

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

ALIAKSANDR ULANOVICH,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. CIV-26-85-JD
)	
MARK SIEGEL, et al.,)	
)	
Respondents.)	

ORDER

On January 19, 2026, Petitioner filed his Petition. Doc. 1. The Court ordered expedited briefing, and Respondents’ Response was due on February 4, 2026. Doc. 8. On February 4, 2026, Respondents filed several documents. Docs. 12, 13, 14, 15. These filings were deficient and confusing. The Court addresses these deficiencies in turn.

I. Respondents’ Counsel’s Entry of Appearance (Docs. 12, 13, 14)

Counsel for Respondents appears to have filed his Entry of Appearance three separate times. Docs. 12, 13, 14. Further, Doc. 12 and Doc. 13 are titled as “Response in Opposition re [10] Motion to Waive Local Counsel Requirement under Local Rule 83.3(c).” Document 10 was Petitioner’s counsel’s request to waive Local Civil Rule 83.3, which the Court has already granted. Doc. 11. Respondents need not respond to that. Accordingly, Docs. 12 and 13 are **STRICKEN**.

Further, Doc. 14 is properly labeled as an Entry of Appearance for Mr. Jones. His Entry of Appearance states that he is entering an appearance on behalf of Respondents Siegal, Lyons, Noem, and Bondi. On the Court’s electronic docket, however, Mr. Jones is

only listed as counsel for Respondent Noem. Accordingly, Doc. 14 is **STRICKEN**. Counsel for Respondents shall file an amended Entry of Appearance for all Respondents on whose behalf he is appearing. When filing the amended Entry of Appearance, counsel for Respondents shall ensure that he is properly listed on the Court's electronic docket as counsel for each of the Respondents for whom he appears.

II. Respondents' Response to Petitioner's Petition (Doc. 15)

It appears that Doc. 15 is intended to serve as Respondents' Response to Petitioner's Petition. Doc. 15. However, Doc. 15 is also titled as "Response in Opposition re [10] Motion to Waive Local Counsel Requirement under Local Rule 83.3(c)." Again, Document 10 was Petitioner's counsel's request to waive Local Civil Rule 83.3, which the Court has already granted. Doc. 11. Accordingly, Doc. 15 is **STRICKEN**. Respondents shall properly re-file their Response to the Petition and ensure that the filing has the correct docket text.

III. Respondents' Counsel's Email Address

Finally, counsel for Respondents has listed a Gmail address on the Court's electronic docket for receipt of all filings with the Court. On Respondents' filings, however, counsel lists what the Court presumes is his ICE email address: Paul.N.Jones@ice.dhs.gov. *See, e.g.*, Doc. 14 (Mr. Jones's deficient Entry of Appearance); Doc. 15 at 1 (Respondents' deficient Response to Petitioner's Petition). All electronic filings in immigration habeas proceedings, Nature of Suit 463, are tagged as restricted to protect the noncitizen's personal, confidential information. It is inappropriate for restricted filings to be distributed to a government attorney's personal Gmail rather than to his

government email. Accordingly, counsel for Respondents is **ORDERED** to correct the email listed on the Court's electronic docket to his government email address before filing any more documents.

IV. Conclusion

Accordingly, Docs. 12, 13, 14, and 15 are **STRICKEN**. Not later than **10 a.m. on February 6, 2026**,

- Counsel for Respondents must correct the email listed on the Court's electronic docket to his government email address;
- Counsel for Respondents must file an amended Entry of Appearance for all Respondents on whose behalf he is appearing; and
- Respondents must properly re-file their Response and ensure that the filing has the correct docket text.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 5th day of February, 2026.


CHRIS M. STEPHENS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE