, permit him to post the alternative bond amount. As to all remaining Petitioners still awaiting bond hearings, the Court should order that Respondents provide them with bond hearings under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and prohibit application of § 1225(b)(2) to deny their bond requests.

Finally, the Court should also prohibit Respondents from transferring any Petitioner outside of the Western District of Washington pending adjudication of the Petition or, in the alternative, require Respondents to provide at least 48 hours' notice (or 72 hours' notice if the period will include a weekend or holiday) prior to any action to transfer them from the Northwest ICE Processing Center (NWIPC).

ARGUMENT

I. The Court should issue an order to show cause requiring a return from Respondents pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2243.

Habeas “is a swift and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or confinement.” *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963), *overruled on other grounds by Wainwright v. Sykes*, 433 U.S. 72 (1977). The requirement for an expeditious remedy is codified by statute: once the court entertains an application, it “shall forthwith award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause,” set a prompt return, and hold a hearing no more than five days after the return. 28 U.S.C. § 2243 (emphasis added). These requirements ensure that courts “summarily hear and determine the facts, and dispose of the matter as law and justice require.” *Id.*

Expeditious consideration is particularly appropriate here because the Court has already resolved the controlling legal issue for these parties: it has declared that § 1226(a) governs the detention of Bond Denial Class members and that Respondents' bond denial policy is unlawful. *Rodriguez Vazquez*, 2025 WL 2782499, at *27. Thus, the sole question the Court must decide in order to grant relief is whether Petitioners are members of the Bond Denial Class—a question that is ascertainable from the government records and declarations submitted with the Petition.

Consistent with this Court’s longstanding practice and to facilitate expedited relief, Petitioners respectfully request that the Court effectuate service of the petition on Respondents.¹ Respondents should then be required to file a return “within three days,” 28 U.S.C. § 2243, upon which the Court should promptly issue a decision on the merits of the petition. Further, the Court should direct Respondents to address only whether Petitioners are members of the Bond Denial Class and the relief to which they are entitled; Respondents are bound by the classwide judgment in *Rodriguez Vazquez* and may not re-litigate the merits questions resolved in that case.

II. The Court should instruct that Respondents must not transfer Petitioners from this district during the pendency of these proceedings.

The Court should also prohibit Respondents from transferring any Petitioner outside this judicial district or require that they provide at least 48 hours’ notice (or 72 hours’ notice if the period will include a weekend or holiday) prior to any transfer from NWIPC.

Petitioners seek these protections because of recent, repeated transfers from NWIPC to other facilities. *See, e.g., Order, Leon Figueroa v. Wamsley*, No. 2:25-cv-02228-TMC (W.D. Wash. Nov. 13, 2025), Dkt. 11 at 3–4 (enjoining Respondents from transferring Petitioners and noting “evidence suggesting a troubling pattern of attempts to transfer *Rodriguez Vazquez* class members before they can seek or obtain individual habeas relief—the only current method to enforce the Court’s declaratory judgment”). If the Court does not prohibit transfer altogether, then advance notice allows Petitioners—most of whom lived locally prior to their arrest—to seek immediate emergency relief from this Court to enjoin any transfer. Ensuring Petitioners’ presence in this district also preserves their access to their (mostly local) immigration counsel (and to habeas counsel). For these reasons, if the Court does not prohibit transfer, then notice prior to any transfer is warranted. *See, e.g., Order, Kumar v. Wamsley*, No. 2:25-cv-2055-KKE (W.D. Wash. Oct. 22, 2025), Dkt. 7 (requiring “Respondents [to] provide Petitioner and

¹ Service by the Court is also consistent with the practice in habeas proceedings under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2254 and 2255. *See* U.S. Courts, Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases and Section 2255 Proceedings (Dec. 1, 2019), at 3 (“In every case, the clerk must serve a copy of the petition and any order on the respondent”); *id.* at 9 (similar).

Petitioner's counsel in this habeas action at least 48 hours' notice (or 72 hours' notice if the period extends into the weekend) prior to any action to move or transfer him from the [NWIPC] or to remove him from the United States."); Order, *Cantero Garcia v. Wamsley*, No. 2:25-cv-02092-TMC (W.D. Wash. Oct. 29, 2025), Dkt. 7 at 4 (same); *see also* Order, *Corrales Castillo v. Wamsley*, No. 2:25-cv-02172-TMC (W.D. Wash. Nov. 5, 2025), Dkt. 8 at 2 (same); Order, *Hernandez Ramos v. Hermosillo*, No. 2:25-cv-02273-TMC (W.D. Wash. Nov. 17, 2025), Dkt. 8 at 2 (same).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioners respectfully request that the Court immediately effectuate service of the petition on Respondents and issue an order to show cause requiring that:

- Respondents' return be filed within three days;
- Respondents must not transfer any Petitioners from this district while it considers this petition, or, in the alternative, Respondents must provide Petitioners at least 48 hours' notice (or 72 hours' notice if the period will include a weekend or holiday) prior to any action to transfer them from the NWIPC.

Respectfully submitted this 20th day of November, 2025.

s/ Matt Adams

Matt Adams, WSBA No. 28287
matt@nwirp.org

s/ Leila Kang

Leila Kang, WSBA No. 48048
leila@nwirp.org

s/ Glenda M. Aldana Madrid

Glenda M. Aldana Madrid, WSBA No. 46987
glenda@nwirp.org

s/ Aaron Korthuis

Aaron Korthuis, WSBA No. 53974
aaron@nwirp.org

s/ Amanda Ng

Amanda Ng, WSBA No. 57181
amanda@nwirp.org

*Counsel certifies that this motion contains
1,054 words in compliance with the Local Civil
Rules.*

NORTHWEST IMMIGRANT
RIGHTS PROJECT
615 Second Ave., Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 957-8611

1 *Counsel for Petitioners*
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27