

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

JUAN T.R.,

Case No. 26-CV-0107 (PJS/DLM)

Petitioner,

v.

SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER

KRISTI NOEM, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security; TODD LYONS, Acting Director of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and DAVID EASTERWOOD, Acting Director, St. Paul Field Office, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement,

Respondents.

On January 8, 2026, petitioner Juan T.R. filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus.¹ The Court issued an order requiring respondents to file an answer no later than January 12, 2026. Respondents failed to answer. Accordingly, the Court granted the writ in part and ordered respondents to afford Juan a bond hearing within seven days or, failing that, to immediately release him from detention. ECF No. 4.

Respondents neither held a bond hearing within the required time nor released Juan. ECF No. 6. The Court then issued a show-cause order and scheduled a hearing at

¹Pursuant to this District's policy in immigration cases, the Court identifies petitioner only by first name and last initials.

which it ordered the personal appearance of Todd Lyons, Acting Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”). ECF No. 7. The Court noted, however, that if the parties filed a stipulation indicating that Juan had been released, the Court would cancel the hearing and would not require Lyons to appear. *Id.* The parties filed such a stipulation (ECF No. 9), and the Court then canceled the hearing in an order dated January 28, 2026 (ECF No. 10).

In its January 28 order, the Court expressed grave concerns about ICE’s noncompliance with court orders. The Court attached to its January 28 order an appendix that identified 96 court orders that ICE had violated in 74 cases. The Court noted that “the list was hurriedly compiled by extraordinarily busy judges” and that, “[u]ndoubtedly, mistakes were made.” *Id.* at 2.

Unfortunately, the government’s response to the Court’s order was not to do a better job complying with court orders, but instead to attack the Court. In an email to the undersigned dated February 9, 2026, Daniel N. Rosen, the United States Attorney for the District of Minnesota, accused the Court of wildly overstating the extent of ICE’s noncompliance with orders. Specifically, Rosen said that he had asked a lawyer in his office to review “a statistically strong sample of the 75 cases” listed in the appendix to the Court’s January 28 order. That “statistically strong sample” consisted of the first 12 cases on the list. Rosen summarized the result of his inquiry as follows:

So as I am seeing it, in eight out of eleven cases [the twelfth case was a duplicate], the Petitioners were released *on time*. In six of those eight cases, there was no violation at all. In one there was a violation regarding an interim step, but the release was on time. In one, the release was on time, but the status report was filed late. In one, where no specific deadline was set for return and release, the return and release took six days. In two cases, the releases were after the deadline

Rosen later concluded:

Judge, please pardon me for being so direct, but your order of January 28 did not merely contain some errors, as you anticipated it may. Assuming the statistical sample we chose is as representative of the whole as I believe it likely is, the information compiled by others for your order was far beyond the pale of accuracy for an order that would be wielded so publicly and so sharply. The lawyers in my civil division didn't deserve it.

Because Rosen made serious allegations against the undersigned and the other judges of this District, the undersigned asked each judge to revisit the cases that he or she had submitted for inclusion in the appendix. The undersigned then had his law clerks independently check the accuracy of the information reported by the other chambers. All of this took some time, as this Court continues to be overwhelmed with the legal work created by Operation Metro Surge.

Attached to this order as Appendix A is the result of the Court's attempt to verify the accuracy of the assertions made in the January 28 order. Appendix A includes only cases that appeared in the appendix to the January 28 order. The Court did in fact find

some mistakes—mistakes that cut both ways. But the bottom line is that ICE violated 97 orders in 66 of the cases referred to in the January 28 order. The January 28 order had identified “96 court orders that ICE has violated in 74 cases.” ECF No. 10 at 2. Obviously, the January 28 order was not “beyond the pale of accuracy,” as claimed by Rosen.

As noted, Rosen asserted in his email that “[t]he lawyers in my civil division didn't deserve” the supposedly inaccurate January 28 order. Putting aside the fact that the January 28 order was not inaccurate, Rosen failed to mention that this Court said the following in the show-cause order that preceded the January 28 order:

The Court expresses its appreciation to attorney Ana Voss and her colleagues [in the civil division], who have struggled mightily to ensure that respondents comply with court orders despite the fact that respondents have failed to provide them with adequate resources.

ECF No. 7 at 2 n.1.

The judges of this District have been extraordinarily patient with the government attorneys, recognizing that they have been put in an impossible position by Rosen and his superiors in the Department of Justice (leading many of those attorneys—including, unfortunately, Ana Voss—to resign). What those attorneys “didn’t deserve” was the Administration sending 3000 ICE agents to Minnesota to detain people without making any provision for handling the hundreds of lawsuits that were sure to follow.

Finally, in his February 9 email, Rosen said:

For our part, we commit to the court that we will redouble our efforts to achieve compliance by our client across the board. The truth is that efforts we have already been undertaking for weeks have led to considerable improvement—efforts which have apparently gone unrecognized by some on the bench, even though the numbers prove them out. We will continue to try to find the ways to improve.

This, too, appears to be untrue. Attached as Appendix B is a list of *additional* cases in which ICE has violated court orders, most of which violations occurred after entry of the January 28 order. Despite Rosen’s assurance of “redouble[d]” efforts that have “led to considerable improvement,” Appendix B documents 113 additional orders that ICE has violated in 77 additional cases—again, above and beyond the 97 orders that ICE violated in the 66 cases identified in Appendix A.

If anything is “beyond the pale,” it is ICE’s continued violation of the orders of this Court. Increasingly, this Court has had to resort to using the threat of civil contempt to force ICE to comply with orders. The Court is not aware of another occasion in the history of the United States in which a federal court has had to threaten contempt—again and again and again—to force the *United States government* to comply with court orders.

This Court will continue to do whatever is required to protect the rule of law, including, if necessary, moving to the use of criminal contempt. One way or another, ICE will comply with this Court's orders.

Dated: February 26, 2026

/s/ Patrick J. Schiltz
Patrick J. Schiltz, Chief Judge
United States District Court

APPENDIX A

Habeas Cases with Order Non-Compliance

Hakan K. v. Noem, et al., Case No. 25-CV-4722 (JMB/DTS)

On December 24, 2025, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner by 1:00 pm on December 25 and, within 7 days, submit a declaration affirming release in accordance with the order. ECF No. 14. Respondents did not file a declaration, requiring the Court to issue an order to show cause. ECF No. 16.

Luis L.P. v. Brott, et al., Case No. 25-CV-4741 (NEB/DJF)

On January 9, 2026, the Court ordered a bond hearing or release within 7 days. ECF No. 8. On January 15, Petitioner was granted bond and paid bond the next day, but, based on a claimed administrative error, was not released until January 26. ECF Nos. 10–13, 15.

Alex V.Y.L. v. Pamela Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-031 (JWB/DJF)

On January 9, 2026, Respondents were ordered to confirm Petitioner's release within 48 hours. ECF No. 7. The update was not timely filed.

Francisco E.O. v. Olson, et al., Case No. 26-CV-080 (JRT/DJF)

On January 15, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to return Petitioner to Minnesota for a bond hearing within 7 days. ECF No. 11. Respondents failed to return Petitioner to Minnesota or hold a bond hearing by the deadline. ECF Nos. 12, 14. On January 23, the Court ordered Respondents to return Petitioner to Minnesota no later than January 24, release him immediately upon his return, and provide a status update by 5:00 pm on January 26. ECF No. 14. Petitioner was finally returned to Minnesota and released on January 28. ECF No. 17.

Marlon M.M. v. Easterwood, et al., Case No. 26-CV-106 (NEB/ECW)

On January 15, 2026, the Court ordered that Petitioner, who had been transferred to Texas, be released immediately in Minnesota subject to the conditions of his previous order of release. ECF No. 10. On January 20, Respondents notified the

Court that Petitioner was still in Texas. ECF No. 12. Respondents did not release Petitioner until January 21, subject to a new order of recognizance. ECF No. 15.

Juan T.R. v. Noem, et al., Case No. 26-CV-0107 (PJS/DLM)

On January 14, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to provide a bond hearing or release Petitioner within 7 days. ECF No. 4. On January 23, Petitioner notified the Court that he had not received a bond hearing and was still in custody. ECF No. 6. After the Court scheduled a show-cause hearing, Respondents released Petitioner on January 27. ECF Nos. 7, 9.

Sharet B.G.M. v. Lyons, et al., Case No. 26-CV-120 (JRT/DTS)

On January 15, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to return Petitioner to Minnesota for a bond hearing to be held within 7 days and, failing that, to release her immediately. ECF No. 9. On January 25, Respondents reported that they were unable to return Petitioner to Minnesota by the deadline and she was still detained in Texas. ECF No. 10. At the parties' request, the Court ordered that Petitioner be immediately released in Texas. ECF Nos. 10, 12.

Botir B. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-130 (LMP/DJF)

On January 9, 2026, at 2:23 pm, the Court ordered Respondents to provide the Petitioner and the Court 72 hours' notice before transferring Petitioner outside of Minnesota. ECF No. 3. Without notice, Respondents moved Petitioner to Texas on January 9. ECF No. 6 at 2. Respondents did not identify what time they moved Petitioner, but they did not contest the Court's conclusion that the transfer occurred after the Court's show-cause order and agreed to return Petitioner to Minnesota without further order of the Court. *Id.* at 2 n.1.

Lida E.G.Q. v. Executive Office for Immigration Review, et al., Case No. 26-CV-138 (JWB/JFD)

On January 9, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from removing Petitioner from Minnesota. ECF No. 3. On January 10, Respondents transferred Petitioner to Texas. ECF No. 6.

Jhony A. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-00146 (JMB/LIB)

On January 15, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to provide Petitioner a bond hearing by 5:00 pm on January 16 or release him immediately. ECF No. 5. The Court further ordered Respondents to provide a status update by 11:00 am on January 20. *Id.* At 2:42 pm on January 20, having received no status update, the Court ordered Respondents to file an update by 4:30 pm and provide a basis for their delay. ECF No. 7. Respondents filed an update stating that Petitioner had been released on January 17. ECF No. 8.

Christopher A.F.E. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-150 (JWB/ECW)

On January 14, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner in Minnesota and to confirm the time, date, and location of release within 48 hours. ECF No. 9. Respondents informed the Court that Petitioner would be released on January 17 and that an update would be provided. ECF No. 10. On January 19, having received no update, the Court ordered Respondents to provide an update by 3:00 pm confirming that Petitioner was released in Minnesota on January 17. ECF No. 11. Respondents confirmed that Petitioner was released in Minnesota, but did not provide the time or date of release. ECF No. 12.

Evelin M.A. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-156 (NEB/DLM)

On January 23, 2026, the Court ordered Petitioner to be released in Minnesota within 24 hours, and ordered Respondents to file an update confirming compliance within 2 days. ECF No. 9. Petitioner was not released until January 27 and Respondents failed to file an update until January 29, which failed to state where Petitioner was released. ECF No. 12.

Jose A. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-160 (NEB/EMB)

On January 15, 2026, the Court ordered immediate release in Minnesota and for Respondents, within 2 days, to confirm Petitioner's release and provide a status update concerning whether they informed Petitioner's counsel of Petitioner's location and whether family was allowed to deliver Petitioner's medication to him. ECF No. 8. On January 17, Petitioner's counsel notified the Court that, upon information and belief, Petitioner was still in Texas and counsel had no update on Petitioner's release nor confirmation that Petitioner's medications were provided

to him. ECF No. 10. On January 20, Respondents updated the Court via email that Petitioner had been released on January 18.

Pascual G. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-00161 (JMB/LIB)

On January 15, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to provide Petitioner a bond hearing no later than January 16 at 5:00 pm or release him immediately and to provide a status update by 11:00 am on January 20. ECF No. 5. Respondents did not release Petitioner until January 17 and did not file an update until after the deadline had passed and the Court issued another order. ECF Nos. 7–8.

Santiago A.C.P. v. Todd Lyons, et al., Case No. 26-CV-164 (JWB/DTS)

On January 15, 2026, the Court ordered immediate release in Minnesota and for Respondents to confirm the date, time, and location of release within 48 hours. ECF No. 9. Respondents did not release Petitioner until 10:03 pm on January 19 and did not confirm the time, date, and location of release until the Court again ordered them to do so. ECF Nos. 12–14, 17–18.

Andrei C. v. Lyons, et al., Case No. 26-CV-166 (SRN/ECW)

On January 12, 2026, at 11:32 am, the Court enjoined Respondents from transporting Petitioner outside of Minnesota. ECF No. 3. Respondents moved Petitioner to Texas that afternoon, after the Court’s order had been served on Respondents. ECF No. 9.

Oscar O.T. v. Pamela Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-167 (JWB/JFD)

On January 15, 2026, the Court ordered immediate release in Minnesota and required Respondents to confirm the time, date, and location of Petitioner’s release within 48 hours. ECF No. 6. Respondents did not release Petitioner until January 28, ECF No. 30, after failing to file updates, ECF Nos. 9, 11, and informing the Court that Petitioner was scheduled to return to Minnesota on January 20 when he was actually transferred from Texas to New Mexico on that date, ECF Nos. 10, 26.

Martin R. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-00168 (JMB/LIB)

On January 15, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to provide Petitioner a bond hearing no later than 5:00 pm on January 16 or release Petitioner immediately,

and to file a status update by 11:00 am on January 20. ECF No. 5. Respondents never provided a bond hearing and did not release Petitioner until January 21, ECF Nos. 10, 12, after failing to file an update, ECF No. 9. Further, Respondents released Petitioner subject to conditions despite the Court's release order not providing for conditions. ECF Nos. 5, 12–13.

Abdi W. v. Trump, et al., Case No. 26-CV-00208 (KMM/SGE)

On January 21, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents, within 3 days, to either (a) complete Petitioner's inspection and examination and file a notice confirming completion, or (b) release Petitioner immediately in Minnesota and confirm the date, time, and location of release. ECF No. 7. No notice was ever filed. The Court emailed counsel on January 27, 2026, at 10:39 am. No response was provided.

Adriana M.Y.M. v. David Easterwood, et al., Case No. 26-CV-213 (JWB/JFD)

On January 24, 2026, the Court ordered immediate release in Minnesota and ordered Respondents to confirm the time, date, and location of release, or anticipated release, within 48 hours. ECF No. 12. Respondent was not released until January 30, and Respondents never disclosed the time of release, instead describing it as "early this morning." ECF No. 16.

Estefany J.S. v. Bondi, Case No. 26-CV-216 (JWB/SGE)

On January 13, 2026, at 10:59 am, the Court ordered Respondents to file a letter by 4:00 pm confirming Petitioner's current location. ECF No. 8. After receiving no response, the Court ordered Respondents, at 5:11 pm, to immediately confirm Petitioner's location and, by noon on January 14, file a memorandum explaining their failure to comply with the initial order. ECF No. 9. Respondents did not file the memorandum, requiring the Court to issue another order. ECF No. 12. On January 15, the Court ordered immediate release in Minnesota and required Respondents to confirm the time, date, and location of release within 48 hours. ECF No. 18. On January 20, having received no confirmation, the Court ordered Respondents to comply immediately. ECF No. 21. Respondents informed the Court that Petitioner was released in Minnesota on January 17, but did not specify the time. ECF No. 22.

Martha S.S. v. Kristi Noem, et al., Case No. 26-CV-231 (JWB/DLM)

On January 16, 2026, at 10:40 am, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner in Minnesota and confirm the time, date, and location of release within 48 hours. ECF No. 8. Respondents did not release Petitioner until 4:27 pm on January 20, ECF No. 13, and twice failed to provide the required confirmation of time, date, and location of release, ECF Nos. 10, 12.

Joaquin Q. L. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-233 (LMP/DTS)

On January 21, 2026, the Court ordered Petitioner's immediate release in Minnesota. ECF No. 8. On January 26, Petitioner was still detained in Texas. ECF No. 10. Respondents did not release Petitioner until 2:54 pm on January 27. ECF No. 13.

Jose L.C.C. v. Pamela Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-244 (JWB/DTS)

On January 15, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner in Minnesota and confirm the time, date, and location of release within 48 hours. ECF No. 6. Respondents did not release Petitioner until January 18 and imposed conditions of release despite the release order not providing for any conditions. ECF Nos. 11–12. Respondents also failed to provide the required confirmation. ECF No. 10.

Juan R. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-252 (SRN/DTS)

On January 16, 2026, Respondents were ordered to release Petitioner from custody within 48 hours. ECF No. 8. Respondents did not release Petitioner until January 23. ECF No. 11.

Jesus A.P. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-261 (PJS/EMB)

On January 15, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from transferring Petitioner out of Minnesota and ordered his immediate return if he had already been removed. ECF No. 8. Respondents failed to comply with the order to return Petitioner to Minnesota immediately. Instead, on January 20, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner was transferred to Texas on January 14 and that Petitioner would be "processed in El Paso for removal proceedings." ECF No. 12. On January 26, the Court ordered Petitioner's immediate release. ECF No. 13. On

this date, ICE's locator showed that Petitioner was in custody in Minnesota. It is unclear when Petitioner was returned.

Abdiqadir A. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-272 (JMB/DTS)

On January 16, 2026, at 1:31 pm, after Respondents failed to answer the habeas petition, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner by 5:00 pm. ECF No. 4. Respondents did not release Petitioner until January 17. ECF No. 7.

Sandra C. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-00283 (JMB/JFD)

On January 16, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to provide Petitioner a bond hearing by 5:00 pm on January 20 or immediately release her. ECF No. 6. As of January 21, Petitioner was still in custody and had not had a bond hearing. ECF Nos. 8–9. The Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner. ECF No. 12. Petitioner was released later that day with conditions, ECF No. 16, despite the Court's orders not providing for conditions, ECF Nos. 6, 12, 18.

Yeylin C.R. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-296 (NEB/LIB)

On January 20, 2026, at 11:37 am, the Court ordered Petitioner's immediate release. ECF No. 6. Petitioner was not released until January 21 and with conditions, despite the release order not providing for conditions. ECF No. 8–9. On January 26, ICE rescinded the conditions. ECF No. 14.

Liban G. v. Noem, et al., Case No. 26-CV-301 (SRN/ECW)

On January 15, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from transporting Petitioner out of Minnesota. ECF No. 5. After being notified that Petitioner had been transported to Texas, the Court ordered Respondents to return Petitioner to Minnesota within 48 hours and notify the Court within 24 hours of his return. ECF No. 8. On January 20, the Court ordered daily updates by 5:00 pm on the status of returning Petitioner to Minnesota. ECF No. 11. Respondents did not return Petitioner to Minnesota until January 22 and failed to timely update the Court on January 22 and 23. ECF Nos. 15, 16, 17. On January 23 at 10:56 am, the Court ordered Petitioner's release by 5:00 pm. ECF No. 18. Respondents did not release Petitioner until approximately 9:32 p.m. ECF No. 21.

Joseph T.M. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-0309 (PJS/EMB)

On January 22, 2026, the Court ordered Petitioner's immediate release. ECF No. 6. On January 23, Petitioner's counsel notified the Court via email that, over 24 hours after Respondents were informed of the release order, Petitioner was still listed as in custody in Sherburne County. Per the email, Petitioner's attorney was told by an ICE representative on the phone that "a judge could not order ICE to release him immediately and that they would, essentially, get to it when they get to it." Respondents' counsel confirmed Petitioner's release shortly thereafter via email.

Manolo Z. L. v. Trump, et al., Case No. 26-CV-316 (LMP/DTS)

On January 15, 2026, at 12:19 pm, the Court ordered Respondents to provide the Petitioner and the Court 72 hours' notice of any transfer of the Petitioner outside of Minnesota. ECF No. 3. After the Court's order, Petitioner was moved to Texas without notice to the Court. ECF No. 13.

Diana L.-C. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-319 (NEB/JFD)

Diana L.-C., her brother, and her minor and U.S. Citizen friend filed a joint habeas action challenging their detention under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Case No. 26-CV-293. On January 14, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from moving Petitioner outside of Minnesota. *Id.* ECF No. 4. The Court then severed the original Petition so that each petitioner had a separate docket. On January 15, ICE transferred Diana L.-C. to Texas. Case No. 26-CV-319, ECF No. 4.

Felix J.C.A. v. Pamela Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-328 (JWB/DLM)

On January 24, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner immediately subject to any conditions imposed in 2019 and, within 48 hours, confirm the time, date, and location of release. ECF No. 7. The update did not state the time or location of release. ECF No. 10. In addition, Respondents improperly imposed a \$1500 bond and did not timely respond to the Court's order to show cause. ECF Nos. 10–13.

Ihor D. v. Noem, et al., Case No. 26-CV-00351 (JMB/DTS)

On January 20, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner by 5:00 pm and confirm release by 11:00 am on January 21. ECF No. 8. On January 21,

Petitioner was still in ICE custody and was not scheduled to be returned to Minnesota for release until January 24. ECF No. 10. On January 22, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner in Minnesota by January 24 and file a status update by 10:00 am on January 26. ECF No. 11. Respondents did not file a status update as ordered. ECF No. 12. After the Court issued an order to show cause, Respondents confirmed that Petitioner was released on January 22. ECF No. 13.

Francisco M. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-369 (JMB/EMB)

On January 16, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from moving Petitioner out of Minnesota. ECF No. 3. On January 20, the Court ordered Respondents to provide a bond hearing or release by 5:00 pm on January 22 and update the Court by 11:00 am on January 23. ECF No. 6. On January 23, Petitioner's counsel notified the Court that he was unaware of any bond hearing and his client was in Texas. ECF No. 10. The Court ordered Respondents to provide details about the bond hearing and when Petitioner was transferred out of Minnesota by 4:00 pm on January 23, failing which the Court would order release. ECF No. 11. After Respondents failed to comply, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner in Minnesota. ECF No. 12. Respondents did not release Petitioner until January 26. ECF No. 15.

Alberto C.M. v. Noem, et al., Case No. 26-CV-0380 (DWF/SGE)

On January 23, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner, i.e., leave his hospital room and remove restraints imposed against hospital recommendation, and file a status update within 3 days. ECF No. 9. Respondents failed to file the required update until after the Court issued an order to show cause. ECF No. 11.

Josue David P. A. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-396 (LMP/JFD)

On January 17, 2026, the Court enjoined Petitioner's removal from Minnesota and ordered his immediate return to Minnesota if he had been removed. ECF No. 5. Counsel for Respondents admitted he did not communicate this order to ICE until January 20, at which time Petitioner had already been transferred to Texas. ECF No. 7. ICE did not respond to counsel's request for return to Minnesota. *Id.* The Court ordered Petitioner's transfer back to Minnesota by January 27, with a status report due at 9:00 am on January 28. ECF No. 8. Respondents did not file

the status report until after 5:00 pm on January 28, after the Court issued an order to show cause. ECF Nos. 10–11.

Nadejda P. v. Lyons, et al., Case No. 26-CV-00404 (KMM/DLM)

On January 22, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to either conduct an inspection or release Petitioner and to file a notice within three days, including the date, time, and location of release. ECF No. 7. No notice was ever filed. The Court emailed counsel on January 27 seeking an update. Petitioner’s counsel confirmed that Petitioner was released on January 23. Respondents’ counsel never responded.

Paula G. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-410 (JMB/DLM)

On January 17, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from moving Petitioner out of Minnesota. ECF No. 3. On January 20, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner in Minnesota no later than 4:00 pm. ECF No. 5. On January 21, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner remained in ICE custody in Texas and that they did not intend to return her to Minnesota until January 24. ECF No. 6. The next day, Respondents advised the Court that Petitioner was flown from Texas to Minnesota on January 22 and released at 8:12 pm. ECF No. 8.

Ronnie C. v. Pamela Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-423 (JWB/JFD)

On January 18, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from transferring Petitioner out of Minnesota. ECF No. 3. At some unspecified time, ICE transferred the petitioner to Texas, claiming that it had not been made aware of the order. ECF No. 5. On January 21, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner in Minnesota and confirm the time, date, and location of release within 48 hours. ECF No. 6. Respondents failed to file an update. On January 26, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately comply with the order to confirm the time, date, and location of release. ECF No. 8. On January 27, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner was released from the Whipple Building “the morning of January 23.” ECF No. 9.

J.B.C.O., et al., v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-0424 (JRT/DJF)

On January 19, 2026, at 11:16 am, the Court ordered Respondents to produce a judicial warrant justifying entry into Petitioners’ home no later than 5:00 pm or the Court would order Petitioners’ immediate release. ECF No. 6. At 6:39 pm,

having received no response, the Court ordered release in Minnesota within 72 hours and required Respondents to provide a status update within 5 days. ECF No. 9. At a January 22 status conference, Respondents' counsel represented that they would comply with the Court's order. On January 23, Petitioners' counsel notified the Court that Petitioners were still in custody in Texas. ECF No. 13. On January 25, having received no formal filings from Respondents, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioners in Minnesota and file a status update by 5:00 pm. ECF No. 14. Respondents then notified the Court that three petitioners had been released that day and the remainder were expected to be released that evening. ECF No. 15.

Silvestre R. C. v. Bondi, et al., No. 26-CV-436 (LMP/JFD)

On January 23, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner by 5:00 pm on January 24 and provide a status update affirming release by 10:00 am on January 26. ECF No. 6. Respondents did not comply with that order. The Court then ordered Respondents to show cause by 3:00 pm on January 26 why they should not be held in contempt. ECF No. 8. Respondents' response was late, ECF No. 11, and in the meantime, Petitioner's counsel notified the Court that Petitioner was released 26 hours after the Court's deadline, ECF No. 10.

Darvin M. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-437 (SRN/EMB)

On January 19, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from transporting Petitioner outside of Minnesota and ordered his immediate return if he had already been transferred. ECF No. 5. Respondents transported Petitioner out of state and failed to immediately return him, as ordered. ECF No. 11.

Maria U.C.G. v. Pamela Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-439 (JWB/LIB)

On January 24, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner in Minnesota, subject to any conditions of Petitioner's November 2022 order of supervision, and confirm the time, date, and location of release. ECF No. 10. The update did not provide the time of Petitioner's release and acknowledged that Respondents imposed conditions inconsistent with the November 2022 order of supervision. ECF No. 12.

Abdirahman S. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-00440 (JMB/DJF)

On January 22, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner no later than 4:00 pm on January 23 and file a letter by 11:00 am on January 26 confirming that Petitioner was released. ECF No. 7. Respondents did not file the letter. On January 27, the Court ordered Respondents to file a letter by 4:00 pm affirming that Petitioner was released as well as a declaration by an individual with personal knowledge stating where and when Petitioner was released. ECF No. 9. Respondents did not file the letter and declaration until January 28. ECF Nos. 11–12.

Enrique L. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-00444 (JMB/SGE)

On January 20, 2026, at 10:06 am, Respondents were enjoined from moving the Petitioner out of Minnesota. ECF No. 3. Petitioner was transferred out of Minnesota at 2:10 pm that day. ECF No. 5.

Fernando T. v. Noem, et al., Case No. 26-CV-0445 (ECT/EMB)

On January 20, 2026, at 11:23 am, the Court enjoined respondents from transporting Petitioner out of Minnesota. ECF No. 7. Respondents admitted that, after having been informed of this order, they transported Petitioner from Minnesota to Texas. ECF No. 9. On January 23, the Court ordered Respondents to file a status report and stated that, absent assurance that Petitioner would be returned before 11:59 pm on January 24, the Court would issue a show-cause order. ECF No. 11. Respondents confirmed that Petitioner would be back in Minnesota on January 24. ECF No. 12. On January 24, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner within 48 hours. ECF No. 13. Because Respondents had not returned Petitioner to Minnesota, he was released in Texas on January 25. ECF No. 17. His counsel personally paid for a plane ticket so Petitioner could return to Minnesota. ECF No. 18.

Alexis D.A.M. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-447 (JRT/ECW)

On January 20, 2026, at 11:51 am, the Court enjoined Respondents from transferring Petitioner out of Minnesota. ECF No. 3. Respondents transferred Petitioner out of Minnesota on January 20. ECF No. 5. On January 26, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner. ECF No. 6. Respondents released Petitioner subject to conditions despite the release order not providing for conditional release. ECF No. 11. After the Court ordered Respondents to identify

their authority for imposing conditions, ECF No. 12, Respondents removed the conditions, ECF No. 13.

Miguel D. v. Bondi, et al., 26-CV-00448 (KMM/DLM)

On January 21, 2026, at 12:20 pm, the Court ordered Petitioner's immediate transfer back to Minnesota. ECF No. 4. On January 23, at 7:58 pm, the Court ordered Petitioner's immediate release. ECF No. 7. Petitioner was not released until January 26, after Petitioner's counsel filed a motion for an order to show cause on January 25 at 11:55 pm stating that Petitioner was still detained in Texas. ECF Nos. 9, 11.

Hector T.G. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-449 (NEB/LIB)

On January 23, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner in Minnesota and file a notice within two days confirming release in Minnesota. ECF No. 8. Respondents did not release Petitioner until January 26 and did not file a notice until January 28, after the Court ordered Respondents to file an update immediately. ECF Nos. 10–11. Respondents also failed to confirm the location of release. ECF No. 11.

Luis S. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-454 (ECT/LIB)

On January 22, 2026, the parties stipulated to the Petitioner's immediate, unconditional release and the Court issued a corresponding order for Petitioner's immediate release with no conditions of supervision. ECF Nos. 5–7. Respondents did not release Petitioner until January 24, subject to conditions, and retained Petitioner's driver's license and work permit. ECF No. 16. The Court held a contempt hearing at which Respondents agreed that they violated the order because Petitioner's release was neither immediate nor unconditional.

Sonia M.M.C. v. Pamela Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-457 (JWB/LIB)

On January 24, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner immediately in Minnesota, subject to the conditions of her November 2022 release, and to confirm the time, date, and location of release. ECF No. 6. Respondents failed to report the time of release and imposed conditions inconsistent with the November 2022 order of supervision. ECF No. 8. On January 27, the Court ordered Respondents, by February 3, to identify the

authority under which they imposed conditions and confirm the time of Petitioner's release. ECF No. 9. Respondents failed to file anything.

Jose A. v. Noem, et al., Case No. 26-CV-00480 (JMB/ECW)

On January 22, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to provide Petitioner a bond hearing or release in Minnesota by 5:00 pm on January 23 and file a status update by 11:00 am on January 26. ECF No. 9. Respondents did not release Petitioner until January 25, ECF No. 13, after repeatedly failing to file status updates as ordered, ECF Nos. 11–12.

Ivan R. v. Pamela Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-485 (JWB/EMB)

On January 21, 2026 at 12:55 pm, the Court enjoined Respondents from moving Petitioner out of Minnesota. ECF No. 4. Respondents moved Petitioner to Texas on January 21 and claimed that they had not yet been informed of the Court's order. ECF No. 7. On January 24, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner in Minnesota and confirm the time, date, and location of release. ECF No. 8. The update did not include the time of release. ECF No. 10.

Yosber I.M.C. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-489 (JRT/DLM)

On January 21, 2026, at 3:45 pm, the Court enjoined Respondents from transporting Petitioner out of Minnesota. ECF No. 4. Petitioner was transferred to an ICE facility in Texas on the evening of January 21. ECF No. 5. On January 29, the Court ordered Respondents to transport Petitioner to Minnesota, unconditionally release him, and return all of his possessions, within 48 hours. ECF No. 9. Petitioner was released with conditions. ECF No. 11.

Fabian L.C. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-493 (NEB/DLM)

On January 24, the Court ordered Respondents to unconditionally release Petitioner within 24 hours. ECF No. 7. Respondents released Petitioner on January 26 subject to conditions. ECF No. 9.

Maria P. v. Brott, et al., Case No. 26-CV-00504 (JMB/JFD)

On January 23, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner by 4:00 pm and confirm release by 11:00 am on January 26. ECF No. 6. Respondents failed to file anything. On January 27, after the Court issued an order to show

cause, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner was released on January 23 at 8:18 pm. ECF No. 9.

Brayan M.O. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-517 (NEB/JFD)

On January 24, at 7:05 pm, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner within 24 hours. ECF No. 8. Respondents did not release Petitioner until January 26 at 6:35 pm. ECF No. 10.

Isidro L. v. Lyons, et al., Case No. 26-CV-00537 (JMB/DLM)

On January 22, 2026, at 9:42 am, the Court enjoined Respondents from moving Petitioner out of Minnesota. ECF No. 3. On January 23 at 1:44 am, ICE notified Petitioner's counsel that Petitioner was moved to Texas. ECF No. 7.

On January 26, the Court ordered that Petitioner, who was still in Texas, be released in Minnesota no later than 4:00 pm on January 28 and ordered Respondents to confirm release in Minnesota by 11:00 am on January 29. ECF No. 8. Respondents did not release Petitioner until January 30, ECF No. 12, after twice failing to file the required update, ECF Nos. 10–11, and finally filing an update more than six hours past the extended deadline, ECF Nos. 11–12.

Maria V.H., et al., v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-546 (JMG/DLM)

On January 22, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from removing petitioners from Minnesota and ordered their immediate return if they had already been removed. ECF No. 4. On January 24, Petitioners filed a motion for contempt alleging that they had been moved to Texas on January 23. ECF Nos. 8, 11. Respondents stated that Petitioners were not in Minnesota on January 22, but did not identify the time of removal. ECF No. 14. On January 24, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately return Petitioners to Minnesota, release them immediately upon return, and file a status report by January 26. ECF No. 18. Respondents failed to file a status report. On January 27, the Court issued an order reminding Respondents to file a status report. ECF No. 20. Although the case involved four Petitioners, Respondents reported that an unspecified "Petitioner" was released in Minnesota at 1:15 am on January 26. ECF No. 21.

Elvis T. E., et al. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-00561 (KMM/JFD)

On January 22, 2026, at 8:10 pm, the Court enjoined Respondents from removing Petitioners from Minnesota. ECF No. 4. At 8:57 pm, the Court alerted Respondents to the imminent filing of a temporary restraining order requiring release of Petitioner C.R.T.V. by 9:30 pm; the order was filed at 9:02 pm. ECF No. 7. Respondents were required to notify the Court as soon as C.R.T.V. was released. *Id.* At 8:59 pm, Respondents' counsel notified the Court that Petitioners were placed on an 8:30 pm flight, after the order enjoining their removal was filed.

Guled O. v. Noem, et al., Case No. 26-CV-0575 (ADM/DJF)

On January 23, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from removing Petitioner from Minnesota and required Respondents to immediately return him if he had already been removed. ECF No. 3. On January 26, Respondents informed the Court that Petitioner was in Texas and that the plans for his return were not known. ECF No. 5.

On January 28, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner in Minnesota. ECF No. 8. Respondents did not release Petitioner until February 2. ECF No. 11.

Carlos A. G. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-00580 (SRB/DJF)

On January 23, 2026, at 2:11 pm, the Court enjoined Respondents from moving Petitioner out of Minnesota. ECF No. 3. On January 23 at 10:04 pm, after Petitioner notified the Court that he was not in Minnesota, the Court ordered Respondents to show cause for Petitioner's transfer, identify his current location, and immediately return him to Minnesota. ECF No. 6. Respondents failed to file anything. On January 26, Petitioner's counsel requested a hearing because she had not been able to locate her client and had received no response to her attempts to contact Respondents. ECF No. 7. At a January 28 hearing, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner had been returned to Minnesota. ECF No. 13.

Jose V. v. Easterwood, et al., Case No. 26-CV-597 (DSD/LIB)

On January 25, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from removing Petitioner from Minnesota and ordered Petitioner's return if he had already been removed.

ECF No. 5. By January 28, Respondents still had not returned Petitioner to Minnesota. ECF No. 9.

Marco Q. v. Noem, et al., Case No. 26-CV-00663 (SRB/DLM)

On January 26, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from removing Petitioner from Minnesota. ECF No. 4. After being notified of the order, Respondents moved Petitioner out of Minnesota. ECF No. 5. On January 27, the Court ordered Respondents to return Petitioner to Minnesota immediately. ECF No. 6. On January 28, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner was still in Texas. ECF No. 8. On January 29, the Court ordered Respondents to transfer Petitioner to Minnesota and immediately release him. ECF No. 10. On January 30, Petitioner notified the Court that he had been in Minnesota since January 28 but remained in custody. ECF No. 12. Respondents released Petitioner at 10:16 pm on January 31. ECF No. 14.

APPENDIX B

Habeas Cases with Order Non-Compliance (New)

Bishar Ahmed A. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-197 (LMP/EMB)

On January 20, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to provide Petitioner a bond hearing or immediate release by January 26 and provide a status update by January 27. ECF No. 9. Respondents never provided a status update.

Paulo S. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-221 (NEB/DJF)

On January 16, 2026, the Court ordered a bond hearing or release within 7 days and ordered Respondents to provide an update within fourteen days. ECF No. 3. Respondents failed to file an update until after the Court issued a second order for an update on February 3. ECF Nos. 5–6.

Edwin Mauricio Z. P. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-222 (LMP/DJF)

On January 20, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to provide Petitioner a bond hearing or release by January 27. ECF No. 8. Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner was released on bond on January 27. ECF No. 11. This was a misrepresentation, as Petitioner was still in custody on January 29. ECF No. 12. The Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner no later than noon on January 30. ECF No. 13. As of 1:26 pm on January 30, Petitioner was still in custody. ECF No. 14. At 3:11 pm, the Court ordered that Respondents certify Petitioner's release no later than 5:00 pm. ECF No. 16. At 6:50 pm, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner had been released sometime before 5:00 pm. ECF No. 17.

Lesly M.M. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-237 (NEB/DLM)

On January 26, 2026, at 6:10 pm, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner within 24 hours. ECF No. 15. Respondents released Petitioner on January 28 at 8:07 pm. ECF No. 17.

Stalin Fernando C. T. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-247 (LMP/LIB)

On January 20, 2026, the Court granted Petitioner a bond hearing or release by January 27 and ordered Respondents to file a status update by January 28. ECF

No. 5. Respondents failed to file a status update and did not release Petitioner until January 30, after the Court again ordered Respondents to file an update. ECF No. 8, which was filed over 24 hours late, ECF Nos. 10–11.

Eliseo M. M. v. Noem et al., Case No. 26-CV-255 (LMP/LIB)

On January 21, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to hold a bond hearing or release Petitioner by January 28 and file a status update by January 29. ECF No. 5. Respondents failed to file a status update until January 30, after the Court again ordered them to do so. January 30 text order; ECF No. 9.

Victor S.M. v. Noem et al., Case No. 26-CV-400 (DWF/EMB)

On January 21, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to hold a bond hearing or release Petitioner by January 28 and provide a status update by January 31. ECF No. 7. Respondents failed to file a status update until February 2, after the Court again ordered them to do so. ECF Nos. 9–10.

U.H.A. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CF-417 (JRT/DLM)

On January 28, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release members of the putative Detained Subclass detained in Minnesota, return members detained elsewhere to Minnesota and release them by February 2, and coordinate safe release with Plaintiffs' counsel. ECF No. 41. On February 3, the Court learned that Defendants had failed to timely release some members of the Detained Subclass, failed to coordinate with counsel during release of others, released at least one class member in Texas, and imposed conditions of release despite the Court's order not providing for conditional release. ECF No. 69.

Victor S.A. v. Bondi, Case No. 26-CV-0443 (PJS/ECW)

On January 26, 2026, the Court ordered Petitioner's immediate release. ECF No. 8. Respondents did not release Petitioner until January 30, ECF No. 16, after Petitioner notified the Court that he was still in custody and the Court scheduled a hearing. ECF Nos. 11, 14.

Jhisvin A.B.V.A. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-455 (JRT/EMB)

On January 24, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to unconditionally release Petitioner as soon as practicable, to inform counsel in advance of the time and

place of release, and to file a status update by 5:00 pm on January 27. ECF No. 8. Respondents failed to file a status update and Petitioner was not released until January 28, subject to conditions. ECF No. 9. On January 29, the Court ordered Respondents to remove the conditions immediately and for the parties to file a status update within 24 hours. ECF No. 10. Respondents failed to file a timely update and did not remove the conditions until February 5. ECF No. 15.

Kaw B.H. v. Noem, et al., Case No. 26-CV-483 (NEB/SGE)

On January 27, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner within 24 hours and confirm release within two days of release. ECF No. 10. Respondents failed to file a timely update. ECF Nos. 12–13.

Ruth H.P. v. Noem, et al., Case No. 26-CV-529 (JWB/DJF)

On January 26, 2026, the Court granted Petitioner’s habeas petition in part and ordered Respondents to complete inspection under 8 U.S.C. § 1159(a) or release Petitioner within 5 days. ECF No. 9. On January 28, after receiving an update from Petitioner, the Court ordered Respondents to file a report addressing the status of screening under § 1159(a), specifying what actions remained in order to complete inspection, and stating whether Petitioner had been provided her medication and whether Petitioner’s medical or hygiene needs had been assessed or addressed. ECF No. 12. Respondents reported that Petitioner was released on January 28 without providing any of the required information. ECF No. 13.

Indriany S.M.C. v. Easterwood et al., Case No. 26-CV-539 (JWB/JFD)

On January 27, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner in Minnesota and confirm the time, date, and location of the release within 48 hours. ECF No. 8. Respondents’ status report failed to include the time of release. ECF No. 11.

Rudy P.A. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-563 (NEB/EMB)

On January 27, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner within 24 hours and confirm release within two days of release. ECF No. 11. Respondents failed to file an update until February 4, after the Court again ordered them to do so. ECF Nos. 13–14.

Franklin I.G.R. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-567 (DWF/DTS)

On January 27, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately and unconditionally release Petitioner and provide a status update within 3 days. ECF No. 8. Respondents failed to file an update until February 2, after the Court again ordered them to do so. ECF No. 10–11. Respondents also imposed conditions on Petitioner’s release despite being expressly prohibited from doing so and did not remove them until after the Court ordered them to do so. ECF Nos. 14–15.

Claudio E.A.S. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-583 (DWF/DLM)

On January 28, 2026, at 12:40 pm, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner in Minnesota and confirm release within 3 days. ECF No. 5. Respondents did not release Petitioner until 6:58 pm on January 30, ECF No. 8, and did not file an update until after the Court again ordered them to do so, ECF Nos. 7–8.

Luis I. A. v. Easterwood et al., Case No. 26-CV-585 (LMP/DTS)

On January 23, 2026, the Court enjoined Petitioner’s removal from Minnesota and ordered his immediate return to Minnesota if he had been removed. ECF No. 5. Respondents did not disclose it, but at the time the Court entered its order granting a bond hearing, on January 28 the ICE locator showed that Petitioner was in Texas. On January 28, the Court ordered Respondents to provide Petitioner a bond hearing, return Petitioner to Minnesota by February 2, and provide a status update no later than noon on February 3 confirming that Petitioner was in Minnesota. ECF No. 9. Respondents failed to file a status update. On February 3 at 12:52 pm, the Court ordered Respondents to file a status update by 11:59 pm that day. ECF No. 11. On February 5, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner was provided a bond hearing but did not disclose Petitioner’s location. ECF No. 12.

Amparo M.T.T. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-598 (JWB/SGE)

On January 28, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner in Minnesota and confirm the time, date, and location of release within 48 hours. ECF No. 9. Respondents’ update did not include the time of release. ECF No. 11.

Segundo A.P.G. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-603 (JWB/LIB)

On January 27, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner in Minnesota and confirm the time, date, and location of release within 48 hours. ECF No. 9. Respondents did not release Petitioner until February 2 at 10:00 pm, ECF No. 25, after repeatedly failing to file the status update and respond to the Court's order to show cause, ECF Nos. 11, 13.

Joel R. v. Bondi, Case No. 26-CV-605 (JMB/DJF)

On January 24, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from moving Petitioner out of Minnesota. ECF No. 4. On January 27, the Court ordered Respondents to unconditionally release Petitioner no later than 4:00 pm on January 28 and file a status update by 11:00 am on January 29. ECF No. 7. Respondents failed to file an update. On January 29, the Court ordered Respondents to file the update by 4:00 pm. ECF No. 9. Respondents notified the Court that they had moved Petitioner to Texas on January 24, where he remained in custody. ECF No. 10. On January 30, the Court ordered Respondents to confirm Petitioner's unconditional release and location of release by 11:00 am on February 2. ECF No. 11. Respondents failed to file the update. On February 3, the Court ordered Respondents to comply with the January 30 order by 11:00 am on February 4. ECF No. 12. On February 3, Respondents filed an update that Petitioner was released in Texas at an unspecified date and time, contrary to the Court's order that he be released in Minnesota. ECF No. 13.

Maximiliano D.T. v. Noem et al., Case No. 26-CV-0610 (PJS/JFD)

On January 29, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately return Petitioner to Minnesota and release him. ECF No. 4. On February 2, Petitioner's counsel notified the Court that Petitioner appeared to be in Minnesota but was still in custody. ECF No. 6. The Court scheduled a show-cause hearing. ECF No. 7. On February 5, Petitioner's counsel confirmed that the Petitioner had been released and the Court canceled the hearing. ECF Nos. 8-9.

Agustina R.E. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-612 (NEB/LIB)

On January 27, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner in Minnesota as soon as practicable with coordination or at least two hours' advance notice to counsel. ECF No. 9. Respondents timely released Petitioner but failed to coordinate with or notify counsel and imposed conditions on release,

despite the release order not providing for conditions. ECF No. 13. On February 6, in response to a briefing order, Respondents stated that they would either justify or withdraw the conditions within 72 hours. ECF No. 16. Respondents did not file anything else until February 19, after the Court again ordered them to do so. ECF Nos. 17–18.

Brandon P.S. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-626 (NEB/DLM)

On January 24, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately return Petitioner to Minnesota. ECF No. 4. On January 27, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner in Minnesota within 2 days. ECF No. 8. As of 1:24 am on January 30, Petitioner was still in custody in Texas. ECF No. 10. Respondents released Petitioner later that day, apparently in Minnesota, but subject to conditions despite the Court’s order not providing for conditional release. ECF No. 15.

Jordy Steven C. J. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-632 (LMP/LIB)

On January 28, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner and file a status update by 12:00 pm on January 30. ECF No. 7. Respondents failed to file the update until February 3, after the Court again ordered them to do so. ECF Nos. 9–10.

Luis C. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-636 (SRN/SGE)

On January 28, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner and return all of his papers and personal property. ECF No. 6. Petitioner did not receive his papers until February 9, after the Court again ordered their return. ECF Nos. 11, 14.

S.M. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-639 (JRT/DTS)

On February 1, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to unconditionally release Petitioner, with all of her personal effects, by 5:00 p.m. on February 2. ECF No. 18. Respondents timely released Petitioner, but subject to conditions and without her personal effects. ECF No. 20. On February 3, the Court ordered Respondents to remove Petitioner’s conditions of release immediately and ordered the parties to file an update within 48 hours. ECF No. 21. On February 5, after being ordered to remove the conditions, Respondents confirmed the removal but stated they were still attempting to locate Petitioner’s personal effects. ECF No. 23.

Juan V.A.C. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-645 (JWB/EMB)

On January 27, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner and, within 48 hours, confirm the time, date, and location of his release or anticipated release. ECF No. 7. Respondents failed to file the update. On January 30, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately file the update and file a letter by 3:00 pm showing cause why they should not be held in contempt. ECF No. 9. On February 1, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner was released on January 31, ECF No. 10, and never responded to the show-cause order.

Hilaria P.C. v. Noem, et al., Case No. 26-CV-687 (NEB/ECW)

On January 30, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner within 24 hours and file a notice within two days of release. ECF No. 7. Respondents failed to file the notice until February 6, after the Court again ordered them to do so. ECF Nos. 9, 11.

Pedro D. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-688 (KMM/ EMB)

On January 30, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner within 24 hours and with all of his personal effects that were seized during arrest, including but not limited to immigration paperwork. ECF No. 5. As of February 19, despite two follow-up orders, ECF Nos. 9, 11, Respondents have still not returned all of Petitioner's property, ECF No. 13. Respondents also failed to timely comply with the Court's February 13 order to file a declaration by February 19 that "describe[s] with specificity the efforts undertaken to return the property," instead offering a declaration that describes ICE procedures generally. ECF Nos. 11, 14.

Walter Rodrigo I. M. v. Noem et al., Case No. 26-CV-698 (LMP/ECW)

On January 27, 2026, the Court enjoined Petitioner's removal from Minnesota and ordered Respondents to answer the Petition by January 30. ECF No. 4. Respondents did not file a timely answer. On February 2, Petitioner notified the Court that Respondents had transferred him to Texas on January 28. ECF No. 6. Also on February 2, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner was currently in Minnesota. ECF No. 7. On February 3, Respondents informed the Court that its previous representation was untrue and that Petitioner was currently en route to Minnesota. ECF No. 9.

Yousef H. v. Noem et al., Case No. 26-CV-716 (LMP/DJF)

On January 30, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to provide a bond hearing or release Petitioner by February 6 and file a status update by February 9. ECF No. 6. Respondents did not file a status update until they were again ordered to do so. ECF Nos. 8–9.

Francisco Z. v. Bondi, Case No. 26-CV-722 (JMB/ECW)

On January 29, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to unconditionally release Petitioner in Minnesota by 4:00 pm. ECF No. 8. On January 30, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner was still in custody in Texas. ECF No. 10. On February 2, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner was released on the morning of January 31. ECF No. 12. Respondents released Petitioner with conditions, which were not rescinded until February 5. ECF No. 16.

Claudio A.A. v. Bondi, Case No. 26-CV-742 (KMM/LIB)

On February 18, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner in Minnesota by 5:00 pm on February 19. ECF No. 14. On February 19, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner was still in custody and was scheduled to be transported back to Minnesota on February 21. ECF No. 16.

Jose G.A.M. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-743 (DWF/DJF)

On January 30, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner without conditions and file an update by February 2. ECF No. 8. Respondents failed to release Petitioner until February 3, improperly imposed conditions on release, and twice failed to file a timely update. ECF Nos. 10, 12, 13. Respondents did not remove the conditions until they were ordered to do so. ECF Nos. 14–15.

Julio C. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-744 (JMB/DTS)

On January 29, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately and unconditionally release Petitioner by 4:00 pm on January 30 and either return Petitioner's property or state a legal basis for retention. ECF No. 7. On January 30, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner was detained in Texas and asked for additional time to comply with the release order. ECF No. 9. On February 2, Respondents informed the Court that Petitioner had been released on the evening of January 31 in Minnesota. ECF No. 11. Petitioner contends that he

was not released until around 6:00 pm on February 1 subject to conditions and without his identity documents. ECF No. 15. On February 3, the Court ordered Respondents to file a response to Petitioner's motion to show cause by February 9. ECF No. 16. Respondents failed to file a response and the motion remains pending.

Angel B. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-751 (JMB/SGE)

On January 30, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to unconditionally release Petitioner no later than 4:00 pm and affirm that Petitioner was released in accordance with the terms of the Order by 11:00 am on February 2. ECF No. 5. On January 31, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner was flown back to Minnesota and released on January 31 at 1:34 am, but did not confirm that Petitioner was released without conditions. ECF No. 8. Respondents did not remove the conditions until February 10. ECF No. 16.

Hassan H. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-770 (JWB/DJF)

On February 2, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner and confirm the time, date, and location of release within 48 hours. ECF No. 8. Respondents failed to file the update. On February 5, the Court ordered Respondents to provide an update immediately. ECF No. 10. Respondent notified the Court that Petitioner was released on February 2, but did not include the time or location of release. ECF No. 11. On February 6, the Court ordered Respondents to confirm the time and location of release. ECF No. 12. Respondents timely filed a notice of release with the time, date, and location, but the notice named a different petitioner in the caption. ECF Nos. 13–14. On February 10, the Court ordered Respondents to file a supplemental update by February 13. ECF No. 14. Respondents failed to file the supplemental update.

Karla R.C. v. Olson, et al., Case No. 26-CV-773 (JWB/DLM)

On January 30, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner and confirm the time, date, and location of release within 48 hours. ECF No. 9. Respondents failed to file the update. On February 4, the Court ordered Respondents to comply immediately. ECF No. 11. On February 5, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner was released in Minnesota on January 31, but did not include the time of release. ECF No. 12.

Christian C.C. v. Noem, et al., Case No. 26-CV-793 (NEB/DLM)

On January 31, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner in Minnesota within 24 hours and notify the Court within 48 hours of release. ECF No. 7. Respondents failed to file the update. On February 4, Petitioner's counsel notified the Court that Petitioner was still in custody and his location was unknown. ECF No. 9. The Court ordered Respondents to update the Court immediately. ECF No. 10. Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner would be returned to Minnesota on February 5 for release. ECF No. 11.

Roberto N. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-799 (JRT/DTS)

On February 1, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner within 48 hours and the parties to file a status report by 5:00 pm on February 4. ECF No. 7. Respondents did not release Petitioner until February 4 and no party filed a status report until the Court again ordered them to do so. ECF Nos. 8–10.

Diego V.M. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-814 (NEB/JFD)

On February 1, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner in Minnesota within 24 hours, to coordinate with or give notice to Petitioner's counsel, and to return Petitioner's personal effects. ECF No. 8. Petitioner was not released until February 4 at around 4 am, and Respondents failed to coordinate with Petitioner's counsel and withheld Petitioner's car keys, cell phone, and wallet. ECF No. 10.

Katheryn S.A.C. v. Noem et al., Case No. 26-CV-815 (JWB/JFD)

On February 3, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner in Minnesota, return all Petitioner's personal property, and confirm the time, date, and location of release within 48 hours. ECF No. 9. Respondents failed to timely file the status update. On February 6, Petitioner notified the Court that she had been released on February 5, but without all of her personal property. ECF No. 11. The Court ordered respondents to confirm the return of the property or provide a status update by February 9. ECF No. 13. On February 9, Respondent reported that the property had not yet been returned. ECF No. 14. On February 12, Respondents reported that Petitioner's property had been located with the exception of Petitioner's state identification card, Social Security card, and employment authorization card, and that counsel had instructed Respondents to keep searching. ECF No. 17. The Court ordered Respondents to

file a letter providing a status update by February 19. ECF No. 18. Respondents did not file the update.

Ricardo I.S.S. v. Noem, et al., Case No. 26-CV-816 (JWB/SGE)

On February 2, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner in Minnesota and confirm the time, date, and location of release within 48 hours. ECF No. 7. Respondents did not file a status update. On February 5, the Court ordered Respondents to file the update immediately. ECF No. 9. Respondents reported that Petitioner was released “last night, February 4,” in Minnesota, but did not report the time of release. ECF No. 11.

Guadalupe O.G. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-820 (KMM/DLM)

On February 4, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately and unconditionally release Petitioner in Minnesota, with all his personal effects, and to confirm release by 5:00 pm on February 5. ECF No. 9. Respondents did not file an update until the Court again ordered them to do so. ECF Nos. 11, 13. On February 13, Petitioner notified the Court that Respondents had released him subject to conditions. ECF No. 14. Respondents did not remove the conditions until after the Court ordered them to do so. ECF Nos. 20–21.

Angel O. v. Noem, et al., Case No. 26-CV-822 (JMB/DJF)

On February 2, 2026, the Court ordered that Petitioner be released on or before 4:00 pm on February 3. ECF No. 6. Respondents did not release Petitioner until 8:02 pm on February 3. ECF No. 8.

Segundo G.U.O. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-830 (DWF/LIB)

On February 2, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately and unconditionally release Petitioner and file an update affirming release within 3 days. ECF No. 8. Respondents did not file the update until the Court again ordered them to do so. ECF Nos. 10–11. On February 6, Petitioner notified the Court that Respondents had released him subject to conditions. ECF No. 12. Respondents did not remove the conditions until being ordered to do so. ECF Nos. 13–14.

Rosemary N.A. v. Easterwood et al., Case No. 26-CV-832 (JRT/JFD)

On February 5, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner within 48 hours and required the parties to file a status update by 5:00 pm on February 8. ECF No. 9. The parties did not timely file an update and Respondents did not release Petitioner until February 10 at 10:26 pm, after Petitioner filed a notice that she was still in custody as of that morning. ECF Nos. 11, 15. Further, Respondents failed to notify the Court of Petitioner's release until February 19, despite the Court giving a second deadline of February 12. ECF Nos. 12, 15.

Francisco R.C. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-833 (DWF/JFD)

On February 2, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner and file an update within 3 days. ECF No. 6. Respondents failed to file an update. After issuing a second deadline that Respondents failed to meet, ECF No. 8, the Court issued an order to show cause on February 9, ECF No. 9, and Respondents filed the update on February 10, ECF No. 10.

Domingo L.T. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-835 (JWB/DLM)

On February 2, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner immediately and file an update within 48 hours. ECF No. 8. Respondents failed to file the update and did not release Petitioner until February 5, after the Court again ordered them to file an update and a letter showing cause why they should not be held in contempt. ECF Nos. 10, 12. Respondents filed a late update, ECF No. 10, but never responded to the show-cause order.

Emilio P. v. Bondi, Case No. 26-CV-850 (JMB/SGE)

On January 30, 2026, at 10:51 am, the Court enjoined Respondents from removing Petitioner from Minnesota and, if he had already been removed, ordered his return by February 2. ECF No. 3. On February 2, at 11:30 am, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner in Minnesota by 4:00 pm on February 3. ECF No. 5. Petitioner's counsel notified the Court that on February 2, the ICE locator placed Petitioner in custody in Texas, but Respondents transported Petitioner to Mexico that day. ECF Nos. 8, 13. Petitioner's motion for contempt remains pending.

Juan Gabriel M.A. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-852 (NEB/DTS)

On February 7, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately transfer Petitioner to Minnesota, release Petitioner within 24 hours, and notify the Court within three days of release. ECF No. 12. Respondents failed to file the notification until February 17. ECF No. 15.

Gabriel A.H.L. v. Noem et al., Case No. 26-CV-860 (JRT/EMB)

On February 6, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to unconditionally release Petitioner within 48 hours and with all of his personal effects. ECF No. 6. Petitioner was not released until February 9 at approximately 2:30 pm. ECF No. 8. Petitioner's counsel has not yet been able to determine if Petitioner was released with his possessions and documentation and without conditions. ECF No. 7.

Mervis E.A.M. v. Bondi, Case No. 26-CV-00861 (JRT/DTS)

On February 6, 2026, the Court ordered that Petitioner be released within 48 hours and that the parties file a status update by 5:00 pm on February 9, 2026. ECF No. 8. The Court did not receive a status report by the deadline. On February 11, the Court ordered the parties to file an update by 5:00 pm on February 13. ECF No. 9. On February 12, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner was released at 6:16 pm on February 11. ECF No. 10.

Daniel Felipe C. C. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-863 (LMP/SGE)

On February 5, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to return Petitioner to Minnesota, immediately release him, and file a status update by 3:00 pm on February 11. ECF No. 8. Respondents failed to file a status report. On February 13, the Court ordered Respondents to comply. ECF No. 10. Respondents then notified the Court that Petitioner was released on February 9. ECF No. 11.

Gabriel J. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-865 (SRN/LIB)

On February 4, 2026, the Court ordered Respondent to confirm Petitioner's release within 48 hours. ECF No. 7. Respondents failed to do so. On February 11, the Court ordered Respondents to show cause why they should not be held in contempt. ECF No. 8. Respondent's counsel then notified the Court that

Petitioner was released on February 5 and acknowledged the failure to comply with the deadline. ECF No. 9.

Antonia D.L.A.C.R. v. Easterwood, et al., Case No. 26-CV-873 (JWB/JFD);

A.L.D.A.T.C. v. Easterwood, et al., Case No. 26-CV-875 (JWB/JFD)

On January 30, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from transferring Petitioners out of Minnesota and, if they had been transferred, ordered their immediate return. No. 26-CV-873, ECF No. 6; No. 26-CV-875, ECF No. 6. Respondents transferred Petitioners to Texas that same day, claiming that the agency did not know of the injunction. No. 26-CV-875, ECF No. 11. On February 3, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioners and confirm the time, date, and location of release within 48 hours. No. 26-CV-873, ECF No. 11; No. 26-CV-875, ECF No. 12. Respondents' update did not include the time of release. No. 26-CV-875, ECF No. 14.

