

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

Case No.	ED CV 26-1810-E	Date	June 4, 2026
Title	DOK ZAINUTDINOV v. ERNESTO SANTACRUZ JR., ETC., ET AL.		

Present: The Honorable Charles F. Eick, United States Magistrate Judge

Bea Martinez	None	None
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter/Recorder	Tape No.

**Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:**

None

**Attorneys Present for Defendants:**

None

**Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS)**

The Court has read and considered all papers filed in support of and in opposition to “Petitioner’s Motion for Further Relief” (ECF Doc. 14), filed May 14, 2026, and the similar if not identical “Petitioner’s Motion for Further Relief” (ECF Doc. 15), filed May 14, 2026 (collectively, “the Motion”). The Court also has listened to an audio recording of the April 22, 2026 hearing before the immigration judge.

The Court previously ordered that Respondents “provide Petitioner a bond hearing before an immigration judge” (Minute Order, filed April 15, 2026, p. 4). In the Motion, Petitioner appears to argue that the immigration judge violated this Court’s Order by failing to “identify the specific reason(s) for the March 25, 2026 revocation of supervision and afford Petitioner a meaningful opportunity to contest them.” Petitioner’s argument is rejected. The Court ordered a bond hearing, not a factual exploration of the March 25, 2026 revocation of supervision. The immigration judge held a bond hearing. At that hearing, neither Petitioner nor Petitioner’s counsel requested of the immigration judge an identification of “the specific reason(s)” “for the revocation of supervision.” At the hearing, Petitioner received a meaningful opportunity to contest his current detention.

In the Motion, Petitioner also argues that the immigration judge improperly placed the burden of proof on Petitioner. Any such alleged error was immaterial, because the immigration judge found that the result would be the same under the burden urged by Petitioner.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

Case No.	ED CV 26-1810-E	Date	June 4, 2026
Title	DOK ZAINUTDINOV v. ERNESTO SANTACRUZ JR., ETC., ET AL.		

In the Motion, Petitioner disagrees with the merits of the immigration judge’s decision. Such disagreement does not demonstrate any failure by the immigration judge to follow the Court’s Order. Nor does such disagreement provide a basis for habeas relief. See Singh v. Bowen, 2026 WL 485760, at \*4-5 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 19, 2026); see also Martinez v. Clark, 124 F.4th 775, 785 (9th Cir. 2024) (court may not “reweigh evidence” that was before the immigration judge).

Accordingly, the Motion is denied.

The parties may file additional papers in support of or in opposition to the Petition on or before June 17, 2026.

cc: All Counsel of Record

Initials of Deputy Clerk bm