

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
Alexandria Division

CRISTIAN JONE JUAREZ VIGIL,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

PAMELA BONDI, *et al.*,  
*Respondents.*

1:26-cv-00168-MSN-WBP

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Petitioner Cristian Jone Juarez Vigil's Motion for Issuance of an Order to Show Cause. ECF 9. On January 20, 2026, Petitioner filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Petition") pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 alleging that he has been unlawfully detained at the Farmville Detention Center. Upon receiving the Petition, the Court issued an Order requiring the Respondents to file either a Notice indicating that the factual and legal issues presented in this Petition do not differ in any material fashion from those presented in *Servellon Martinez*, 1:25-cv-1792 (E.D. Va.), or an Opposition to the Petition discussing the material differences between *Servellon Martinez* and this Petition. ECF 2. After Respondents filed a Notice, this Court granted the Petition as to Count III, in which Petitioner claimed that his characterization by Respondents as an "applicant for admission" pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a), thus subjecting him to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), was incorrect and violated his right to due process. ECF 5. In granting the Petition, the Court ordered the Federal Respondents to conduct a bond hearing. *Id.* Petitioner subsequently received a bond hearing but was denied release on bond by an Immigration Judge. ECF 7.

Petitioner now asks this Court to issue a second show cause order requiring Respondents to address his claims that (1) his detention without the issuance of a warrant violates 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and the Due Process Clause (Count I), and (2) his characterization by Respondents as

an “applicant for admission” pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a) violates the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”) (Count IV). ECF 9.

The Court declines to issue a second show cause order as to Petitioner’s APA claims. The Court has already adjudicated the underlying issue—the statutory authority for Petitioner’s detention—and granted him the relief he seeks through this claim—a bond hearing before an Immigration Judge. Petitioner’s APA claim is thus moot. *See Porter v. Clarke*, 852 F.3d 358, 363 (4th Cir. 2017) (explaining that “a case is moot when the issues presented are no longer ‘live’ or the parties lack a legally cognizable interest in the outcome” (quoting *Powell v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486, 496 (1969))).

The same is not true, however, for Petitioner’s claim that he is entitled to release from detention because he was not properly detained pursuant to a warrant. Because this claim is still live, it is hereby

ORDERED that on or before Tuesday, February 17, 2026, the Federal Respondents show cause as to why the Petition should not be granted as to Count I; it is further

ORDERED that any Reply by Petitioner shall be filed by Friday, February 20, 2026; and it is further

ORDERED that Petitioner shall not be removed from this judicial district during the pendency of this action unless and until the Court issues a contrary order. 28 U.S.C. § 1651; *FTC v. Dean Foods Co.*, 384 U.S. 597, 603 (1966).

It is SO ORDERED.

February 12, 2026  
Alexandria, Virginia

/s/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael S. Nachmanoff  
United States District Judge