

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

JUAN T.R.,

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

Petitioner,

v.

ORDER

KRISTI NOEM, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY; TODD LYONS, Acting Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and DAVID EASTERWOOD, Acting Director, St. Paul Field Office, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement,

Respondents.

Graham Blair Ojala-Barbour, OJALA-BARBOUR LAW FIRM, for petitioner.

Ana H. Voss, UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, for 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. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2243 (requiring judges to either “forthwith award the writ” or order the respondent to show cause, within three days, why the writ should not be granted).

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

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 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 have now filed such a stipulation (ECF No. 9), and thus, as promised, the Court will cancel the hearing, and Lyons will not be required to appear.

That does not end the Court’s concerns, however. Attached to this order is an appendix that identifies 96 court orders that ICE has violated in 74 cases. The extent of ICE’s noncompliance is almost certainly substantially understated. This list is confined to orders issued since January 1, 2026, and the list was hurriedly compiled by extraordinarily busy judges. Undoubtedly, mistakes were made, and orders that should have appeared on this list were omitted.

This list should give pause to anyone—no matter his or her political beliefs—who cares about the rule of law. ICE has likely violated more court orders in

January 2026 than some federal agencies have violated in their entire existence. The Court warns ICE that future noncompliance with court orders may result in future show-cause orders requiring the personal appearances of Lyons or other government officials. ICE is not a law unto itself. ICE has every right to challenge the orders of this Court, but, like any litigant, ICE must follow those orders unless and until they are overturned or vacated.

Juan asks that the Court schedule a hearing at which he may present evidence and argument concerning the hardships that he has suffered as a result of respondents' failure to abide by the January 14 order. *See In re Tetracycline Cases*, 927 F.2d 411, 413 (8th Cir. 1991) ("Civil contempt sanctions may be imposed for either or both of two distinct purposes, to coerce compliance with a court order, and to compensate the complainant for actual losses sustained by him as a result of the defendants' contumacy." (quoting *In re Chase & Sanborn Corp.*, 872 F.2d 397, 400–01 (11th Cir.1989))). The Court will not schedule a hearing at this time. If Juan wants to seek monetary sanctions, he may file a properly supported motion to that effect.

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, and on all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the hearing currently scheduled for Friday, January 30, 2026, at 1:00 pm in Courtroom 15 (MPLS) is CANCELED.

Dated: January 28, 2026

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