

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

7 DANIEL RAMIREZ MEDINA,

8 Petitioner,

9 v.

10 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND  
11 SECURITY, et al.,

12 Respondents.

CASE NO. C17-218 RSM

ORDER ADOPTING IN PART  
JUDGE DONOHUE'S R&R AND  
DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION  
FOR CONDITIONAL RELEASE

13  
14 THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Petitioner's Objections to the portion of the  
15 Report and Recommendation ("R&R") of the Honorable James P. Donohue, United States  
16 Magistrate Judge, in which Judge Donohue has recommended the denial of Petitioner's release  
17 from immigration detention. Dkts. #64 at 34-44 and #66. Having reviewed such Objections, the  
18 government's response thereto, and the remaining record, the Court now ADOPTS that portion  
19 of Judge Donohue's R&R for the reasons set forth by Judge Donohue and for the additional  
20 reasons discussed herein.

21 Just as Petitioner argued before Judge Donohue that his case is extraordinary and  
22 involves special circumstances warranting relief, so too does he raise such arguments before this  
23 Court in his Objections. Dkt. #66. He submits that Judge Donohue's conclusion that he is not  
24 entitled to conditional release is clearly erroneous. Dkt. #66 at 12. This Court disagrees.

1           As an initial matter, the Court notes that Petitioner must take some responsibility for the  
2 position he finds himself as of this date. Indeed, he has placed himself in the tenuous position of  
3 arguing that his arrest and detention have violated his constitutional rights, while also asserting  
4 that he is not challenging the revocation of his DACA status or “anything that has to do with the  
5 removal proceedings themselves.” Dkt. #62 at 52:4-7. That position ultimately leads this Court  
6 to agree with Judge Donohue that Petitioner is not entitled to release at this stage of the  
7 proceedings.

8           Petitioner is now being held in immigration detention after U.S. Department of Homeland  
9 Security issued a Notice to Appear (“NTA”) in removal proceedings and a Notice of Custody  
10 Determination that he is to be held without bond. Dkt. #32, Exs. 1 and 4. By Petitioner’s own  
11 admission, he is not challenging “anything that has to do with the removal proceedings  
12 themselves.” Thus, the Court agrees with the government, that even if the Court were to find this  
13 case presents extraordinary circumstance and/or that Petitioner is highly likely to succeed on the  
14 merits, he is not entitled to release. *See* Dkt. #68 at 2-4. DHS has the statutory discretion to  
15 detain aliens during the pendency of their removal proceedings. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).  
16 Further, as this Court has previously recognized, the remedy for an unlawful arrest in violation of  
17 the Fourth Amendment is suppression of evidence. *See INS v. Lopez-Mendoza*, 468 U.S. 1032,  
18 1040-41 (1984); *United States v. Garcia-Beltran*, 443 F.3d 1126, 1131-32 (9th Cir. 2006); *see*  
19 *also Martinez-Medina v. Holder*, 673 F.3d 1029, 1033-34 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting that  
20 exclusionary rule applies in civil removal proceedings only when the Fourth Amendment  
21 violation is egregious). Indeed, the government recognizes that “an unlawful arrest can have  
22 important consequences.” Dkt. #68 at 4. Similarly, the United States Supreme Court has  
23 explained:

1 Irregularities on the part of the Government official prior to, or in  
2 connection with, the arrest would not necessarily invalidate later  
3 proceedings in all respects conformable to law. “A writ of habeas corpus  
4 is not like an action to recover damages for an unlawful arrest or  
5 commitment, but its object is to ascertain whether the prisoner can  
6 lawfully be detained in custody; and if sufficient ground for his detention  
7 by the government is shown, he is not to be discharged for defects in the  
8 original arrest or commitment.”

9 *United States ex rel. Bilokumsky v. Tod*, 263 U.S. 149, 158, 44 S. Ct. 54, 57 (1923) (citations  
10 omitted). Likewise, the Supreme Court has noted that “[t]he ‘body’ or identity of a defendant or  
11 respondent in a criminal or civil proceeding is never itself suppressible as a fruit of an unlawful  
12 arrest, even if it is conceded that an unlawful arrest, search, or interrogation occurred.” *INS v.*  
13 *Lopez-Mendoza*, 468 U.S. 1032, 1039, 104 S. Ct. 3479, 3483-84 (1984).

14 This Court acknowledges the unusual circumstances of this case and that many questions  
15 remain regarding the appropriateness of the government’s conduct. However, while the Court is  
16 sympathetic to the situation in which the Plaintiff finds himself, it can only conclude that he is  
17 not entitled to immediate release under the posture of this case. Accordingly, should petitioner  
18 desire release from his current detention, his avenue for seeking such release should occur in the  
19 context of his removal proceedings, which by his own admission, are not being challenged here.

20 For all of these reasons, the Court ADOPTS that portion of Judge Donohue’s R&R  
21 pertaining to Petitioner’s motion for conditional release (Dkt. #45) and DENIES the motion.  
22 Should Petitioner desire a bond redetermination hearing, the Court once again directs the  
23 government to schedule such a hearing **no later than one week from the date of Petitioner’s**  
24 **request.**

25 The Court shall review Judge Donohue’s R&R with respect to Defendants’ Motion to  
26 Dismiss pursuant to the schedule previously set for any Objections on that portion of the R&R.

27 ///

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

The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to the parties and to Judge Donohue.

DATED this 24<sup>th</sup> day of March 2017.



RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE