

1 STACY TOLCHIN (SBN 217431)
2 *stacy@tolchinimmigration.com*
3 LAW OFFICES OF STACY TOLCHIN
4 776 E. Green St., Suite 210
Pasadena, CA 91101
Telephone: (213) 622-7450
Facsimile: (213) 622-7233

5 MOHAMMAD TAJ SAR (SBN 280152)

6 *mtajsar@aclusocal.org*

7 MAYRA JOACHIN (SBN 306065)

8 *mjoachin@aclusocal.org*

9 EVA BITRÁN (SBN 302081)

10 *ebitran@aclusocal.org*

11 DAE KEUN KWON (SBN 313155)

12 *akwon@aclusocal.org*

13 OLIVER MA (SBN 354266)

14 *oma@aclusocal.org*

15 STEPHANIE PADILLA (SBN 321568)

16 *spadilla@aclusocal.org*

17 DIANA SÁNCHEZ (SBN 338871)

18 *dianasanchez@aclusocal.org*

19 ACLU FOUNDATION OF

20 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

21 1313 West Eighth Street

22 Los Angeles, CA 90017-4022

23 Telephone: (213) 977-5232

24 Facsimile: (213) 201-7878

25 *Counsel for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs*
26 *(additional counsel information on cont. page)*

MARK ROSENBAUM (SBN 59940)

mrosenbaum@publiccounsel.org

REBECCA BROWN (SBN 345805)

rbrown@publiccounsel.org

SOPHIA WRENCH (SBN 354416)

swrench@publiccounsel.org

RITU MAHAJAN (SBN 252970)

rmahajan@publiccounsel.org

GINA AMATO (SBN 215519)

gamato@publiccounsel.org

PUBLIC COUNSEL

610 South Ardmore Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90005

Telephone: (213) 385-2977

Counsel for All Plaintiffs

17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

18 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

19 Pedro VASQUEZ PERDOMO; Carlos
20 Alexander OSORTO; and Isaac VILLEGAS
21 MOLINA; Jorge HERNANDEZ
22 VIRAMONTES; Jason Brian GAVIDIA; LOS
23 ANGELES WORKER CENTER NETWORK;
24 UNITED FARM WORKERS; COALITION
25 FOR HUMANE IMMIGRANT RIGHTS;
26 IMMIGRANT DEFENDERS LAW CENTER,

27 Plaintiffs,

28 v.

Kristi NOEM, in her official capacity as
Secretary, Department of Homeland Security;
Todd M. LYONS, in his official capacity as
Acting Director, U.S. Immigration and Customs
Enforcement; Rodney S. SCOTT, in his official

Case No.: 2:25-cv-05605-MEMF-SP

**PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT
OF APPLICATION FOR
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING
ORDER**

Hon. Maame Ewusi-Mensah Frimpong

1 capacity as Commissioner, U.S. Customs and
2 Border Patrol; Michael W. BANKS, in his
3 official capacity as Chief of U.S. Border Patrol;
4 Kash PATEL, in his official capacity as Director,
5 Federal Bureau of Investigation; Pam BONDI, in
6 her official capacity as U.S. Attorney General;
7 Ernesto SANTACRUZ JR., in his official
8 capacity as Acting Field Office Director for Los
9 Angeles, U.S. Immigration and Customs
10 Enforcement; Eddy WANG, Special Agent in
11 Charge for Los Angeles, Homeland Security
12 Investigations, U.S. Immigration and Customs
13 Enforcement; Gregory K. BOVINO, in his
14 official capacity as Chief Patrol Agent for El
15 Centro Sector of the U.S. Border Patrol; Jeffrey
16 D. STALNAKER, in his official capacity as
17 Acting Chief Patrol Agent, San Diego Sector of
18 the U.S. Border Patrol; Akil DAVIS, in his
19 official capacity as Assistant Director in Charge,
20 Los Angeles Office, Federal Bureau of
21 Investigation; Bilal A. ESSAYLI, in his official
22 capacity as U.S. Attorney for the Central District
23 of California,

24
25
26
27
28
Defendants.

1 ANNE LAI (SBN 295394)
2 *alai@law.uci.edu*
3 UC IRVINE SCHOOL OF LAW
4 IMMIGRANT AND RACIAL JUSTICE
5 SOLIDARITY CLINIC
6 P.O. Box 5479
7 Irvine, CA 92616-5479
8 Telephone: (949) 824-9894
9 Facsimile: (949) 824-2747

10 *Counsel for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs*

11 LAUREN MICHEL WILFONG**
12 *lwilfong@ndlon.org*
13 NATIONAL DAY LABORER ORGANIZING
14 NETWORK
15 1030 S. Arroyo Parkway, Suite 106
16 Pasadena, CA 91105
17 Telephone: (626) 214-5689

18 *Counsel for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs*

19 BREE BERNWANGER (SBN 331731)
20 *bbernwanger@aclunc.org*
21 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
22 FOUNDATION OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
23 39 Drumm Street
24 San Francisco, CA 94111
25 Telephone: (415) 621-2493

26 *Counsel for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs*

27 BRISA VELAZQUEZ OATIS
28 (SBN 339132)
bvoatis@aclu-sdic.org
ACLU FOUNDATION OF
SAN DIEGO & IMPERIAL COUNTIES
P.O. Box 87131
San Diego, CA 92138-7131
Telephone: (619) 398-4199

Counsel for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs

EDGAR AGUILASOCHO
(SBN 285567)
eaguilasocho@farmworkerlaw.com
MARTÍNEZ AGUILASOCHO LAW, INC.
900 Truxtun Ave Suite 300
Bakersfield, CA 93301
Telephone: (661) 859-1174

Counsel for Plaintiff United Farm Workers

CARL BERGQUIST*
cbergquist@chirla.org
COALITION FOR HUMANE IMMIGRANT
RIGHTS
2351 Hempstead Road
Ottawa Hills, OH 43606
Telephone: (310) 279-6025

*Counsel for Plaintiff Coalition for Humane
Immigrant Rights*

* Pro hac vice application granted
** Pro hac vice application forthcoming

1 In their Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Application for a Temporary Restraining Order, Dkt. No. 71
2 (“Opp.”), Defendants spend a great number of pages trying to persuade the Court not to reach the merits.
3 Each of Defendants’ erected roadblocks is unavailing. Defendants first complain of unfair surprise, but
4 they had more than 24 hours’ notice and five days to respond to Plaintiffs’ application. Defendants
5 misconstrue the law on standing and ignore the evidence establishing Plaintiffs’ standing under the
6 relevant case law. And Defendants say an injunction is unavailable, but an injunction is the appropriate
7 remedy when, as here, the evidence indicates a policy and practice of flouting the Fourth Amendment.

8 On the merits, Defendants make no serious effort to disprove the existence of their unlawful
9 policy and practice, which is shown by Plaintiffs’ “vast” record, Opp. at 7, and by statements from top
10 federal officials. The limited factual evidence Defendants did submit addresses enforcement activity that
11 Plaintiffs do not challenge in this action or *admits* that Defendants are relying on factors that the Ninth
12 Circuit has held cannot constitute reasonable suspicion.

13 Plaintiffs seek tailored and temporary relief. Their proposed TRO serves the public interest by
14 ensuring that any of Defendants’ immigration enforcement activities in the District adhere to the law.
15 The requested TRO is tailored to provide relief *to Plaintiffs*. To avert further irreparable harm, Plaintiffs
16 respectfully request the Court grant a TRO until such time that a hearing on a preliminary injunction can
17 be held.

18 **ARGUMENT**

19 **I. Plaintiffs Have Met the Standard for Proceeding *Ex Parte*.**

20 Plaintiffs did not create the emergency, and sought court intervention as soon as they reasonably
21 could investigate the facts and file suit.¹ Defendants’ unlawful immigration raids are ongoing and
22 Plaintiffs and their members are subject to that unlawful conduct with each day that passes.²

23
24
25 ¹ Plaintiffs had difficulty accessing individuals detained, including at B-18, and some people are “scared
26 to speak in public settings about their experiences for fear of backlash, retaliation, or abuse by
immigration authorities.” Dkt. 45-8, ¶ 26; Dkt. 38-9, ¶¶ 12–17, 33, 36; *see also* TRO App. at 23.

27 ² This case presents an even stronger case for emergency relief than *United Farm Workers v. Noem*,
28 which focused on an initial “nearly weeklong” operation. 2025 WL 1235525, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 29,
2025). Here, the conduct is continuing.

1 Plaintiffs complied with the rules for notice of their ex parte application and did not delay or
2 proceed “in secret.” *Contra* Opp. at 6–8. Plaintiffs gave Defendants notice more than a day before their
3 TRO application was filed. TRO App. at i. The Court then granted Defendants five days to respond,
4 much longer than the standard 24 hours. Dkt. 42. And Defendants had the very same access to public
5 reporting that Plaintiffs did, and even greater access to witnesses and government records. Any relief
6 ordered would last only until a preliminary injunction hearing can be held. Defendants will have an
7 opportunity to further develop a record, or can move to dissolve the TRO if appropriate. *See All. for*
8 *Wild Rockies v. Higgins*, 690 F. Supp. 3d 1177, 1186 (D. Idaho 2023); *see also* F. R. Civ. Pro 65(b)(4).³

9 Plaintiffs’ *ex parte* request was properly submitted, satisfies *Mission Power*, and is supported by
10 other cases where courts have issued TRO relief. *See, e.g., Black Lives Matter Seattle-King Cnty. v. City*
11 *of Seattle, Seattle Police Dep’t*, 466 F. Supp. 3d 1206, 1211 (W.D. Wash. 2020).

12 **II. Plaintiffs’ Standing is Clear from the Record.**

13 Defendants argue—without authority—that courts are reluctant to find associational standing in
14 the Fourth Amendment context. Opp. at 12-13. But there is nothing unusual about organizational
15 plaintiffs asserting Fourth Amendment claims on behalf of their members. *See, e.g., Coal. on*
16 *Homelessness v. City & Cnty. of San Francisco*, 758 F. Supp. 3d 1102, 1125 (N.D. Cal. 2024); *Garcia v.*
17 *City of Los Angeles*, 2020 WL 6586303, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2020); *see also Am. Fed’n of State,*
18 *Cty. & Mun. Emps. Council 79 v. Scott*, 717 F.3d 851, 861 n.1 (11th Cir. 2013). It is well-established
19 that “[a]n association may have standing . . . as the representative of its members” when the three-part
20 test established by *Hunt v. Washington State Apple Advert. Comm’n*, 432 U.S. 333, 343 (1977) has been
21 met. The organizational Plaintiffs have met that test here.

22 Defendants contend that the organizational Plaintiffs have not identified any members who have
23 suffered an injury, Opp. at 13, but they do not engage with the record establishing that Plaintiffs’
24 members have been directly harmed by the raids and/or are likely to be subject to Defendants’ unlawful
25 policy and practice in the future. *See, e.g.,* Dkt. 45-10, ¶¶ 3–9 (member of CLEAN, one of LAWCN’s

26
27 ³ In passing, Defendants suggest that Plaintiffs seek a mandatory injunction. Opp. at 5–6. But nowhere
28 do Defendants explain why Plaintiffs’ requested TRO, which asks that Defendants *refrain* from doing
something, should be treated as a mandatory injunction. It is not.

1 worker centers, was stopped without reasonable suspicion); Dkt. 45-13, ¶¶ 13–18 (discussing CLEAN
2 members impacted); Dkt. 45-8, ¶¶ 27–29 (UFW member, a U.S. citizen, subjected to suspicionless stop
3 by Border Patrol); *see also* Dkt. 38-9, ¶ 26 (CHIRLA member impacted). Not only have Plaintiffs’
4 members already experienced harm, but many are missing work and unable to conduct daily activities
5 because they fear being unlawfully stopped. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 38-9, ¶¶ 24–30; Dkt. 45-8, ¶¶ 30–32; Dkt.
6 45-13, ¶¶ 13, 17–18. This establishes standing. *See LaDuke v. Nelson*, 762 F.2d 1318, 1324–26 (9th Cir.
7 1985), *amended*, 796 F.2d 309 (9th Cir. 1986) (discussing and distinguishing *City of Los Angeles v.*
8 *Lyons*, 461 U.S. 95 (1983)).⁴ Further, the organizational Plaintiffs are membership-based groups that
9 focus on immigrant and immigrant workers’ rights as a core part of their missions and work. *See* Dkt.
10 45-12, ¶¶ 5–12 (LAWCN); Dkt. 45-8, ¶¶ 11–14 (UFW); Dkt. 38-9, ¶¶ 1–11 (CHIRLA); *Cf.* Opp. at 13
11 (mischaracterizing them as “legal services organizations”). The interests they seek to protect are clearly
12 pertinent to their missions. *Presidio Golf Club v. Nat’l Park Serv.*, 155 F.3d 1153, 1159 (9th Cir. 1998).

13 **III. Plaintiffs Are Likely to Succeed on the Merits of Their Fourth Amendment Claim.**

14 **A. Defendants do not dispute a policy and practice of non-targeted detentive stops.**

15 In addressing the merits of Plaintiffs’ claim, Defendants do not refute with any specificity the
16 record evidence demonstrating a policy and practice of unjustified detentive stops across the District.
17 Plaintiffs’ declarations from 17 percipient witnesses describing more than two dozen stops and citations
18 to extensive public reporting of Defendants’ actions make clear that officers are agents are engaged in
19 such conduct. Defendants do not contest any of the facts in any of the declarations. Nor do Defendants
20 contest any of the dozens of news reports and video posts documenting such stops.

21 The two declarations that Defendants did submit with their opposition simply claim, generally,
22 that ICE and CBP receive Fourth Amendment training and engage in targeted operations. Dkt. 71-1 ¶¶ 6,
23 9; Dkt. 71-2 ¶¶ 10-11. But Plaintiffs are not challenging enforcement activity where Defendants have
24 prior information about an individual targeted or where an individual is subject to an administrative
25 warrant. Plaintiffs challenge Defendants’ “collateral” encounters and “roving patrol” operations where

26
27 ⁴ Plaintiffs are not seeking a TRO on behalf of non-parties, nor are they asking for provisional
28 certification of a class as part of this motion. Defendants’ argument that the named Plaintiffs lack
standing to seek relief for others, *see* Opp. at 13–14, is therefore beside the point.

1 agents and officers are deciding whom to stop based on race, language, location where they happen to
2 be, and/or the type of work a person does.⁵

3 Defendants do not—and cannot—contest that federal officials recently imposed a quota of 3,000
4 arrests daily and that, to meet that quota, officials directed personnel to limit reliance on target lists and
5 instead go see who they could round up at “Home Depot” and “7-Eleven” stores. TRO App. at 5, 13–14.
6 Defendants’ actions on the ground are the predictable (indeed intended) result of those official edicts.

7 And finally, while Defendants claim that contact made in non-targeted encounters is
8 “consensual,” Dkt. 71-1 ¶¶ 6, 9; Dkt. 71-2 ¶¶ 5–6, that is simply belied by the record. *See* TRO App. at
9 9–12, 18–20. Defendants do not address this record in any meaningful way.

10 **B. Defendants do not perform an individualized assessment of reasonable suspicion.**

11 Plaintiffs have shown that Defendants are engaged in a policy and practice of “stop first, ask
12 questions later.” While Defendants pay lip service to a totality of the circumstances analysis, the reality
13 is that they are not relying on particularized facts to evaluate reasonable suspicion.

14 Defendants claim that agents and officers use a totality of circumstances approach. Opp. at 19.
15 But the declarations they cite discuss training, not practice, and to the extent they discuss practice, the
16 declarations only make sweeping assertions unconnected to any period of time, operation, or specific
17 incident. Dkt. 71-1 ¶ 5; Dkt. 71-2 ¶ 8. The Harvick declaration does not reference a review of any
18 incident reports or other documentation regarding stops over the past month or otherwise explain the
19 basis of his statements. This is inadequate to overcome the ample evidence submitted by Plaintiffs.

20 Indeed, the evidence that is available about the stops of the three Petitioners-Plaintiffs on June 18
21 confirms that Defendants did not make individualized assessments of reasonable suspicion. Defendants
22 do not contest that all three were subject to a detentive stop before officers knew Petitioners-Plaintiffs
23 identities or anything about them. The Form I-213 for one of the Petitioners-Plaintiffs confirms that the
24 operation was not a targeted one for a specific individual or individuals. Tolchin Decl. ¶ 3 & Ex. A. All
25 three were seized even though Defendants concede not all three attempted to flee. *See* Opp. 21.

26
27 ⁵ While Defendants spend a fair amount of time discussing the requirements for warrantless arrests, *see*
28 Opp. at 17–18, to clarify, Plaintiffs also are not moving for TRO relief at this time on their claims
related to warrantless arrests.

1 **C. Defendants rely exclusively on impermissible or marginally probative factors.**

2 To the extent Defendants discuss the factors that they do rely on to conduct detentive stops, they
3 *admit* that they rely on factors that the Ninth Circuit has made clear do not constitute reasonable
4 suspicion, either on their own or in combination.

5 First, Defendants claim that “appearance” may be used as a “relevant factor” among others in
6 making an investigatory stop. Opp. at 20. But this is dangerous and incorrect. Even if Defendants do not
7 rely on appearance alone, the Ninth Circuit has made clear that apparent race or ethnicity should *not be*
8 *considered at all* given the demographic realities in this District. TRO App at 20–21.⁶

9 Next, Defendants claim that “location” may be considered when making an investigatory stop.
10 Opp. at 20-21. But as Plaintiffs have explained, relying on locations (whether neighborhoods broadly or
11 specific areas such as Home Depot parking lots or car washes) to base reasonable suspicion
12 determinations is of marginal value, if any at all, since any such “location or route frequented by illegal
13 immigrants, but also by many legal residents, is not significantly probative to an assessment of
14 reasonable suspicion.” *United States v. Manzo-Jurado*, 457 F.3d 928, 936 (9th Cir. 2006); *see* TRO App.
15 at 21. Defendants make no attempt to address these arguments, or others made by Plaintiffs about broad
16 profiles or “guilt by association” being impermissible for reasonable suspicion. TRO App. at 21–22.

17 Finally, Defendants suggest that flight alone can constitute reasonable suspicion. Opp. at 21. To
18 be clear, as the stops of Petitioners-Plaintiffs show, Defendants are not relying on flight to determine
19 who to stop or not. Defendants, however, are also wrong on the law. As the Ninth Circuit has
20 recognized, “racial dynamics in our society—along with a simple desire not to interact with police—
21 offer an ‘innocent’ explanation of flight,” thus “when every other fact posited by the government weighs
22 so weakly in support of reasonable suspicion, we are particularly hesitant to allow flight to carry the day
23 in authorizing a stop.” *United States v. Brown*, 925 F.3d 1150, 1157 (9th Cir. 2019). And where
24 Defendants engaged Plaintiffs so aggressively, with unidentified, armed agents bursting out of cars,
25 there can be little surprise that they provoked flight. *Id.* at 1155 (“[a]mong some citizens, particularly
26

27 ⁶ Defendants attempt to say that their reliance on appearance is in connection with a specific suspect
28 description, Opp. at 20, but cite to portions of their declarations that discuss targeted operations, which
as noted above, are not at issue in this case.

1 minorities and those residing in high crime areas, there is . . . the possibility that the fleeing person is
2 entirely innocent” and “believes that contact with the police can itself be dangerous”) (quoting *Illinois v.*
3 *Wardlow*, 528 U.S. 119, 132 (2000) (Stevens, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part)); *see also*
4 TRO App. at 22 n.75 (citing *United States v. Rodella*, 804 F.3d 1317 (10th Cir. 2015)).

5 **D. Defendants’ policy and practice is continuing.**

6 Defendants’ unlawful practices are ongoing. Over the past seven days, Defendants have raided
7 car washes in Anaheim on July 3,⁷ in Montebello on July 3,⁸ in West Hollywood on July 4,⁹ in Artesia
8 on July 8¹⁰; street vendors in Boyle Heights on July 6¹¹; and MacArthur Park in Los Angeles on July
9 7.¹² Defendants also raided Home Depot sites, including in Hollywood and Van Nuys on July 5, and
10 arrested a lawfully present laborer who was taken to B-18 before finally released after proving his lawful
11 presence. *See* Declaration of Maegan Ortiz, ¶¶ 3–5. According to El Centro Sector Border Patrol Sector
12 Chief Gregory Bovino, Defendants have 50 teams out at a time, and they are not going anywhere soon.¹³

13
14
15 ⁷ Michelle Fischer, *Father detained by federal agents while working at Anaheim car wash, family says*,
16 ABC 7 News (July 7, 2025), <https://abc7.com/post/father-gilberto-gomez-garcia-detained-ice-working-anaheim-car-wash-family-says/17011733/> (describing the arrest of an employee who has worked at the
17 car wash for 20 years)

18 ⁸ Amairani Hernandez, *Express Car Wash in Montebello targeted twice in immigration raids*, Calo
19 News (July 7, 2025), https://www.calonews.com/communities/montebello/express-car-wash-in-montebello-targeted-twice-in-immigration-raids/article_28aa580f-1cc0-456f-89ee-debe381565a3.html
(describing repeat raids at the same car wash)

20 ⁹ Paulo Murillo, *ICE Raid Targets Santa Palm Car Wash in West Hollywood on Fourth of July*, WeHo
21 Times (Jul. 4, 2025), <https://wehotimes.com/ice-raid-targets-santa-palm-car-wash-in-west-hollywood-on-fourth-of-july/> (agents “blocked the driveway” and seized longstanding employees).

22 ¹⁰ Cameron Kiszla, *Feds seen at Artesia car wash; unclear if people were detained*, KTLA 5 News (July
23 8, 2025), <https://ktla.com/news/local-news/feds-seen-at-artesia-car-wash-no-arrests-made/>.

24 ¹¹ Jessiza Perez and Alex Medina, *At least two detained in immigration raids on East L.A. street vendors*, Boyle Heights Beat (July 7, 2025), <https://boyleheightsbeat.com/whittier-boulevard-immigration-raids/>.

25 ¹² Melissa Gomez et al., *Heavily armed immigration agents descend on L.A.’s MacArthur Park*, L.A.
26 Times (July 7, 2025), <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2025-07-07/immigration-agents-descend-on-macarthur-park>.

27 ¹³ Fox 11 Los Angeles, *LA Mayor demands ICE raids to stop; CBP says 'Better get used to it'*, YouTube
28 (July 7, 2025), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U9W6jGRtRHI>.

1 **IV. Likelihood of Irreparable Harm and the Balance of Equities Favors a TRO.**

2 Defendants make the incredible assertion that Plaintiffs have not established a likelihood of
3 irreparable harm. Opp. at 22. But as explained above, there is extensive evidence that Defendants are not
4 only engaged in detentive stops without reasonable suspicion, but also that the policy and practice is
5 ongoing and will not cease anytime soon. *See supra* at 3–6. The individual Plaintiffs’ and organizational
6 Plaintiffs’ members’ fears that they will be subject to this policy and practice are neither hypothetical,
7 nor is the possibility remote. *Cf. LaDuke*, 762 F.3d at 1324 (“standard pattern” of officially sanctioned
8 conduct increases likelihood of recurrent injury); *Melendres v. Arpaio*, 695 F.3d 990, 1002 (9th Cir.
9 2012) (similar). Indeed, the record shows that some individuals have been stopped more than once and
10 that Defendants have raided the same location multiple times. Dkt. 38-11, ¶¶ 32–38 (describing ImmDef
11 client who had been stopped twice); Dkt. 45-4, ¶¶ 6–8, 14 (explaining that car wash where Plaintiff
12 Hernandez Viramontes works was raided four times); Dkt. 45-13, ¶¶ 14.

13 The balance of equities and the public interest weigh strongly in favor of a TRO. The
14 government’s interest is in *lawful* immigration enforcement. Because the government’s conduct is
15 unlawful, there is a compelling countervailing interest in curbing such abuse of power. *See* TRO App. at
16 25. One need look no further than the fact that 18 states and multiple local entities have sought to weigh
17 in on Plaintiff’s TRO application—detailing how Defendants’ actions have profoundly impacted local
18 communities—to see the strong public interest in an injunction. *See* Dkt. 49-1 (Brief of Amici Curiae
19 States) at 6–10; Dkt. 63 (Cities and County Application to Participate in Hearing).

20 **V. 8 U.S.C. § 1252 Does Not Deprive This Court of Jurisdiction.**

21 The Court’s jurisdiction is not barred by 8 U.S.C. §§ 1252(a)(5), (b)(9), and (g). *Contra* Opp. at
22 14–16. Sections 1252(a)(5) and 1252(b)(9) concern “challenges arising from [a] removal proceeding.”
23 *Nasrallah v. Barr*, 590 U.S. 573, 580 (2020). Section 1252(g) applies only to claims “arising from” three
24 discrete “decisions or actions”: to “commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal
25 orders.” *Reno v. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 482 (1999). Plaintiffs here
26 do not challenge any individual’s removal nor the discrete actions barred by 1252(g).

27 Defendants also implicitly acknowledge that Section 1252(b)(9), by definition, applies only to
28 noncitizens. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9) (applying to actions taken to remove individuals without status).

1 Plaintiffs include two U.S. citizens and organizational Plaintiffs with members that are U.S. citizens and
2 lawfully present individuals. Section 1252(b)(9) cannot bar their claims.

3 Petitioner-Plaintiffs Vasquez Perdomo, Villegas Molina, and Osorto seek injunctive relief based
4 on their likelihood of being stopped in the future. That they are currently in removal proceedings is
5 beside the point.¹⁴ Their experiences are offered as evidence of Defendants’ policy and practice.

6 Courts have also rejected Defendants’ broad interpretation of Section 1252(b)(9). *See Dep’t of*
7 *Homeland Sec. v. Regents of the Univ. of California*, 140 S. Ct. 1891, 1907 (2020) (Section 1252(b)(9)
8 is “certainly not a bar where, as here, the parties are not challenging any removal proceedings”);
9 *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 292–95 (2018). Plaintiffs’ claims are “independent of the removal
10 process.” *Gonzalez v. U.S. Immigration & Customs En’t*, 975 F.3d 788, 810–811 (9th Cir. 2020); *see*
11 *also, e.g., United Farm Workers v. Noem*, 2025 WL 1235525, at *17–20 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 29, 2025);
12 *Torres v. United States Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, 411 F. Supp. 3d 1036, 1048–49 (C.D. Cal. 2019).

13 Defendants’ Section 1252(g) argument, Opp. at 15, is untenable. The Supreme Court has rejected
14 as “implausible” the suggestion that Section 1252(g) covers “all claims arising from deportation
15 proceeding[.]” *Reno*, 525 U.S. at 482, 485 n.9; *see also Regents*, 140 S. Ct. at 1907; *Arce v. United*
16 *States*, 899 F.3d 796, 800 (9th Cir. 2018). Plaintiffs challenge conduct that occurred *well before* any
17 decision to “commence proceedings.” Their claims do not fall within the scope of Section 1252(g). *See*
18 *Wong v. United States*, 373 F.3d 952, 959, 964–65 (9th Cir. 2004).¹⁵

19 **VI. The Proposed TRO is Appropriately Specific and Tailored.**

20 Defendants’ other “threshold” arguments against issuance of a TRO fail. *See* Opp. at 9.

21
22 ¹⁴ In fact, the government has yet to issue a Notice to Appear (NTA) in Petitioner-Plaintiff Villegas
23 Molina’s case, and therefore, he is not in removal proceedings. *See* Tolchin Decl. ¶ 5; 8 U.S.C.
24 § 1239.1(a). Defendants are also wrong to suggest these questions can be taken up in removal
25 proceedings. *See* Opp. at 16. Even in removal proceedings, individuals can only raise Fourth
26 Amendment claims only to suppress evidence or terminate proceedings, and only by showing that a
violation was “egregious.” *Sanchez v. Sessions*, 904 F.3d 643, 655–56 (9th Cir. 2018). And it is possible
that “no . . . order [of removal] would ever be entered,” thus “depriv[ing] [Plaintiffs] of any meaningful
chance for judicial review.” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 293.

27 ¹⁵ In fact, Defendants’ suggestion that Plaintiffs’ claim can be raised in a petition for review, Opp. at 16,
28 is fatal to their Section 1252(g) argument. If Section 1252(g) bars judicial review, it would do so even in
a petition for review. *See, e.g., Vilchiz-Soto v. Holder*, 688 F.3d 642, 644 (9th Cir. 2012).

1 First, Defendants cite six cases for the uncontroversial proposition that “injunctive relief must be
2 tailored to remedy the specific harm alleged.” Opp. at 8. The proposed TRO does just that. Plaintiffs’
3 proposed order contains two operative paragraphs: the first enjoins Defendants from committing the
4 specific legal wrong that Plaintiffs allege they have experienced and are likely to experience absent
5 intervention from the Court: “detentive stops” without the legally required “reasonable suspicion”; and
6 the second specifically enjoins Defendants from relying solely on four factors. Dkt. 45-22 at 4–5, ¶¶ 1–
7 2.¹⁶ The TRO is tailored, concrete, and not difficult to construe.¹⁷

8 The proposed order is not boilerplate, as Defendants suggest, *see* Opp. at 9, but specifies the
9 illegal behavior to be enjoined. *See Coal. on Homelessness v. City & Cnty. of San Francisco*, 2024 WL
10 3325655, at *1 (9th Cir. July 8, 2024) (upholding PI requiring City to comply with policy over objection
11 to “obey the law” injunction); *Ortega-Melendres v. Arpaio*, 836 F. Supp. 2d 959, 994 (D. Ariz. 2011),
12 *aff’d sub nom. Melendres v. Arpaio*, 695 F.3d 990 (9th Cir. 2012) (enjoining officers “from detaining
13 any person based only on knowledge or reasonable belief, without more, that the person is unlawfully
14 present”); *Black Lives Matter Seattle-King Cnty. v. City of Seattle, Seattle Police Dep’t*, 466 F. Supp. 3d
15 1206, 1216 (W.D. Wash. 2020) (granting TRO enumerating weapons that could not be used for crowd
16 control); *Anti Police-Terror Project v. City of Oakland*, 3:20-cv-03866-JCS, Dkt. 33 (N.D. Cal. Jun. 18,
17 2020) (similar). But even Defendants’ own authorities explain that obey-the-law injunctions are
18 permissible when the defendant “has taken some particular action . . . that convinces the court that
19 voluntary compliance with the law will not be forthcoming.” *E.E.O.C. v. AutoZone, Inc.*, 707 F.3d 824,
20 842–43 (7th Cir. 2013). As discussed above, that is certainly the case here.

21 Second, Defendants complain that Plaintiffs seek relief against too many Defendants, Opp. at 10,
22 but their own brief acknowledges that, in addition to ICE, ERO, and CBP, “**any law enforcement**

23 _____
24 ¹⁶ Defendants complain about certain “other paragraphs” in Plaintiffs’ proposed order concerning
training, *see* Opp. at 9, but those paragraphs are actually in the proposed order to show cause.

25 ¹⁷ That discovery, motion practice, and requests for monitoring may follow at later stages of the case is
26 irrelevant to the balance of equities for a TRO at this stage. *Cf.* Ds.’ Opp. at 10. Defendants had the
27 option to follow the law. They didn’t. A court order is therefore necessary. If Plaintiffs’ somehow
28 misuse TRO enforcement procedures or litigation procedures more generally, the Court can always
address that at the appropriate time. Defendants’ attempt to stave off an order by speculating about the
motives of Plaintiffs or Plaintiffs’ counsel here is unconvincing.

1 **officials within the Department of Justice**” are now authorized to perform immigration enforcement
2 activities. Opp. at 2 (emphasis added). DOJ agencies, including the FBI, are involved in enforcement in
3 this District. TRO App. at 2; Dkt. 45-16. A TRO against all Defendants is necessary so that one agency
4 does not respond to an order by simply transferring enforcement authority to another.¹⁸

5 Regarding *Trump v. CASA*, this Court has authority to issue a District-wide order to remedy the
6 imminent and irreparable injury **Plaintiffs and their members** will otherwise suffer. See TRO App. at
7 24–25. Defendants do not respond to any of Plaintiffs’ arguments on this issue. Plaintiffs are not
8 required to establish class certification as a prerequisite for seeking such an injunction. See *Easyriders*
9 *Freedom F.I.G.H.T. v. Hannigan*, 92 F.3d 1486, 1502 (9th Cir. 1996).

10 **CONCLUSION**

11 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should grant Plaintiffs’ TRO application. Further, the Court
12 should deny Defendants’ request to stay relief for any period of time as they will suffer no harm from an
13 order requiring them to comply with the law.¹⁹

14 Dated: July 9, 2025

15 Respectfully submitted,

16 ACLU FOUNDATION OF
17 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

18 By: Mohammad Tajsar
Attorney for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs

19 UC IRVINE SCHOOL OF LAW
20 IMMIGRANT AND RACIAL JUSTICE
21 SOLIDARITY CLINIC

22 By: Anne Lai
Attorney for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs

23 _____
24 ¹⁸ Hamed Aleaziz & Todd Heisler, *Under Pressure From the White House, ICE Seeks New Ways to*
25 *Ramp Up Arrests*, N.Y. Times (June 11, 2025), <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/06/11/us/politics/ice-la-protest-arrests.html> (in response to court order, directing DOJ law enforcement agencies to take over door knocking tasks).

26 ¹⁹ For similar reasons, no bond is appropriate here. Cf. Opp. at 23-24. See *Jorgensen v. Cassidy*, 320
27 F.3d 906, 919 (9th Cir. 2003); *Taylor-Failor v. Cnty. of Hawaii*, 90 F. Supp. 3d 1095, 1102–03 (D. Haw.
28 2015); see also *Black Lives Matter Seattle-King Cnty. v. City of Seattle, Seattle Police Dep’t*, 466 F.
Supp. 3d 1206, 1216 (W.D. Wash. 2020) (waiving bond requirement on similar reasoning).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

LR 11-6.2 Certificate of Compliance

The undersigned counsel certifies that this filing is ten (10) pages, which complies with this Court's standing order.

Date: July 9, 2025

ACLU FOUNDATION OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

By: Mohammad Tajsar
Attorney for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs

EXHIBIT 1

1 STACY TOLCHIN (SBN 217431)
stacy@tolchinimmigration.com
2 LAW OFFICES OF STACY TOLCHIN
776 E. Green St., Suite 210
3 Pasadena, CA 91101
Telephone: (213) 622-7450
4 Facsimile: (213) 622-7233

5 MOHAMMAD TAJ SAR (SBN 280152)
mtaj sar@aclusocal.org

6 MAYRA JOACHIN (SBN 306065)
mjoachin@aclusocal.org

7 EVA BITRAN (SBN 302081)
ebitr an@aclusocal.org

8 DAE KEUN KWON (SBN 313155)
akwon@aclusocal.org

9 OLIVER MA (SBN 354266)
oma@aclusocal.org

10 STEPHANIE PADILLA (SBN 321568)
spadilla@aclusocal.org

11 DIANA SANCHEZ (SBN 338871)
dianasanchez@aclusocal.org

12 ACLU FOUNDATION OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
13 1313 West Eighth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017-4022
14 Telephone: (213) 977-5232
Facsimile: (213) 201-7878

15 *Counsel for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs*
16 *(additional counsel information on cont.*
17 *page)*

MARK ROSENBAUM (SBN 59940)

mrosenbaum@publiccounsel.org
REBECCA BROWN (SBN 345805)

rbrown@publiccounsel.org
SOPHIA WRENCH (SBN 354416)

swrench@publiccounsel.org
RITU MAHAJAN (SBN 252970)

rmahajan@publiccounsel.org
GINA AMATO (SBN 215519)

gamato@publiccounsel.org
PUBLIC COUNSEL

610 South Ardmore Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90005
Telephone: (213) 385-2977

Counsel for All Plaintiffs

18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

19 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

20 Pedro VASQUEZ PERDOMO; Carlos
Alexander OSORTO; and Isaac
21 VILLEGAS MOLINA; Jorge
HERNANDEZ VIRAMONTES; Jason
22 Brian GAVIDIA; LOS ANGELES
WORKER CENTER NETWORK;
23 UNITED FARM WORKERS;
COALITION FOR HUMANÉ
24 IMMIGRANT RIGHTS; IMMIGRANT
DEFENDERS LAW CENTER,

25 Plaintiffs,

26 v.

27 Kristi NOEM, in her official capacity as
28 Secretary, Department of Homeland

Case No.: 2:25-cv-05605-MEMF-SP

**DECLARATION OF STACY
TOLCHIN**

Hon. Maame Ewusi-Mensah
Frimpong

[Filed concurrently with Stop/Arrest
Plaintiffs' Reply ISO TRO]

1 Security; Todd M. LYONS, in his official
2 capacity as Acting Director, U.S.
3 Immigration and Customs Enforcement;
4 Rodney S. SCOTT, in his official
5 capacity as Commissioner, U.S. Customs
6 and Border Patrol; Michael W. BANKS,
7 in his official capacity as Chief of U.S.
8 Border Patrol; Kash PATEL, in his
9 official capacity as Director, Federal
10 Bureau of Investigation; Pam BONDI, in
11 her official capacity as U.S. Attorney
12 General; Ernesto SANTACRUZ JR., in
13 his official capacity as Acting Field
14 Office Director for Los Angeles, U.S.
15 Immigration and Customs Enforcement;
16 Eddy WANG, Special Agent in Charge
17 for Los Angeles, Homeland Security
18 Investigations, U.S. Immigration and
19 Customs Enforcement; Gregory K.
20 BOVINO, in his official capacity as Chief
21 Patrol Agent for El Centro Sector of the
22 U.S. Border Patrol; Jeffrey D.
23 STALNAKER, in his official capacity as
24 Acting Chief Patrol Agent, San Diego
25 Sector of the U.S. Border Patrol; Akil
26 DAVIS, in his official capacity as
27 Assistant Director in Charge, Los
28 Angeles Office, Federal Bureau of
Investigation; Bilal A. ESSAYLI, in his
official capacity as U.S. Attorney for the
Central District of California,

Defendants.

1 ANNE LAI (SBN 295394)
2 *alai@law.uci.edu*
3 UC IRVINE SCHOOL OF LAW
4 IMMIGRANT AND RACIAL
5 JUSTICE
6 SOLIDARITY CLINIC
7 P.O. Box 5479
8 Irvine, CA 92616-5479
9 Telephone: (949) 824-9894
10 Facsimile: (949) 824-2747

11 *Counsel for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs*

12 LAUREN MICHEL WILFONG*
13 *lwilfong@ndlon.org*
14 NATIONAL DAY LABORER
15 ORGANIZING NETWORK
16 1030 S. Arroyo Parkway, Suite 106
17 Pasadena, CA 91105
18 Telephone: (626) 214-5689

19 *Counsel for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs*

20 BREE BERNWANGER (SBN 331731)
21 *bbernwanger@aclunc.org*
22 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
23 UNION FOUNDATION OF
24 NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
25 39 Drumm Street
26 San Francisco, CA 94111
27 Telephone: (415) 621-2493

28 *Counsel for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs*

BRISA VELAZQUEZ OATIS
(SBN 339132)
bvoatis@aclu-sdic.org
ACLU FOUNDATION OF
SAN DIEGO & IMPERIAL
COUNTIES
P.O. Box 87131
San Diego, CA 92138-7131
Telephone: (619) 398-4199

Counsel for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs

EDGAR AGUILASOCHO
(SBN 285567)
eaguilasocho@farmworkerlaw.com
MARTINEZ AGUILASOCHO LAW, INC.
900 Truxtun Ave Suite 300
Bakersfield, CA 93301
Telephone: (661) 859-1174

Counsel for Plaintiff United Farm Workers

CARL BERGQUIST*
cbergquist@chirla.org
COALITION FOR HUMANE
IMMIGRANT RIGHTS
2351 Hempstead Road
Ottawa Hills, OH 43606
Telephone: (310) 279-6025

*Counsel for Plaintiff Coalition for Humane
Immigrant Rights*

* Pro hac vice application forthcoming

DECLARATION OF STACY TOLCHIN

1
2 I, Stacy Tolchin, declare under penalty of perjury, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
3 1746, that the following is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

4 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law before the State of California.
5 I have been practicing immigration law since 2002 and am admitted to practice
6 before the United States Supreme Court; the United States Court of Appeals for the
7 Ninth, Tenth, and Second Circuits; the United States District Courts for the Northern
8 District of California, Eastern District of California, Central District of California,
9 and Southern District of California; the United States District Court for New
10 Mexico; and the U.S. Court of Federal Claims.

11 2. I represent Petitioner-Plaintiffs Pedro Vasquez Perdomo, Isaac Antonio
12 Villegas Molina, and Carlos Alexander Osorto in this action as well as in their
13 respective immigration matters.

14 3. Mr. Vasquez Perdomo was placed into removal proceedings through
15 the issuance of a Notice to Appear on June 25, 2025. On July 3, 2025, the
16 Department of Homeland Security filed a Form I-213 in connection with his bond
17 proceedings. The Form I-213 was provided to me in unredacted form, and a true and
18 correct redacted copy of Form I-213 is attached.

19 4. On July 3, 2025, Mr. Vasquez Perdomo was ordered released on bond
20 by an immigration judge at Adelanto. The bond for Mr. Vasquez Perdomo was
21 issued at 1:57 p.m. on July 3, 2025 by the immigration judge. Mr. Vasquez
22 Perdomo's representative attempted to post bond on July 3, 2025 at 3:07 p.m. but
23 was told that it was too late to post bond, and that bond had to be posted by 2:30
24 p.m. As a result, Mr. Vasquez Perdomo remained detained over the July 4th
25 weekend.

26 5. Mr. Villegas Molina was ordered released on bond on July 7, 2025 by
27 an immigration judge. He still has not been issued a Notice to Appear and therefore
28 has not been placed in removal proceedings, despite his detention by immigration

1 authorities. In my nearly 24 years of practice in immigration law, I have never
2 before had a bond hearing for a client where the Notice to Appear has not been
3 issued.

4 6. Mr. Osorto was placed into removal proceedings through the issuance
5 of a Notice to Appear on June 24, 2025. On July 8, 2025, Mr. Osorto appeared for a
6 master calendar removal hearing at Adelanto. The Department of Homeland
7 Security did not file any evidence in support of the charge of removal and the
8 Department of Homeland Security attorney informed me that his office has not been
9 able to keep up with detained cases and was not ready to proceed on the case. The
10 case was continued to July 30, 2025. Mr. Osorto still has not been scheduled for a
11 bond hearing, despite his detention by immigration authorities since June 18, 2025.

12 7. The immigration court also has not been able to keep up with the
13 detained docket. I was told by the clerk at Adelanto that there were four staff
14 processing nearly a hundred bond hearing requests. Bond hearings are severely
15 delayed. The electronic case filings are not uploaded by the clerks before the
16 hearings, and the judges are having to proceed with hearings unable to see the
17 evidence filed by the parties.

18 8. Mr. Vasquez Perdomo and Mr. Villegas Molina posted bond on July 7,
19 2025. I was informed by their deportation officers on that date that they would be
20 released on July 8, 2025 in order to be fitted for ankle monitoring bracelets, even
21 though the bond orders of release were on July 3 and July 7, 2025.

22 9. On July 8, 2025, I was informed by a deportation officer at the
23 Adelanto Facility at approximately 4 p.m. that Mr. Vasquez Perdomo and Mr.
24 Villegas Molina would not be released due to a “directive,” and that the officer was
25 waiting for instruction. I contacted Pauline Alarcon, counsel for Defendants, and
26 informed her that the failure to release Mr. Vasquez Perdomo and Mr. Villegas
27 Molina was a violation of the immigration judge’s bond order. At 5:00 p.m. she
28 informed me that she had contacted Adelanto and that Mr. Vasquez Perdomo and

1 Mr. Villegas Molina would be released that evening. At 6:00 p.m., GEO staff
2 informed individuals from the Pasadena Community Job Center who were there to
3 pick up Mr. Vasquez Perdomo and Mr. Molina that release was not certain and that
4 they were on “standby.” I contacted the United States Attorney’s office again and
5 was informed that Mr. Vasquez Perdomo and Mr. Villegas Molina would be
6 released around 8:00 p.m. Mr. Vasquez Perdomo and Mr. Villegas Molina were
7 eventually released around 9:00 p.m. on July 8, 2025.

8
9

10 Dated: July 9, 2025
11 Pasadena, CA



12
13
14 Stacy Tolchin
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ATTACHMENT A

U.S. Department of Homeland Security Subject ID : [REDACTED] Record of Deportable/Inadmissible Alien

Family Name (CAPS) VASQUEZ PERDOMO, PEDRO		First	Middle	Sex M	Hair BLK	Eyes BRO	Complexion DRK
Country of Citizenship [REDACTED]	Passport Number and Country of Issue [REDACTED]		Visa Number [REDACTED]	Height 66	Weight 176	Occupation LABOR	
U.S. Address [REDACTED]				Scars and Marks			
Date, Place, Time, and Manner of Last Entry [REDACTED]			Passenger Boarded at	F.B.I. Number [REDACTED]		<input type="checkbox"/> Single <input type="checkbox"/> Divorced <input type="checkbox"/> Married <input type="checkbox"/> Widower <input type="checkbox"/> Separated	
Number, Street, City, Province (State) and Country of Permanent Residence 5 [REDACTED]				Method of Location/Apprehension L			
Date of Birth [REDACTED]	Age: 54	Date of Action 06/25/2025	Location Code LOS/LOS	At/Near See I-831	Date/Hour 06/18/2025 07:07		
Country of Birth [REDACTED]		AR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Form: (Type and No.) <input type="checkbox"/> Lifted <input type="checkbox"/> Net Lifted <input type="checkbox"/>	By [REDACTED]			
NIV Issuing Post and NIV Number		Social Security Account Name		Status at Entry		Status When Found	
Date Visa Issued		Social Security Number		Length of Time Illegally in U.S.			
Immigration Record POSITIVE - See Narrative			Criminal Record				
Name, Address, and Nationality of Spouse (Maiden Name, if Appropriate) [REDACTED]					Number and Nationality of Minor Children None		
Father's Name, Nationality, and Address, if Known [REDACTED]				[REDACTED]			
Monies Due/Property in U.S. Not in Immediate Possession None Claimed		Fingerprinted? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Systems Checks See Narrative	Charge Code Word(s) See Narrative			
Name and Address of (Last)(Current) U.S. Employer See Narrative		Type of Employment See Narrative	Salary	Employed from/to Hr 06/18/2025			
Narrative (Outline particulars under which alien was located/apprehended. Include details not shown above regarding time, place and manner of last entry, attempted entry, or any other entry, and elements which establish administrative and/or criminal violation. Indicate means and route of travel to interior.)							
FIN: [REDACTED]		Left Index fingerprint		Right Index fingerprint			
[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]			
<p>IMMIGRATION RECORD</p> <p>-----</p> <p>History was expected but not provided</p> <p>Subject Health Status</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The subject claims good health.</p> <p>Current Administrative Charges</p> <p>-----</p> <p>... (CONTINUED ON I-831)</p>							
Alien has been advised of communication privileges _____ (Date/Initials)			[REDACTED] (Signature and Title of Immigration Officer)				
Distribution:		Received: (Subject and Documents) (Support of Interview)					
		Officer: [REDACTED]					
		on: June 25, 2025 (time)					
		Disposition: Warrant of Arrest/Notice to Appear					
		Examining Officer: [REDACTED]					

EOIR - 5 of 30

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Continuation Page for Form I-213

Alien's Name VASQUEZ PERDOMO, PEDRO	File Number [REDACTED]	Date 06/25/2025
--	---------------------------	--------------------

06/25/2025 - [REDACTED]

Previous Criminal History

Subject has no criminal history

RECORDS CHECKED

- CIS Unk
- EARM Pos
- IAFIS Pos
- NCIC Neg
- TECS Neg

NAME AND ADDRESS OF US EMPLOYER

[REDACTED]

TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT

Operators, Fabricators, and Laborers

AT/NEAR

PASADENA , CA

Record of Deportable/Excludable Alien:

Encounter:

Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) is currently executing Operation At Large targeting immigration violators in Los Angeles, California. The operation focuses on law enforcement operations in direct support of Presidential Executive Orders while ensuring personnel safety and maintaining tactical control while operating in a confined, civilian-heavy environment.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and Department of Justice (DOJ) have developed a 6-month, nationwide operation to significantly increase Operation At Large arrests of illegal aliens, focusing on individuals with executable final orders of removal. In May 2025, this operation commenced deploying 1,000 interagency teams daily across 25 Areas of Responsibility (AORs), operating 7-days a week. The operation prioritizes regions with the highest concentrations of executable final orders, as identified by the ATrac (Alien Tracker) system, with resources dynamically reallocated weekly to maximize efficiency. The operation integrates personnel from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO), Homeland Security Investigations (HSI), United States Border Patrol (USBP), Office of Field Operations (OFO), Air and Marine Operations (AMO), Office of Information Technology (OIT) and, Department of Justice (DOJ), Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), United States Marshals Service (USMS), Internal Revenue Service (IRS) - Criminal Investigation Division (CID), and National Guard, with additional support from 287(g) partners in their assigned jurisdictions. The operation aims to enhance public safety and enforce immigration laws.

Signature [REDACTED]	Title Deportation Officer
-------------------------	------------------------------

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Continuation Page for Form I-213

Alien's Name VASQUEZ PERDOMO, PEDRO	File Number [REDACTED]	Date 06/25/2025
--	---------------------------	--------------------

On June 19, 2025, ERO Fugitive Operations San Bernardino (SBD) were working in support of ICE Operation At Large in Pasadena, CA Deportations Officers [REDACTED] and Supervisor Detention and Deportation Officer [REDACTED] took enforcement action and arrested VASQUEZ Perdomo, Pedro A246 058 703 after determining alienage. On the same date, ERO SBD transported VASQUEZ to the Los Angeles Staging Facility for processing.

On June 19, 2025, ERO Los Angeles transported VASQUEZ to the Desert View Facility for housing.

On June 22, 2025, ERO Los Angeles transported VASQUEZ to the Adelanto ICE Processing Center for case processing.

Interview:

[REDACTED]

On June 19, 2025, ERO SBD were working in support of ICE Operation At Large in Pasadena, CA and arrested VASQUEZ. On the same date, ERO transported VASQUEZ to the Los Angeles Staging Facility for processing.

[REDACTED]

CONSULAR NOTIFICATION:

Signature [REDACTED]	Title Deportation Officer
-------------------------	------------------------------

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Continuation Page for Form I-213

Alien's Name VASQUEZ PERDOMO, PEDRO	File Number [REDACTED]	Date 06/25/2025
--	---------------------------	--------------------

VASQUEZ was notified of the right to communicate with a consular officer from his country as per Article 36(a) (b) of the Vienna Convention of Consular Relations. VASQUEZ acknowledged understanding the right but declined to speak with anyone at this time.

Criminal History:

No known criminal History



Date in Custody: June 19, 2025

Phone call completed: Yes, No Unknown, X

Call refused: Yes No

Date and Time of Call: _____

Name of Person and Number called: _____

Relationship: _____

Length of call: _____

Other Identifying Numbers



Signature [REDACTED]	Title Deportation Officer
-------------------------	------------------------------

EOIR - 8 of 30



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW
ADELANTO IMMIGRATION COURT**

Respondent Name:

VASQUEZ PERDOMO, PEDRO

To:

Tolchin, Stacy
776 E. Green St Suite 210
Pasadena, CA 91101

A-Number:

[REDACTED]

Riders:

In Custody Redetermination Proceedings

Date:

07/03/2025

ORDER OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE

The respondent requested a custody redetermination pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 1236. After full consideration of the evidence presented, the respondent's request for a change in custody status is hereby ordered:

Denied, because

Granted. It is ordered that Respondent be:

released from custody on his own recognizance.

released from custody under bond of \$ 1,500.00

other:

Other:



Immigration Judge: [REDACTED] 07/03/2025

Appeal: Department of Homeland Security: waived reserved
Respondent: waived reserved

Appeal Due: 08/04/2025

Certificate of Service

This document was served:

Via: [M] Mail | [P] Personal Service | [E] Electronic Service | [U] Address Unavailable

To: [] Noncitizen | [] Noncitizen c/o custodial officer | [E] Noncitizen's atty/rep. | [E] DHS

Respondent Name : VASQUEZ PERDOMO, PEDRO | A-Number : [REDACTED]

Riders:

Date: 07/03/2025 By: [REDACTED], Immigration Judge



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW
ADELANTO IMMIGRATION COURT**

Respondent Name:

VILLEGAS-MOLINA, ISAAC ANTONIO

To:

Tolchin, Stacy
776 E. Green St Suite 210
Pasadena, CA 91101

A-Number:

[REDACTED]

Riders:

In Custody Redetermination Proceedings

Date:

07/07/2025

ORDER OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE

The respondent requested a custody redetermination pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 1236. After full consideration of the evidence presented, the respondent's request for a change in custody status is hereby ordered:

Denied, because

Granted. It is ordered that Respondent be:

released from custody on his own recognizance.

released from custody under bond of \$ 5,000.00

other:

With ATD at DHS discretion.

Other:



Immigration Judge: [Redacted] 07/07/2025

Appeal: Department of Homeland Security: waived reserved
Respondent: waived reserved

Appeal Due: 08/06/2025

Certificate of Service

This document was served:

Via: [M] Mail | [P] Personal Service | [E] Electronic Service | [U] Address Unavailable

To: [] Noncitizen | [] Noncitizen c/o custodial officer | [E] Noncitizen's atty/rep. | [E] DHS

Respondent Name : VILLEGAS-MOLINA, ISAAC ANTONIO | A-Number : [Redacted]

Riders:

Date: 07/07/2025 By: [Redacted] Court Staff

1 STACY TOLCHIN (SBN 217431)
stacy@tolchinimmigration.com
2 LAW OFFICES OF STACY TOLCHIN
776 E. Green St., Suite 210
3 Pasadena, CA 91101
Telephone: (213) 622-7450
4 Facsimile: (213) 622-7233

5 MOHAMMAD TAJ SAR (SBN 280152)
mtajsar@aclusocal.org
6 MAYRA JOACHIN (SBN 306065)
mjoachin@aclusocal.org
7 EVA BITRAN (SBN 302081)
ebitrان@aclusocal.org
8 DAE KEUN KWON (SBN 313155)
akwon@aclusocal.org

9 OLIVER MA (SBN 354266)
oma@aclusocal.org
10 STEPHANIE PADILLA (SBN 321568)
spadilla@aclusocal.org
11 DIANA SANCHEZ (SBN 338871)
dianasanchez@aclusocal.org
12 ACLU FOUNDATION OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
13 1313 West Eighth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017-4022
14 Telephone: (213) 977-5232
Facsimile: (213) 201-7878

15 *Counsel for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs*
16 *(additional counsel information on cont.*
17 *page)*

MARK ROSENBAUM (SBN 59940)
mrosenbaum@publiccounsel.org
REBECCA BROWN (SBN 345805)
rbrown@publiccounsel.org
SOPHIA WRENCH (SBN 354416)
swrench@publiccounsel.org
RITU MAHAJAN (SBN 252970)
rmahajan@publiccounsel.org
GINA AMATO (SBN 215519)
gamato@publiccounsel.org
PUBLIC COUNSEL
610 South Ardmore Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90005
Telephone: (213) 385-2977

Counsel for All Plaintiffs

18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
19 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

20 Pedro VASQUEZ PERDOMO; Carlos
Alexander OSORTO; and Isaac
21 VILLEGAS MOLINA; Jorge
HERNANDEZ VIRAMONTES; Jason
22 Brian GAVIDIA; LOS ANGELES
WORKER CENTER NETWORK;
23 UNITED FARM WORKERS;
COALITION FOR HUMANE
24 IMMIGRANT RIGHTS; IMMIGRANT
DEFENDERS LAW CENTER,

25 Plaintiffs,

26 v.

27 Kristi NOEM, in her official capacity as
28 Secretary, Department of Homeland

Case No.: 2:25-cv-05605-MEMF-SP

**DECLARATION OF MAEGAN
ORTIZ IN SUPPORT OF TRO**

Hon. Maame Ewusi-Mensah
Frimpong

1 Security; Todd M. LYONS, in his official
2 capacity as Acting Director, U.S.
3 Immigration and Customs Enforcement;
4 Rodney S. SCOTT, in his official
5 capacity as Commissioner, U.S. Customs
6 and Border Patrol; Michael W. BANKS,
7 in his official capacity as Chief of U.S.
8 Border Patrol; Kash PATEL, in his
9 official capacity as Director, Federal
10 Bureau of Investigation; Pam BONDI, in
11 her official capacity as U.S. Attorney
12 General; Ernesto SANTACRUZ JR., in
13 his official capacity as Acting Field
14 Office Director for Los Angeles, U.S.
15 Immigration and Customs Enforcement;
16 Eddy WANG, Special Agent in Charge
17 for Los Angeles, Homeland Security
18 Investigations, U.S. Immigration and
19 Customs Enforcement; Gregory K.
20 BOVINO, in his official capacity as Chief
21 Patrol Agent for El Centro Sector of the
22 U.S. Border Patrol; Jeffrey D.
23 STALNAKER, in his official capacity as
24 Acting Chief Patrol Agent, San Diego
25 Sector of the U.S. Border Patrol; Akil
26 DAVIS, in his official capacity as
27 Assistant Director in Charge, Los
28 Angeles Office, Federal Bureau of
Investigation; Bilal A. ESSAYLI, in his
official capacity as U.S. Attorney for the
Central District of California,

Defendants.

1 ANNE LAI (SBN 295394)
alai@law.uci.edu
2 UC IRVINE SCHOOL OF LAW
3 IMMIGRANT AND RACIAL
4 JUSTICE
5 SOLIDARITY CLINIC
6 P.O. Box 5479
7 Irvine, CA 92616-5479
8 Telephone: (949) 824-9894
9 Facsimile: (949) 824-2747

10 *Counsel for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs*

11 LAUREN MICHEL WILFONG*
12 lwilfong@ndlon.org
13 NATIONAL DAY LABORER
14 ORGANIZING NETWORK
15 1030 S. Arroyo Parkway, Suite 106
16 Pasadena, CA 91105
17 Telephone: (626) 214-5689

18 *Counsel for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs*

19 BREE BERNWANGER (SBN 331731)
20 bbernwanger@aclunc.org
21 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
22 UNION FOUNDATION OF
23 NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
24 39 Drumm Street
25 San Francisco, CA 94111
26 Telephone: (415) 621-2493

27 *Counsel for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs*

28 BRISA VELAZQUEZ OATIS
(SBN 339132)
bvoatis@aclu-sdic.org
ACLU FOUNDATION OF
SAN DIEGO & IMPERIAL
COUNTIES
P.O. Box 87131
San Diego, CA 92138-7131
Telephone: (619) 398-4199

Counsel for Stop/Arrest Plaintiffs

EDGAR AGUILASOCHO
(SBN 285567)
eaguilasocho@farmworkerlaw.com
MARTINEZ AGUILASOCHO LAW, INC.
900 Truxtun Ave Suite 300
Bakersfield, CA 93301
Telephone: (661) 859-1174

Counsel for Plaintiff United Farm Workers

CARL BERGQUIST*
cbergquist@chirla.org
COALITION FOR HUMANE
IMMIGRANT RIGHTS
2351 Hempstead Road
Ottawa Hills, OH 43606
Telephone: (310) 279-6025

*Counsel for Plaintiff Coalition for Humane
Immigrant Rights*

* Pro hac vice application forthcoming

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DECLARATION OF MAEGAN ORTIZ

I, Maegan Ortiz, hereby declare:

I make this declaration based on my own personal knowledge. If called, I could and would competently testify hereto:

1. I am the Executive Director of IDEPSCA (Instituto de Educación Popular del Sur de California). IDEPSCA is an organization whose mission is to contribute towards the transformation of creating a more humane and democratic world through the use of popular education. Specifically, our goal is to organize and educate low-income community members who want to resolve problems in their own communities.

2. IDEPSCA operates five Day Laborers Community Job Centers in the City of Los Angeles. These include the centers at Home Depot locations in Hollywood, Cypress Park, and Van Nuys. The centers provide a humane way to look for work and offer a learning environment through literacy, English classes and information about health, labor and immigration laws. These centers also function as a public safety alternative to soliciting employment on the street corners and suffering from severe exploitation and unsafe working conditions.

3. On July 5, 2025, federal immigration agents raided the Home Depot locations in Hollywood and Van Nuys. The Home Depot in Hollywood is located at 5600 Sunset Blvd, Hollywood, CA 90028, between Wilton Pl and St. Andrews Pl. The Home Depot in Van Nuys is located at 8250 Balboa Pl, Los Angeles, CA 91406, at the intersection of Balboa Pl and Roscoe Blvd.

4. Based on conversations my staff and I have had with eyewitnesses, I understand that masked federal agents raided the Home Depot parking lot in Hollywood on July 5 around 9:00 or 9:30 A.M. They took a customer. They also stopped and arrested at least one day laborer, but he was then released after showing documentation that he was lawfully present in the United States. I spoke with this day laborer on July 8, 2025. He said he was standing by the parking lot entrance on

1 St. Andrews Pl. on July 5 when the agents grabbed him suddenly. The agents took
2 him to B-18 at the downtown federal building and released him later in the day.

3 5. Based on my review of videos and on subsequent conversations my
4 staff and I have had with eyewitnesses, I understand that around 9:30 A.M. on July
5 5, masked federal agents in military gear with military-style weapons, including
6 agents with "Border Patrol" patches, raided the Home Depot in Van Nuys. The
7 agents came in several unmarked vehicles and targeted all of the parking lot
8 entrances. Groups of three to four agents went roaming from entrance to entrance.
9 Agents picked up people from every corner of the parking lot. For example, the
10 agents grabbed a group of four to five workers who were by the Roscoe Blvd
11 entrance. I arrived at the site around 10 A.M. and spoke with eyewitnesses.

12 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

13 Executed on July 9, 2025 in Los Angeles, California.

14
15
16 Maegan Ortiz
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28