

APPENDIX

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix A: Fourth Circuit’s Decision (Mar. 24, 2026).....	1a
Appendix B: District Court’s Order Denying EAJA Application (Feb. 19, 2026).....	2a
Appendix C: District Court’s Order on Habeas Relief and Attorney’s Fees (Jan. 22, 2026)	4a
Appendix D: District Court’s Memorandum and Opinion (Jan. 22, 2026).....	6a
Appendix E: District Court’s Order Granting Emergency Relief (Feb. 6, 2026)	17a
Appendix F: Table of Relevant District Court Decisions—Dec. 2025 to Mar. 2026.....	19a

1a

APPENDIX A

FILED: March 24, 2026

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 26-6251
(1:25-cv-04045-GLR)

KEVIN ISAAC MONTTOYA PALACIOS

Petitioner - Appellant

v.

JEREMY R. BACON, Field Office Director,
Baltimore Field Office, United States Immigration
and Customs Enforcement; TODD LYONS, Acting
Director, United States Immigration and Customs
Enforcement; KRISTI NOEM, Secretary of
Homeland Security; PAMELA JO BONDI, United
States Attorney General

Respondents - Appellees

ORDER

Upon consideration of appellant's consent motion for summary affirmance, the court grants the motion. The judgment of the district court is affirmed.

Entered at the direction of Judge Niemeyer with the concurrence of Judge Agee and Judge Thacker.

For the Court

/s/ Nwamaka Anowi, Clerk

APPENDIX B

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

KEVIN ISAAC MONTOYA	*	
PALACIOS,	*	
Petitioner,	*	Civil Action No.
v.	*	GLR-25-4045
NIKITA BAKER, et al.,	*	
Respondents.	***	

ORDER

The Court is in receipt of Petitioner Kevin Isaac Montoya Palacios’s Motion for Attorney Fees filed on February 16, 2026 (ECF No. 29). Montoya Palacios acknowledges that the Court has previously denied his request for attorney’s fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act (“EAJA”) by explaining that “the Fourth Circuit held that attorneys’ fees relating to a habeas petition are not available under the EAJA because such a petition is not a ‘civil action’ for purposes of the EAJA.” (Mot. Att’y Fees at 4, ECF No. 29; Jan. 22, 2026 Mem. Op. at 9, ECF No. 20 (quoting Obando-Segura v. Garland, 999 F.3d 190, 191, 197 (4th Cir. 2021))). Nevertheless, “Petitioner files this application in compliance with the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(1)(B) to preserve the issue for appellate review.” (Mot. Att’y Fees at 4). Because nothing substantively has changed since the Court’s last ruling on this issue, the Court will DENY the Motion for Attorney Fees (ECF No. 29).

3a

So ordered this 19th day of February, 2026.

/s/

George L. Russell, III
Chief United States District Judge

APPENDIX C

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

KEVIN ISAAC MONTOYA	*	
PALACIOS,	*	
Petitioner,	*	Civil Action No.
v.	*	GLR-25-4045
NIKITA BAKER, et al.,	*	
Respondents.	***	

ORDER

For the reasons stated in the foregoing Memorandum Opinion, it is this 22nd day of January, 2026 by the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, hereby:

ORDERED that Petitioner Kevin Isaac Montoyo Palacios's Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and Request for Temporary Restraining Order (the "Amended Petition") (ECF No. 4) is GRANTED in that Respondents shall RELEASE Petitioner to the Baltimore Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") Facility, located at 31 Hopkins Plaza, 6th Floor, Baltimore, Maryland 21202, on or before 5:00 P.M. on Thursday, January 29, 2026, under the same terms as his previous Order of Supervision;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any modifications to Petitioner's Order of Supervision shall be made under the appropriate administrative regulations, including but not limited to 8 C.F.R. § 241.13(h)(1);

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Amended Petition is DENIED without prejudice to the extent that Petitioner is seeking the same or similar relief through the D.V.D. litigation;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Montoyo Palacios's Amended Petition (ECF No. 4) is DENIED as to any further relief he seeks at this time;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondents' Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 15) is DENIED as MOOT;

IS FURTHER ORDERED that Montoyo Palacios's request for attorneys' fees and costs is DENIED;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall FILE a Joint Status Report by February 19, 2026, updating the Court on the Government's compliance with this Order;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to enforce compliance with this Order; and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall PROVIDE a copy of this Order to all counsel of record.

/s/

George L. Russell, III
Chief United States District Judge

APPENDIX D

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

KEVIN ISAAC MONTOYA	*	
PALACIOS,	*	
Petitioner,	*	Civil Action No.
v.	*	GLR-25-4045
NIKITA BAKER, et al.,	*	
Respondents.	***	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Petitioner Kevin Isaac Montoyo Palacios’s (“Montoyo Palacios” or “Petitioner”) Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and Request for Temporary Restraining Order (“TRO”) under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (ECF No. 4) and Respondents Nikita Baker, Pamela Jo Bondi,¹ Todd M. Lyons, Kristi Noem’s (collectively “Respondents” or “the Government”) Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 15). The Motion is ripe for disposition, and no hearing is necessary. See Local Rule 105.6 (D.Md. 2025). For the reasons set forth below, the Court will grant the

¹ The Government contends that the Attorney General is not a proper respondent. (Mem. L. Supp. Response & Mot. Dismiss [“Response”] at 13–14, ECF No. 15). For the reasons stated in Solis Nolasco v. Kristi Noem, No. GLR-25-3847, 2026 WL 25002, at *7–8 (D.Md. Jan. 5, 2026), the Court finds that the Attorney General is a proper respondent in this case.

Petition in part and deny it in part and deny the Motion as moot.

I. BACKGROUND

Petitioner Kevin Isaac Montoyo Palacios is a citizen and native of El Salvador. (Am. Pet. Writ Habeas Corpus [“Am. Pet.”] ¶ 1, ECF No. 4). He fled from El Salvador to the United States out of fear of gangs and police harassment in El Salvador. (Id. ¶ 12).

U.S. Border Patrol agents encountered him at or near Hebronville, Texas on April 25, 2016. (Mem. L. Supp. Response & Mot. Dismiss [“Response”] at 2, ECF No. 15).² The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) issued a Notice to Appear against Montoyo Palacios, charging him with inadmissibility under section 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”). (Id. at 2–3). Petitioner was placed in removal proceedings and, on July 21, 2016, was released on bond in the amount of \$1,500. (Id. At 3). Petitioner’s removal proceedings were held on September 11, 2023, at which an immigration judge (“IJ”) from the Executive Office of Immigration Review ordered Petitioner to be removed to El Salvador; however, in that same Order, the IJ granted Petitioner withholding from removal to El Salvador under the Convention Against Torture. (Id. (citing Removal Order at 1, ECF No. 15-1)). Petitioner alleges that after he was released on bond, he was placed under supervision and that he complied with the supervision requirements for years. (See Reply Mem.

² Unless otherwise noted, citations to the page numbers refer to the pagination assigned by the Court’s Case Management/Electronic Case Files (“CM/ECF”) system.

Opp'n Resp'ts' Mot. Dismiss & Supp. Pet. Writ Habeas Corpus ["Reply"] at 4, ECF No. 19).

On December 8, 2025, Montoyo Palacios attended a scheduled Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") check-in in Baltimore. (Response at 3). Officers served Montoyo Palacios with a Notice of Revocation of Release, which revoked his supervision and states that ICE intends to remove him to Mexico (Notice Revocation Release at 2, ECF No. 15-3), and a Notice of Removal, which notified Montoyo Palacios of ICE's intent to deport him to Mexico (Notice Removal at 1, ECF No. 15-2). ICE officials conducted an informal interview on December 8, 2025, but Montoyo Palacios declined to make a statement. (Response at 9; Sworn Statement at 1, ECF No. 15-4). Montoyo Palacios was transferred to the Christian County Jail in Hopkinsville, Kentucky, where, as of January 16, 2026, he remains detained. (Response at 1).

On December 11, 2025, Montoyo Palacios filed the instant Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and request for TRO under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. (ECF No. 4).³ Respondents filed a consolidated Response and Motion to Dismiss on December 30, 2025. (ECF No. 15). Montoyo Palacios filed a Reply in Opposition to the Government's Motion and in Support of his Petition on January 12, 2026. (ECF No. 19).

³ Petitioner captions his pleading as a "Petition for a Writ Of Habeas Corpus and TRO Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241." (ECF No. 4). Neither party briefs the TRO factors in Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7 (2008), so the Court declines to construe this Petition in that light.

II. DISCUSSION

A. Standard of Review

A district court may grant a writ of habeas corpus if a petitioner is in federal custody in violation of the United States Constitution or federal law. 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3). If a district court entertains a habeas petition, then it must either award the writ or order the respondent to show cause as to why the writ should not be granted, unless it is apparent from the application that the petitioner is not entitled to the requested relief. 28 U.S.C. § 2243.

B. Analysis

Petitioner argues that his continued detention violates 8 U.S.C. § 1231 and that his removal to a third country without an opportunity to express his fear of persecution in that country violates his due process rights. (Reply at 3, ECF No. 19). The Government contends that ICE is authorized to detain and remove Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6), that his continued detention is constitutionally permissible, and that he has received all process due to him under law. (Response at 4–13). The Court will address each issue in turn.

1. Petitioner's Detention Under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)

There is no dispute that Montoya Palacios is detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a). (See Reply at 3). Section 1231(a) provides that, “when an alien is ordered removed, the Attorney General shall remove the alien from the United States within a period of 90 days” (the “removal period”) and that “the Attorney General shall detain the alien” during the removal

period. 8 U.S.C. §§ 1231(a)(1)(A), (a)(2)(A). Except when the noncitizen is detained in a case outside the immigration process or when a court orders a stay of removal, the removal period begins when the removal order becomes administratively final. Id. § 1231(a)(1)(B). If the noncitizen does not leave or is not removed during the removal period, then the noncitizen “shall be subject to supervision under regulations prescribed by the Attorney General” pending their removal. Id. § 1231(a)(3). But certain noncitizens, including those who are inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182, may be detained beyond the removal period. Id. § 1231(a)(6).

Montoya Palacios argues that his continued detention is no longer permissible. (Reply at 3). In Zadvydas v. Davis, the Supreme Court considered whether the Government may detain a noncitizen under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6) “indefinitely beyond the removal period or only for a period reasonably necessary to secure the alien’s removal.” 533 U.S. at 682. The two noncitizen-petitioners in Zadvydas received removal orders and had been detained well beyond their removal periods under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6), partly because their native countries and other countries to which they had connections had refused to accept them. Id. at 684–86. The petitioners challenged the extent of the Attorney General’s authority to detain them on a seemingly indefinite basis given the unlikelihood of the Government securing their removal. Id. at 684–86, 688.

In assessing that authority, the Supreme Court recognized that “Congress has ‘plenary power’ to create immigration law, and that the Judicial Branch must defer to Executive and Legislative Branch

decisionmaking in that area.” Id. at 695. “But that power,” the Court explained, “is subject to important constitutional limitations.” Id. And “an alien’s liberty interest is, at the least, strong enough to raise a serious question as to whether, irrespective of the procedures used, the Constitution permits detention that is indefinite and potentially permanent.” Id. at 696 (citation omitted). Considering the significant liberty interest at stake and the lack of “congressional intent to authorize indefinite, perhaps permanent, detention,” id. at 699, the Court held that a noncitizen’s detention pending removal is presumptively reasonable only for six months (inclusive of the removal period), after which, if the noncitizen “provides good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future, the Government must respond with evidence sufficient to rebut that showing,” id. at 701.

Here, Montoya Palacios likely contends that his presumptively reasonable period expired on or around March 11, 2024—six months after his withholding of removal order became administratively final on September 11, 2023—and that the Government has provided no factual basis to believe that his removal will occur in the reasonably foreseeable future. (Am. Pet. 13–16; Reply at 3–4). Specifically, Petitioner argues that he has “lived in the United States for years on an Order of Supervision, complied with ICE reporting, and posed no flight risk or danger.” (Reply at 4). He adds that “ICE revoked his release abruptly at a routine check-in, without individualized findings that detention was necessary or that removal was imminent. Re-detention under these circumstances

raises the very constitutional concerns Zadvydas sought to avoid: arbitrary confinement untethered to a realistic removal plan.” (*Id.*). Respondents contend that Montoya Palacios’s argument is premature because he has been detained only since December 8, 2025, and that even if his argument is proper at this juncture, he has not provided a good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood that he will be removed in the reasonably foreseeable future. (Response at 6–8). For the reasons set forth below, the Court finds that Montoya Palacios’s argument is not premature and that he has met the “good reason” requirement under Zadvydas.

a. The Six-Month Presumption

The Government first suggests that Montoya Palacios’s argument under Zadvydas is “premature” because he has been detained only since December 8, 2025. (*Id.*). The premise of this argument is that Montoya Palacios’s six-month period restarted when he was detained on December 8, 2025. Some Courts agree with that premise, finding that the six-month period restarts upon re-detention, *see, e.g., Abedi v. Carter*, No. 25-3141-JWL, 2025 WL 3209009, at *1 (D.Kan. Oct. 6, 2025), or pauses while the noncitizen is not detained and resumes upon re-detention, *see, e.g., Rodriguez-Guardado v. Smith*, 271 F.Supp.3d 331, 335 n.8 (D.Mass. 2017) (citation omitted). Other courts, however, “broadly agree that ‘the six-month period [under Zadvydas] does not reset when the government detains an alien under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a), releases him from detention, and then re-detains him again.’” *Diaz-Ortega v. Lund*, No. 1:19-CV-670-P, 2019 WL 6003485, at *7 n.6 (W.D.La. Oct. 15, 2019) (quoting *Sied v. Nielsen*, 17-CV-06785-LB, 2018 WL

1876907, at *6 (N.D.Cal. Apr. 19, 2018)), report and recommendation adopted, No. 1:19- CV-670-P, 2019 WL 6037220 (W.D.La. Nov. 13, 2019); Villanueva v. Tate, 801 F.Supp.3d 689, 702 (S.D.Tex. 2025) (“The government’s contention that it may avoid the holding of Zadvydas and re-start the six-month presumptively constitutional detention clock by simply releasing and then re-detaining a noncitizen has no basis in either the statutes, the regulations, or Zadvydas itself.”); Zavvar v. Scott, No. TDC-25-2104, 2025 WL 2592543, at *4 (D.Md. Sept. 8, 2025) (“[T]here is, at a minimum, a reasonable argument that the six-month period runs continuously from the beginning of the removal period, even if the noncitizen is not detained throughout that period.”).

This Court agrees with the latter position and finds that Montoyo Palacios’s six-month period did not restart upon his re-detention on December 8, 2025. See Cordon- Salguero v. Noem, No. GLR-25-1626, Mot. Hr’g Tr. 33:23–34:4 (D.Md. June 23, 2025) (ECF No. 21) (finding that the six-month period was not tolled upon petitioner’s release from detention in 2018). Therefore, Montoyo Palacios’s six-month period expired in March 2024, and his challenge against his detention is not premature.⁴

⁴ As this Court explained in Cruz Medina v. Noem, 794 F.Supp.3d 365 (D.Md. 2025), the six-month presumption of reasonableness shifts the burdens between the Government and the noncitizen-detainee, but it does not prohibit judicial review of a noncitizen’s detention for six months. Id. at 375–76. Thus, even if Montoyo Palacios’s six-month period had not yet expired, his Petition still would not be premature.

b. The Likelihood of Montoyo Palacios's Removal

The Government next argues that, even if Montoyo Palacios's argument is not premature, he has not provided good reason to believe that his removal is not likely to occur in the reasonably foreseeable future. (Response at 78). This Court disagrees, and adopts the reasoning set forth in Solis Nolasco v. Kristi Noem, No. GLR-25-3847, 2026 WL 25002, at *4–6 (D.Md. Jan. 5, 2026), and concludes that, based on the record before the Court, removal does not appear likely to occur in the reasonably foreseeable future. Montoyo Palacios's continued detention, therefore, violates his due process rights as interpreted under Zadvydas.

2. Montoyo Palacios's Removal to a Third Country

With respect to Montoyo Palacios's dispute over removal to a third country, the Court again incorporates the reasoning set forth in Solis Nolasco by reference and concludes that Montoyo Palacios's claim regarding his removal to Mexico is more appropriately addressed in D.V.D. v. U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 778 F.Supp.3d 355 (D.Mass. 2025), and will deny the Amended Petition as to that claim without prejudice to seeking the same or similar relief through the D.V.D. litigation. I.V.I. v. Baker, No. JKB-25-1572, 2025 WL 1519449, at *2 (D.Md. May 27, 2025); see also Tanha v. Warden, Balt. Det. Facility, No. JRR-25-2121, 2025 WL 2062181, *8 (D.Md. July 22, 2025) (finding that third country removal claim more appropriately addressed in D.V.D. and denying without prejudice); Ghamelian v.

Baker, No. SAG-25-2106, 2025 WL 2049981, at *3, 5 (D.Md. July 22, 2025) (same).

3. Attorneys' Fees

Finally, Montoyo Palacios requests attorneys' fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA") (Am. Pet. at 6), which allows a court to "award reasonable fees and expenses of attorneys" to a "prevailing party in any civil action brought by or against . . . any agency or any official of the United States acting in his or her official capacity" 28 U.S.C. § 2412(b). In Obando-Segura v. Garland, 999 F.3d 190 (4th Cir. 2021), however, a case in which a petitioner had filed a successful habeas petition seeking release from immigration detention, the Fourth Circuit held that attorneys' fees relating to a habeas petition are not available under the EAJA because such a petition is not a "civil action" for purposes of the EAJA. Id. at 191, 197. The Court, therefore, must deny Montoyo Palacios's request for attorneys' fees and costs under the EAJA.⁵

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court GRANTS IN PART and DENIES IN PART Montoyo Palacios's Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and request for TRO (ECF No. 4) and DENIES as MOOT

⁵ Lastly, the Court adopts the reasoning set forth in Solis Nolasco, and concludes that where the Motion to Dismiss was simultaneously Respondents' Answer through a single brief addressing both the Motion and the Answer (see ECF No. 15), the Court finds that (1) there was no need for a Motion to Dismiss; and (2) the Court's resolution of the Petition necessarily resolves the Motion to Dismiss. 2026 WL 25002, at *8. The Court, therefore, will deny the Government's Motion to Dismiss as moot.

16a

the Government's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 15). A separate Order follows.

Entered this 22nd day of January, 2026.

/s/

George L. Russell, III
Chief United States District Judge

APPENDIX E

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

KEVIN ISAAC MONTOYA	*	
PALACIOS,	*	
Petitioner,	*	
v.	*	Civil Action No.
		GLR-25-4045
NIKITA BAKER, et al.,	*	
Respondents.	***	

ORDER

On February 6, 2026, Petitioner Kevin Isaac Montoya Palacios filed an Emergency Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (ECF No. 25), informing the Court that despite being ordered to be released to the Baltimore Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) Facility under his previous Order of Supervision, Montoya Palacios was transferred from Kentucky to Ohio, and later to Louisiana, where he was subsequently placed on a plane for removal to El Salvador in violation of this Court’s January 22, 2026 Order (ECF No. 21). (Mot. T.R.O. ¶¶ 1–5, ECF No. 25). According to Montoya Palacios, he was only removed from the aircraft “through the intervention of an ICE agent while already on board, preventing deportation by chance rather than lawful process.” (*Id.* ¶ 6). Montoya Palacios further asserts that he is currently detained in Baltimore, where ICE agents refuse to release him, contending that “release cannot occur unless counsel

is physically present, a condition not imposed by the Court [nor] communicated by the Government.” (Id., ¶ 9).

Accordingly, it is this 6th day of February, 2026, by the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, hereby:

ORDERED that Respondents, their officers, agents, servants, employees, and all persons acting in concert with them are ENJOINED from removing Montoya Palacios from the United States or transferring him outside the District of Maryland pending further order of this Court;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondents shall immediately RELEASE Montoya Palacios under the same Order of Supervision that was in effect prior to his detention, in strict compliance with this Court’s January 22, 2026 Order (ECF No. 21), and shall not impose any additional or extra-judicial conditions on release; and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that that Respondents shall FILE a Status Report no later than Tuesday, February 10, 2026, confirming compliance with this Order and explaining why Montoya Palacios was not released consistent with this Court’s January 22, 2026 Order (ECF No. 21).

/s/

George L. Russell, III
Chief United States District Judge

APPENDIX F

Denying Fees Under the EAJA to Immigration Detainees Who Were Granted Habeas Relief—Dec. 2025 to Mar. 2026	
1	Nuraetov v. Bondi, 2026 WL 872253 (W.D. La. Mar. 30, 2026)
2	Gonzalez-Perez v. Noem, 2026 WL 824662 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 25, 2026)
3	Mekhtievi v. Thompson, 2026 WL 752627 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 16, 2026)
4	Bokwe v. Bondi, 2026 WL 752260 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 13, 2026)
5	Ibarra v. Noem, 2026 WL 752261 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 13, 2026)
6	Alfonzo-Mujica v. Thompson, 2026 WL 752625 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 13, 2026)
7	Hernandez Mendez v. Bondi, 2026 WL 752626 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 13, 2026)
8	Mendez Gomez v. Bondi, 2026 WL 753307 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 13, 2026)
9	Romero Sosa v. Bondi, 2026 WL 753308 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 13, 2026)
10	Lara-Guerra v. Noem, 2026 WL 753310 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 13, 2026)
11	Cerda-Espinosa v. Bondi, 2026 WL 754841 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 13, 2026)

12	Pasto v. Bondi, 2026 WL 754844 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 13, 2026)
13	Flores Garcia v. Noem, 2026 WL 754846 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 13, 2026)
14	Wilson-Del Pozo v. Bondi, 2026 WL 752628 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 12, 2026)
15	Rodriguez Brizuela v. Noem, 2026 WL 752257 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 12, 2026)
16	Zamora v. Bondi, 2026 WL 693054 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 10, 2026)
17	Angel v. Noem, 2026 WL 594368 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 3, 2026)
18	Jobe v. Acuna, 2026 WL 775928 (W.D. La. Mar. 3, 2026), report and recommendation adopted, 2026 WL 772631 (W.D. La. Mar. 18, 2026)
19	Acosta Espana v. Ortega, 2026 WL 594362 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 2, 2026)
20	Gomez Alvarado v. Vergara, 2026 WL 594366 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 2, 2026)
21	Zamudio Sanchez v. Noem, 2026 WL 596133 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 2, 2026)
22	Gomez-Gonzalez v. Vergara, 2026 WL 594364 (W.D. Tex. Feb. 27, 2026)
23	Sanchez v. Bondi, 2026 WL 594365 (W.D. Tex. Feb. 27, 2026)
24	Longoria Mendoza v. Noem, 2026 WL 809441 (W.D. Tex. Feb. 26, 2026)

25	Hernandez v. De Anda-Ybarra, 2026 WL 560334 (W.D. Tex. Feb. 25, 2026)
26	Dong v. Bondi, 2026 WL 696933 (W.D. La. Feb. 24, 2026), report and recommendation adopted, 2026 WL 693424 (W.D. La. Mar. 11, 2026)
27	Mogos v. Thompson, 2026 WL 475079 (W.D. Tex. Feb. 13, 2026)
28	Jamshidiparvar v. Thompson, 2026 WL 301070 (W.D. Tex. Feb. 2, 2026)
29	Simanca Gonzalez v. Aldridge, 2026 WL 313476 (S.D. W. Va. Feb. 2, 2026)
30	Socorro v. Acuna, 2026 WL 242707 (W.D. La. Jan. 29, 2026)
31	Gonzalez-Perez v. Bondi, 2026 WL 300788 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 26, 2026)
32	Leksina v. Rice, 2026 WL 655563 (W.D. La. Jan. 23, 2026), report and recommendation adopted, 2026 WL 642195 (W.D. La. Mar. 6, 2026)
33	Gallardo Brito v. Thompson, 2026 WL 195761 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 22, 2026)
34	Montoya Palacios v. Baker, 2026 WL 171690 (D. Md. Jan. 22, 2026)
35	Avendano Lopez v. Garcia, 2026 WL 105023 (W.D. La. Jan. 14, 2026)
36	Doukoure v. Bowen, 2026 WL 106387 (W.D. La. Jan. 14, 2026)

37	Mendoza-Menjivar v. Bondi, 2026 WL 89964 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 12, 2026)
38	Silva v. Bondi, 2026 WL 90060 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 12, 2026)
39	Guillen-Mora v. Lyons, 2026 WL 94656 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 9, 2026)
40	Fadeev v. Lyons, 2026 WL 93147 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 7, 2026)
41	Vega-Vega v. Bondi, 2026 WL 93979 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 6, 2026)
42	Flores-Boziere v. Bondi, 2026 WL 94649 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 5, 2026)
43	Banoub v. Crawford, 2025 WL 3723458 (E.D. Va. Dec. 23, 2025)
44	Rodriguez Lara v. Bondi, 2025 WL 3654263 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 16, 2025)
45	Lopez-Neria v. Bondi, 2025 WL 3654329 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 12, 2025)
46	Chang v. Noem, 2025 WL 3657324 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 8, 2025), report and recommendation adopted, 2025 WL 3670503 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 17, 2025)
47	Pineda-Medrano v. Bondi, 2025 WL 3472152 (E.D. Va. Dec. 3, 2025)
48	Nina Cayllahua v. Lyons, 2025 WL 4661282 (E.D. Va. Dec. 1, 2025)

Awarding Fees Under the EAJA to Immigration Detainees Who Were Granted Habeas Relief—Dec. 2025 to Mar. 2026	
49	Valasco Hurtado v. Bondi, 2026 WL 752441 (D. Minn. Mar. 17, 2026)
50	Morales Mendez v. Field Off. Dir., U.S. ICE, 2026 WL 734347 (N.D.N.Y. Mar. 16, 2026)
51	Salazar v. Noem, 2026 WL 594606 (D. Neb. Mar. 3, 2026)
52	Krajekian v. Cantu, 2026 WL 598226 (D. Ariz. Jan. 2, 2026), report and recommendation adopted, 2026 WL 596300 (D. Ariz. Mar. 3, 2026)
53	Bernardo-Rodriguez v. Hyde, 2026 WL 370863 (D. Me. Feb. 10, 2026)
54	Vasquez v. Noem, 2025 WL 3771402 (D. Utah Dec. 31, 2025)
55	Diaz-Cruz v. Dedos, 2025 WL 3628517 (D.N.M. Dec. 12, 2025)
56	Rivera Espinosa v. Francis, 2025 WL 3513983 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 8, 2025)
Inviting Immigration Detainees Who Were Granted Habeas Relief to Apply for Fees Under the EAJA—Dec. 2025 to Mar. 2026	
57	Rodriguez v. Noem, 2026 WL 799363 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 23, 2026)
58	Perez v. Noem, 2026 WL 753646 (D. Neb. Mar. 17, 2026)

59	Cetino Garcia v. Noem, 2026 WL 733798 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 16, 2026)
60	Nossov v. Hoover, 2026 WL 711691 (M.D. Pa. Mar. 13, 2026)
61	Camara v. Lowe, 2026 WL 701774 (M.D. Pa. Mar. 12, 2026)
62	Ndou v. Noem, 2026 WL 686564 (D.N.M. Mar. 11, 2026)
63	Singh v. Noem, 2026 WL 657036 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 9, 2026)
64	Corregidor v. Margolin, 2026 WL 636745 (D.N.M. Mar. 6, 2026)
65	Malik v. Dosanj, 2026 WL 638483 (D. Haw. Mar. 6, 2026)
66	Utiashvili v. Rose, 2026 WL 637642 (M.D. Pa. Mar. 6, 2026)
67	Camara v. Lowe, 2026 WL 625489 (M.D. Pa. Mar. 5, 2026)
68	Martinez Carrales v. Bondi, 2026 WL 624169 (D. Neb. Mar. 5, 2026)
69	Rojas Sandoval v. Bondi, 2026 WL 613483 (D. Minn. Mar. 4, 2026)
70	Singh v. Castro, 2026 WL 608756 (D.N.M. Mar. 4, 2026)
71	Leon v. Hoover, 2026 WL 597984 (M.D. Pa. Mar. 3, 2026)
72	Vu v. Dosanj, 2026 WL 594740 (D. Haw. Mar. 3, 2026)

73	Ruiz v. Warden, Torrance Cnty, Det. Ctr., 2026 WL 579326 (D.N.M. Mar. 2, 2026)
74	Ramos v. Dedos, 2026 WL 555338 (D.N.M. Feb. 27, 2026)
75	Garcia Bautista v. Noem, 2026 WL 532427 (D. Colo. Feb. 26, 2026)
76	Singh v. Easterwood, 2026 WL 544997 (D. Neb. Feb. 26, 2026)
77	Meeran v. Rose, 2026 WL 540379 (M.D. Pa. Feb. 26, 2026)
78	Lopez Garcia v. Bondi, 2026 WL 498714 (D. Minn. Feb. 23, 2026)
79	Singh v. Lyons, 2026 WL 524267 (M.D. Pa. Feb. 25, 2026)
80	Abghari v. Hermosillo, 2026 WL 503317 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 24, 2026)
81	Singh v. Castro, 2026 WL 508176 (D.N.M. Feb. 23, 2026)
82	De Jesus Soriano v. Bondi, 2026 WL 487722 (D. Neb. Feb. 20, 2026)
83	Sanchez v. Noem, 2026 WL 473094 (D.N.M. Feb. 19, 2026)
84	Fuentes Bonilla v. Baltazar, 2026 WL 452365 (D. Colo. Feb. 18, 2026)
85	Diallo v. Lowe, 2026 WL 458294 (M.D. Pa. Feb. 18, 2026)
86	Egbele v. Bondi, 2026 WL 458242 (D. Minn. Feb. 18, 2026)

87	Mamatkulov v. Lowe, 2026 WL 456917 (M.D. Pa. Feb. 18, 2026)
88	Romero-Avila v. Bondi, 2026 WL 458456 (D. Minn. Feb. 18, 2026)
89	Vang v. Bondi, 2026 WL 458195 (D. Minn. Feb. 18, 2026)
90	Xiong v. Noem, 2026 WL 465220 (D. Minn. Feb. 18, 2026)
91	Albornoz v. Hermosillo, 2026 WL 444983 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 17, 2026)
92	Tigasi Tigasi v. Bondi, 2026 WL 447535 (D. Minn. Feb. 17, 2026)
93	Rosario v. Bondi, 2026 WL 465723 (D. Minn. Feb. 17, 2026)
94	Dieng v. Hermosillo, 2026 WL 411857 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 13, 2026)
95	Hernandez v. Kunes, 2026 WL 411726 (M.D. Pa. Feb. 13, 2026)
96	Gonzalez v. Noem, 2026 WL 396241 (D.N.M. Feb. 12, 2026)
97	Aguirre-Guevara v. Oddo, 2026 WL 376846, at *1 (W.D. Pa. Feb. 11, 2026)
98	Cova v. Rose, 2026 WL 376921 (W.D. Pa. Feb. 11, 2026)
99	Suquilanda v. Bondi, 2026 WL 381847 (D. Minn. Feb. 11, 2026)
100	Salazar v. Noem, 2026 WL 381889 (D. Minn. Feb. 11, 2026)

101	Gallardo v. Bondi, 2026 WL 383747 (D. Minn. Feb. 11, 2026)
102	Gutierrez v. Easterwood, 2026 WL 399474 (D. Minn. Feb. 11, 2026)
103	Henry A. v. Bondi, 2026 WL 482180 (D. Minn. Feb. 10, 2026)
104	Lumi v. Bondi, 2026 WL 383834 (D. Minn. Feb. 10, 2026)
105	Mendez v. Bondi, 2026 WL 383842 (D. Minn. Feb. 10, 2026)
106	Zacarias v. Bondi, 2026 WL 383840 (D. Minn. Feb. 10, 2026)
107	Temahagari v. Bondi, 2026 WL 353264 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 9, 2026)
108	Torres v. Bondi, 2026 WL 359901 (D. Minn. Feb. 9, 2026)
109	Esquivel Leon v. Hoover, 2026 WL 601913 (M.D. Pa. Feb. 6, 2026), report and recommendation adopted, 2026 WL 597984 (Mar. 3, 2026)
110	Perez v. Bondi, 2026 WL 329171 (D. Neb. Feb. 6, 2026)
111	De Ortiz v. Noem, 2026 WL 331242 (D. Minn. Feb. 5, 2026)
112	Hernandez v. Baltazar, 2026 WL 304362 (D. Colo. Feb. 5, 2026)
113	Hidalgo v. Easterwood, 2026 WL 297822 (D. Minn. Feb. 4, 2026)

114	Martinez Gamez v. Easterwood, 2026 WL 295400 (D. Neb. Feb. 4, 2026)
115	Castro v. Noem, 2026 WL 280470 (D.N.M. Feb. 3, 2026)
116	Batz v. Berg, 2026 WL 288135 (D. Neb. Feb. 2, 2026)
117	Chaglia v. Bondi, 2026 WL 281009 (D. Minn. Feb. 2, 2026)
118	Celis Quintero v. Bondi, 2026 WL 281010 (D. Minn. Feb. 2, 2026)
119	Salazar v. Noem, 2026 WL 280803 (D. Neb. Feb. 2, 2026)
120	Owdetallah v. Bondi, 2026 WL 691201 (W.D. Okla. Jan. 22, 2026), report and recommendation adopted, 2026 WL 483648 (W.D. Okla. Feb. 20, 2026)
121	Abanil v. Baltazar, 2026 WL 100587 (D. Colo. Jan. 14, 2026)
122	Sandoval Abzun v. Genalo, 2026 WL 100028 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 14, 2026)
123	Santos Ramirez v. Bondi, 2026 WL 84515 (D.N.M. Jan. 12, 2026)
124	Intrigo-Sedgwick v. Noem, 2025 WL 3688155 (D.N.M. Dec. 19, 2025), report and recommendation adopted, No. 25-cv-01065, ECF No. 27 (D.N.M. Jan. 6, 2026)