Junior O.P.V. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-890 (JWB/JFD)

On February 3, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner without an order of recognizance or similar instrument. ECF No. 9. Respondents released Petitioner on an order of recognizance. ECF No. 11. Respondents did not remove the conditions until the Court issued an order to show cause. ECF Nos. 12–13.

Jose M.L.H. v. Easterwood, et al., Case No. 26-CV-893 (JWB/DLM)

On February 2, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner and confirm the time, date, and location of release. ECF No. 9. Respondents' update did not confirm the time. ECF No. 11.

Rafael A.P.A. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-906 (JRT/ECW)

At 1:59 pm on February 6, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner within 48 hours. ECF No. 6. Respondents did not release Petitioner until 9:16 pm on February 8. ECF No. 7.

Luis A.Z.H. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-915 (JRT/LIB)

At 2:35 pm on February 4, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner in Minnesota within 48 hours and provide him with his prescription

medications. ECF No. 6. On February 7, Petitioner was still in custody and not yet in Minnesota. ECF No. 7. Also on February 7, Petitioner's counsel emailed the Court that ICE agents failed to confirm that Petitioner was given his medications and failed to respond to multiple messages. Petitioner was not released until February 9. ECF Nos. 9, 10.

Juan Carlos G.A. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-941 (LMP/SGE)

On February 3, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner no later than 5:00 pm on February 5. ECF No. 6. Respondents released Petitioner after the deadline and subject to conditions, asserting that Petitioner had a prior removal order which justified conditions of release. ECF Nos. 8, 10. During briefing on the petition, Respondents never raised Petitioner's removal order. ECF No. 4. Accordingly, the Court struck the conditions of release. ECF No. 15.

Fredy S. v. Bondi, Case No. 26-CV-961 (ECT/DTS)

On February 5, 2026, at 5:00 p.m., the Court ordered that, if Petitioner was in Minnesota, Respondents must release him within 48 hours. ECF No. 7. Although Petitioner was in Minnesota, Respondents did not release Petitioner until 7:30 am on February 8, after the Court issued an order to show cause. ECF Nos. 9-12.

Jonathan A.L.L. v. Lyons, et al., Case No. 26-CV-968 (JWB/DJF)

On February 6, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to immediately release Petitioner and confirm the time, date, and location of release within 48 hours. ECF No. 6. Respondents did not release Petitioner until February 10 and failed to file a timely update. ECF No. 11.

Wilmer M.A. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-975 (NEB/EMB)

On February 6, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner within 24 hours. ECF No. 7. Respondents did not release Petitioner until February 9. ECF No. 11.

George A. v. Easterwood, et al., Case No. 26-CV-983 (JMB/ECW)

On February 6, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner by 4:00 pm on February 7 and file an update and declaration by 11:00 am on February 9 providing details about the release. ECF No. 7. Respondents did not release

Petitioner until February 9 and their update was not timely and did not include the declaration. ECF No. 9. The Court ordered Respondents to file the required documentation by 11:00 am on February 11. ECF No. 10. After respondents failed to comply, the Court ordered compliance by 4:00 pm on February 12. ECF No. 11. Respondents' filing named a different Petitioner, with a different date of release, and did not include the required declaration. ECF No. 12.

Alfredo A., et al. v. Easterwood, et al., Case No. 26-CV-1016 (PJS/DLM)

At 10:51 am on February 6, 2026, the Court ordered emergency, immediate release of Petitioner due to his son's critical medical emergency. ECF No. 7. Beginning at 10:00 am, the assigned Judge personally contacted Minnesota's United States Attorney, Daniel Rosen, the U.S. Marshal, and Respondents' counsel to ensure timely release. Despite being detained locally, in Sherburne County, Petitioner had not been released as of 5:41 pm. Just before 7:00 pm, Petitioner's counsel filed a motion for contempt. ECF No. 8. After this filing, Petitioner's counsel "received word that Petitioner would be released." ECF No. 11. Petitioner's release "occurred around 8:20 pm" on February 6, more than 9 hours after his emergency immediate release was ordered by the Court. *Id.*

Brayan A.L. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-1019 (JRT/SGE)

On February 6, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to unconditionally release Petitioner within 48 hours and coordinate the release with Petitioner's counsel, and ordered the parties to provide an update by 5:00 pm on February 9. ECF No. 7. Respondents did not release Petitioner until 2:00 am on February 10, in freezing temperatures and apparently without coordinating with counsel, and subject to conditions. ECF No. 9. Respondents also failed to file a timely update. ECF No. 8.

Haidee C.C. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-1022 (JWB/DJF)

On February 6, 2026 at 3:15 pm, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner immediately and confirm the time, date, and location of release within 48 hours. ECF No. 8. Respondents did not release Petitioner until more than 24 hours later and did not file the update until after the Court issued another order on February 9. ECF Nos. 10–11. The update did not include the time of release. ECF No. 11.

Ibrahime D. v. Bondi, et al., 26-CV-1046 (KMM/SGE)

On February 8, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner in Minnesota within 24 hours, with all of his personal effects, and notify the Court within 24 hours of release or notify the Court as to when Petitioner would be released. ECF No. 6. Respondents did not release Petitioner until February 10 and did not notify the Court within 24 hours of release. ECF No. 9. Petitioner alleges that Respondents damaged his documents and there is a pending order to show cause. ECF Nos. 11–13.

Jorge P.M. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-1065 (PJS/EMB)

At 8:53 am on February 5, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from transferring Petitioner out of Minnesota and ordered his immediate return if he had already been transferred. ECF No. 3. That evening, Petitioner’s counsel notified the Court that Petitioner had been transferred to Texas. ECF No. 4.

Jonathan P.Y.G. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-1100 (JRT/ECW)

On February 6, 2026, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner within 48 hours and to coordinate with counsel to ensure that Petitioner was not left outside in the cold. ECF No. 6. Respondents did not release Petitioner until February 9 and, contrary to their representations that they would release Petitioner to his counsel, they left Petitioner outside in the cold. ECF No. 7.

Jorge H.C.F. v. Bondi et al., Case No. 26-CV-1111 (DWF/SGE)

On February 6, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from moving Petitioner out of Minnesota and ordered them to immediately return Petitioner if Petitioner was transferred. ECF No. 3. Respondents failed to return Petitioner to Minnesota, instead transferring Petitioner from one facility in Texas to another. ECF No. 4.

Bryan Israel P. R. v. Noem et al., Case No. 26-CV-1213 (LMP/SGE)

On February 8, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from moving Petitioner out of Minnesota and ordered Petitioner’s immediate return if he had been moved. ECF No. 4. Petitioner was moved to Texas after entry of the order and was still there on February 11. ECF No. 6. On February 11, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner and file a status report confirming compliance and identifying the individuals responsible for transporting Petitioner to Texas

and failing to promptly return him. ECF No. 8. Respondents confirmed the time, date, and location of release, but did not provide further information. ECF No. 11.

Erika Vanesa L.-V. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-1219 (NEB/DTS)

On February 8, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from moving Petitioner out of Minnesota and ordered immediate return if Petitioner was transferred. ECF No. 3. By February 9, Petitioner was in Texas. ECF No. 5. On February 10, Respondents informed the Court that Petitioner was scheduled to return that day, ECF No. 6, and the Court ordered Respondents to immediately transfer Petitioner to Minnesota and release her within 24 hours, ECF No. 9. Respondent then informed the Court that Petitioner was scheduled to return to Minnesota on February 12. ECF No. 11. Petitioner was not released until approximately 5:30 pm on February 12 and reported that Respondents did not provide her any food that day. ECF Nos. 12–13.

Jose Antonia H.S. v. Bondi, et al., Case No. 26-CV-1253 (NEB/DTS)

On February 9, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from moving Petitioner out of Minnesota and ordered immediate return if Petitioner was transferred. ECF No. 3. On February 12, Petitioner's counsel alleged that, on February 11, Petitioner called his partner and said he had just been moved to a facility in Texas. ECF No. 8. The Court ordered Respondents to respond to Petitioner's motion for an order to show cause by February 17. ECF No. 10. The Court also separately ordered Respondents to release Petitioner by February 15 and confirm Petitioner's release within 4 days. ECF No. 11. As of February 21, Respondents had neither responded to Petitioner's motion nor confirmed Petitioner's release.

Lucio C.A. v. Noem, Case No. 26-CV-1441 (KMM/EMB)

On February 15, 2026, the Court enjoined Respondents from transferring Petitioner out of Minnesota and required his immediate return if he had been transferred. ECF No. 4. On February 18, the Court ordered Respondents to release Petitioner by 5:00 pm on February 19. ECF No. 5. At 10:08 pm on February 19, Respondents notified the Court that Petitioner was still in custody, had not yet been returned to Minnesota, and was scheduled to be transferred to Minnesota on February 21. ECF No. 8.