UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

E.A.P.C., Petitioner, v. MINGA WOFFORD, *et al.*, Respondents.	No. 1:25-cv-01546 JLT CDB (HC) ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND GRANTING IN PART PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (Doc. 19)

E.A.P.C. is federal detainee proceeding by counsel, who initiated this action by filing a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and motion for temporary restraining order on November 12, 2025, while in the custody of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement at the Mesa Verde ICE Processing Center in Bakersfield, California. (Doc. 1.) This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302(c)(17).

On November 25, 2025, the Court converted the TRO to a preliminary injunction, granted the preliminary injunction in part and referred the matter to the assigned magistrate judge for findings and recommendations on the merits of the petition. (Doc. 12 at 21.) Respondents were permitted to file a further brief on the merits of the habeas petition within 45 days of the order, or alternatively, to file within 30 days a notice that it does not intend to file further briefing. (*Id.*) On December 18, 2025, the government filed a notice indicating that it does not intend to file

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

further briefing in this matter and thereby stands on its arguments made in connection with its opposition to Petitioner's motion to the merits of the habeas petition. (Doc. 18.)

On January 6, 2026, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations to grant in part Petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus only as to Petitioner's first cause of action seeking relief for violation of his procedural due process rights. (Doc. 19.) The Court served the findings and recommendations on the parties and informed them that any objections were to be filed within 14 days. (*Id.* at 17.) On January 21, 2026, Respondents timely filed objections. (Doc. 20.)

In their objections, Respondents incorporate by reference their previously stated position that Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) but acknowledge that the Court and the assigned magistrate judge's findings and recommendations both disagree with this position. *Id.* at 1-2. Respondents do not raise any new argument in its objections. (*Id.*)

According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court concludes that the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis. Thus, the Court ORDERS:

1. The findings and recommendations issued on January 6, 2026 (Doc. 19) are **ADOPTED** in full.
2. Petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus (Doc. 1) is **GRANTED IN PART** only as to Petitioner's first cause of action for violation of his procedural due process rights.
3. The Clerk of the Court is **DIRECTED** to close this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **January 29, 2026**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE