

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

JUAN HUMBERTO LEMA SALAZAR,

Petitioner,

vs.

PAMELA BONDI, Attorney General; KRISTI
NOEM, Secretary, U.S. Department of
Homeland Security; TODD M. LYONS, Acting
Director of Immigration and Customs
Enforcement; DAVID EASTERWOOD, Acting
Director, St. Paul Field Office Immigration and
Customs Enforcement, and ERIC KLANG,
Crow Wing County Sheriff,

Respondents.

Case No. 0:26-cv-00736-SHL-DLM

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

On February 1, 2026, the Court granted Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and ordered that he be immediately released with all of his personal effects. (ECF 6.) On February 4, 2026, Petitioner’s counsel reported that Petitioner was released, but Immigration and Customs Enforcement did not return Petitioner’s cell phone and a gold neck chain. (ECF 8.) On February 6, 2025, the Court entered an Order reiterating that Petitioner should have all personal belongings returned to him, including his cell phone and gold neck chain, and warned that failure to comply with the Court’s Order may result in an order to show cause. (ECF 9.) On February 13, 2026, Petitioner reported that the property had not yet been returned despite counsel conferring about the return of property “several times” and attempting to recover it at the Whipple Building. (ECF 11.) On February 20, 2026, Petitioner’s counsel returned to the Whipple Building to try to retrieve Petitioner’s property, again without success. (ECF 12.) Counsel conferred with the United States Attorney’s Office approximately one week later, reporting that “it is unclear to what extent ICE has, or intends to, search for Petitioner’s property.” (Id.)

The Court hereby **GRANTS** Petitioner’s Motion for Order to Show Cause and **ORDERS** Respondents to **SHOW CAUSE** on or before April 30, 2026, why sanctions should not be imposed for the failure to comply with Court Orders. If Petitioner’s property has already been returned to him as of the date of this Order, one or both parties should file a status report saying so, and no further response will be required. If Petitioner’s property still has not been returned to him,

Respondents' response must, among other things: (i) explain the protocols they had in place at the Whipple Building and any other facility where Petitioner was held for keeping track of each detainee's property; (ii) explain the training they provided to ICE officers to ensure that each detainee's property would be properly inventoried and stored following seizure of that property; (iii) provide all inventory logs, reports, and other documents relating to Petitioner's property starting from the time of his arrest, including, but not limited to, records showing the chain of custody of his property starting from when it was confiscated; and (iv) explain the efforts that have been taken to locate Petitioner's property and why those efforts have been unsuccessful.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 20, 2026



STEPHEN H. LOCHER
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE