

Case	Cite	Parties	Facts	Procedural vehicle	Federal / Constitutional claims	State law claims	Relief sought	Status	Complaint URL
<i>Brizuela v. Feliciano</i>	No. 12-0226 (D. Conn. filed Feb. 13, 2012)	P: Yale Law School Worker and Immigrant Rights Advocacy Clinic (Michael Wishnie) D: Local law enforcement	A Connecticut resident, represented by students in Yale Law School's immigration clinic, filed a representative habeas petition and class action complaint challenging the Connecticut Department of Corrections' practice of holding individuals after their lawful state custody has expired solely on the basis of an immigration detainer	Petition for writ of habeas corpus; in the alternative for relief under 42 U.S.C. 1983; seeking class certification for representative habeas action, or class action under 1983.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fourth Amendment violation. 2. Fourth Amendment violation (ultra vires) 3. Fourth Amendment violation (detention w/o hearing) 4. Fourth Amendment violation (state commandeering) 5. Fourteenth Amendment (substantive due process) 6. Fourteenth Amendment (procedural due process) 	None.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Writ of habeas corpus 2. Issue injunction 3. Declaratory judgment 4. Reasonable costs 5. Any other relief court deems proper 	Settled	http://www.legalactioncenter.org/sites/default/files/docs/lac/Brizuela%20v.%20Feliciano%20Complaint.pdf
<i>Roy v. Los Angeles County</i>	No. CV 12-9012 (Central District California, filed October 19, 2012)	P: ACLU D: County of Los Angeles; Sheriff of Los Angeles	Roy v. Los Angeles County is a lawsuit against Los Angeles County and the L.A. County Sheriff Lee Baca for denying bail on the basis of ICE holds, and for holding people in County Jail for more than 48 hours based on those ICE holds.	42 USC 1983; seeking class certification pursuant to FRCP 23(b)(2)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fourteenth Amendment (42 USC 1983) (due process) 2. Fourth Amendment (unlawful seizure) 3. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Violation of California Constitution, Article 1 Section 7 (due process) 4. Violation of California Constitution, Article 1 Section 13 (unlawful seizure) 5. False imprisonment 6. California Government code 815.2 and 815.6 (mandatory LASD duty to allow persons to post bail) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Declaratory judgment that refusal to allow posting bail is unlawful 2. Injunction not to detain pursuant to immigration hold 3. Injunction not to detain beyond 48 hours without probable cause hearing 4. Declaratory judgment that detention per immigration hold is unlawful 	Filed 10/19/12	https://www.scribd.com/document/110550860/Roy-v-L-A-County-Complaint

<p><i>Rios-Quiroz v. Williamson County</i></p>	<p>No. 3:11-cv-01168 (Middle District Tennessee, filed 12/12/2011)</p>	<p>P: Elliott Ozment Law D: Williamson County Tennessee</p>	<p>All Plaintiffs voluntarily reported to the Williamson County Criminal Justice Center (“CJC”) after each receiving a misdemeanor citation in lieu of custodial arrest. When Plaintiffs arrived at the Williamson County Sheriff’s Office (“WCSO”), employees of the WCSO communicated with the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement</p>	<p>42 USC 1983; class certification pursuant to FRCP 23 (b)(3)</p>	<p>1. Fourth Amendment (42 USC 1983) (illegal policy, practice, and custom) 2. Fourteenth Amendment (procedural due process) 3. Fourth Amendment (TCA 40-7-123 unconstitutional as applied) 4. Violation of Supremacy Clause (preempted local enforcement of federal immigration law)</p>	<p>5. Violation of Tennessee Constitution, Article 1, Section 15 (denial of bail to persons charged with non-capital offenses) 6. False Imprisonment</p>	<p>1. Declaratory relief 2. Damages 3. Class certification 4-5. Reasonable expenses / costs</p>	<p>Decision 9/10/2012, granting defendant's motion to dismiss: ICE detainer is mandatory and therefore complaint is properly addressed to federal government.</p>	<p>Available on PACER; to be filed on X drive</p>
<p><i>Rivas v. Martin</i></p>	<p>No. 10-0197 (N.D. Ind. filed June 16, 2010)</p>	<p>P: Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund D: Sheriff of LaGrange County; various jail commanders</p>	<p>An individual filed suit against the LaGrange County Sheriff and jail administrators for holding her on an ICE detainer for ten days after she posted bond.</p>	<p>42 USC 1983</p>	<p>1. Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment (due process) (42 USC 1983)</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>1. Assume jurisdiction. 2. Declaratory judgment. 3. Compensatory damages 4. Reasonable fees 5. Other relief.</p>	<p>On March 18, 2011, the district court denied defendants’ motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim, finding that plaintiff had sufficiently stated a claim for violation of her due process rights. On September 1, 2011, the parties stipulated to dismissal with prejudice of all</p>	<p>http://www.legalactioncenter.org/sites/default/files/docs/lac/Melendrez-6-10-Complaint.pdf</p>
<p><i>Keil v. Triveline</i></p>	<p>No. 09-3417 (W.D. Mo. filed Nov. 6, 2009) appeal docketed, No. 11-1647 (8th Cir., Mar. 24, 2011)</p>	<p>P: Sharma-Crawford, Attorneys at Law, LLC D: ICE agents</p>	<p>A U.S. citizen sued individual ICE officers and a Department of State official alleging that they violated his Fourth and Fifth Amendment rights by unlawfully arresting and holding him in a county jail pursuant to an ICE detainer.</p>	<p>Habeas corpus</p>	<p>1. Fourth Amendment (unreasonable search and seizure) 2. Fifth Amendment (due process) 3. Federal Tort Claims Act</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>1. Actual and compensatory damages 2. Punitive and exemplary damages 3-4. Attorney fees / other relief</p>	<p>District court granted defendants’ motions for summary judgment, finding that plaintiff’s Fourth Amendment claim failed because defendants had probable cause to arrest plaintiff for falsely claiming U.S. citizenship and misusing a U.S. passport. The Eighth Circuit affirmed the lower</p>	<p>http://www.legalactioncenter.org/sites/default/files/docs/lac/Keil-11-9-09-Complaint.pdf</p>

<p><i>Jimenez-Moreno v. Napolitano</i></p>	<p>No. 11-05452 (N.D. Ill. filed Aug. 11, 2011)</p>	<p>P: National Immigrant Justice Center (Mark Fleming) D: ICE</p>	<p>Two individuals filed a class action lawsuit challenging ICE's assertion of authority to instruct law enforcement agencies to detain alleged noncitizens for the sole purpose of</p>	<p>Writ of habeas corpus; injunctive relief pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 702. Seeking class cert via FRCP 23(b)(1) and (2) or (c)(4)</p>	<p>1. Violation of 5 U.S.C. §§ 706 (Administrative Procedure Act) 2. Violation of Fourth Amendment 3. Violation of Fifth Amendment 4. Violation of Tenth</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>1-3. Certification as class action 4-7. Declaratory judgment 8. Injunction 9-10 Costs/fees and other relief</p>	<p>Appears to be still pending</p>	<p>http://www.legactioncenter.org/sites/default/files/docs/lac/Moreno-Complaint-8-11-11.pdf</p>
<p><i>Galarza v. Szalczyk</i></p>	<p>2012 WL 1080020 (E.D. Pa. Mar. 30, 2012) (unpublished)</p>	<p>P: ACLU of Pennsylvania & ACLU IRP D: ICE; local law enforcement; local government</p>	<p>In November 2008, Mr. Galarza was mistakenly swept up in a series of drug arrests by Allentown police. Mr. Galarza, who had nothing to do with the crimes, was jailed at the Lehigh County Prison along with other arrestees. He was later acquitted of any wrongdoing. Though he posted bail the next day, Mr. Galarza was not released because ICE had issued an immigration detainer against him. Mr. Galarza's Social Security card and</p>	<p>42 USC 1983</p>	<p>1. Fourth Amendment and due process (Bivens) 2. Fifth Amendment (Bivens) (equal protection) 3. Fifth Amendment and 8 CFR 1357 (due process) 4. Fourteenth Amendment (42 USC 1983) (equal protection) 5. Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment (42 USC 1983) (unreasonable seizure, deprivation of liberty and due process) 6. Fourteenth Amendment (42 USC 1983) (due process) 7. Fourteenth Amendment (42 USC 1983) (equal protection)</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>1. Compensatory damages as to City of Allentown and individual defendants 2. Punitive damages as to individual defendants 3-4. Reasonable costs / other relief</p>	<p>On March 19, 2013, Plaintiff appealed the March 30, 2012 order and opinion of the court granting Lehigh County's Motion to Dismiss.</p>	<p>http://www.aclu.org/files/assets/2011.04.06_first_amended_complaint.pdf</p>

<p><i>Committee for Immigrant Rights of Sonoma County v. Sonoma County</i></p>	<p>2010 WL 841372 (N.D. Ca. Mar. 10, 2010) (unpublished)</p>	<p>P: ACLU of Northern CA (Andre Segura) D: ICE; local law enforcement; local govt</p>	<p>The ACLU-NC filed a lawsuit in September 2008 charging that the Sonoma County Sheriff's Department and the U.S. Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) have been collaborating beyond the law to target, arrest, and detain Latino residents of Sonoma County.</p>	<p>42 USC 1983, 5 USC 702</p>	<p>1. Fourth Amendment (42 USC 1983) (unreasonable search and seizure) 2. Fourteenth Amendment (42 USC 1983) (equal protection) 3. Fourteenth Amendment (42 USC 1983) (due process) 4. Fourth Amendment and 8 USC 1357 (Bivens and 5 USC 702) (unreasonable search and seizure) 5. Fifth Amendment (Bivens and 5 USC 702) (equal protection) 6. Fifth Amendment, 8 USC 1357, 8 CFR 287.3, 8 CFR 287.7 (Bivens and 5 USC 702) (due process) 7. Violation of 42 USC 2000d et seq. 8. 5 USC 706 9. 42 USC 1983, 42 USC 1985(3) 10. California Constution, Art. I., Section 13 11. California Constitution, Art. I, Section 7(a) (equal protection) 12. California Constitution, Art. I, Section 7(a) (due process) 13. Violation of Bane Act, California Civil Code 52.1 14. California Government Code § 11135 and Its Implementing Regulations 15. False Imprisonment (Cal Gov't Code § 815.2) 16. Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress 17. False Imprisonment</p>	<p>10. California Constution, Art. I., Section 13 11. California Constitution, Art. I, Section 7(a) (equal protection) 12. California Constitution, Art. I, Section 7(a) (due process) 13. Violation of Bane Act, California Civil Code 52.1 14. California Government Code § 11135 and Its Implementing Regulations 15. False Imprisonment (Cal Gov't Code § 815.2) 16. Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress</p>	<p>1. Preliminary and permanent injunction against County Defendants 2. Preliminary and permanent injunctions against ICE and individual defendants 3-5 Declaratory judgment 6. Nominal, compensatory, special, statutory, and punitive damages 7-9. Costs/expenses/other relief</p>	<p>287.7 claims rejected. Otherwise, settled for money damages and policy changes</p>	<p>http://www.legalactioncenter.org/sites/default/files/docs/lac/P-2nd-Amend-Comp-9-14-09.pdf</p>
<p><i>Florida Immigrant Coalition v. Mendez</i></p>	<p>2010 WL 4384220 (S.D.Fl. Oct. 28, 2010) (unpublished)</p>	<p>P: LatinoJustice PRLDEF D: local govt</p>	<p>Three Florida immigrant rights organizations and an individual plaintiff filed a habeas petition and complaint seeking to enjoin the policies and practices of the defendant, Palm Beach County Sheriff, that</p>	<p>42 USC 1983, habeas corpus</p>	<p>1. Fourteenth Amendment (42 USC 1983) (due process) 2. Fourth Amendment and Fourteenth Amendment</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>1. Issue writ of habeas corpus 2. Declaratory judgment 3. Injunction 4. Nominal, compensatory, and punitive damages 5-6. Costs / other relief</p>	<p>Dismissed (governmental immunity)</p>	<p>http://www.legalactioncenter.org/sites/default/files/docs/lac/9-03-09-Complaint.pdf</p>
<p><i>Ricketts v. Palm Beach County Sheriff</i></p>	<p>985 So.2d 591 (2008)</p>	<p>P: Palm Beach PDs D: local govt</p>	<p>Appellant was arrested for a third degree felony, and a bond of \$1,000 was promptly set. However, when he attempted to post the bond, the sheriff refused to accept it, because appellant was subject to an immigration hold</p>	<p>Habeas corpus</p>	<p>Habeas; Fourth amendment</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>Writ of habeas corpus</p>	<p>Dismissed (court held that immigration detainer habeas is a federal issue)</p>	<p>Not available</p>

<i>Cote v. Lubins</i>	No. 09-0091 (M.D. Fla. filed Feb. 23, 2009)	P: ACLU of Florida D: local govt	Cote, a twenty-three-year-old mother of three, was arrested without charge. The police ignored a domestic violence call to which they were responding, and arrested Cote instead who couldn't prove her citizenship, usurping federal immigration	Habeas corpus	1. No administrative remedies available 2. Arrest in violation of Fourth Amendment 3. Deprivation of liberty without due process in violation of Fourteenth Amendment 4. Form I-247 does not provide lawful basis to detain	None.	Writ of habeas corpus	Dismissed as moot (P released)	http://www.acufl.org/pdfs/cotehabeas.pdf
<i>Jimenez v. United States</i>	No. 11-1582 (S.D. Ind. filed Nov. 30, 2011)	P: ACLU of IN D: ICE	A U.S. Citizen who was unlawfully held for three days pursuant to an ICE detainer and denied bond filed suit against unknown individual ICE officers and the United	Bivens. Federal Tort Claims Act.	1. Unreasonable seizure in violation of Fourth Amendment (Bivens) 2. Erroneous detention and injury represent negligence, false imprisonment; U.S. is liable under F.T.C.A.	None.	1. Accept jurisdiction 2. Compensatory damages 3. Award all other relief	Currently in discovery	http://www.legalactioncenter.org/sites/default/files/docs/lac/Complaint_2011-30-11.pdf
<i>Urbina v. Rustin</i>	No. 08-0979 (W.D. Pa. filed July 11, 2008)	P: Community Justice Project (Pittsburgh, PA) D: Local government	Two individuals filed a habeas petition and class action suit against the Warden of Allegheny County Jail challenging their continued detention pursuant to ICE detainers and alleging violations of the Fourteenth Amendment	Habeas corpus, 42 USC 1983. Seeking class certification pursuant to FRCP 23(b)(2) and (3)	1. Violation of Due Process Clause of Fourteenth Amendment	None.	1. Assume jurisdiction 2. Order to show cause why writ should not be granted 3. Grant writ 4. Grant other relief	Plaintiffs filed a motion for class certification on July 23, 2008, seeking to certify a class consisting of all who are or will be detained in the Allegheny County Jail based solely on an immigration detainer and without the opportunity to	http://www.legalactioncenter.org/sites/default/files/docs/lac/Urbina%20v.%20Rustin%20Habeas%20and%20Compl.pdf
<i>Renteria-Villegas v. Metropolitan Government of Nashville</i>	2011 WL 4048523 (M.D. Tenn. Sept. 12, 2011) (unpublished)	P: National Lawyers Guild National Immigration Project, SPLC (Tom Fritzsche) D: ICE, local government	The lawsuit argued that the Tennessee Supreme Court previously ruled that the Nashville Police Department was solely responsible for all prevention and detection of crimes, investigation and apprehension of criminals, and enforcement of criminal and civil laws.	5 USC 702	2. Violation of Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. §§ 701 et seq.; 28 U.S.C. § 2201) 3. Violation of Fourteenth Amendment Due Process clause	1. Violation of Metropolitan Charter (Tenn. Code. §§ 29-14-102, 103, 111; 28 U.S.C. § 2201) 4. False imprisonment	1. Declaratory judgment 2. Preliminary and then permanent injunction 3. Compensatory and permanent damages 4-5. Reasonable costs / other relief	Claim that local cooperation with ICE violated city charter was allowed to go forward	http://cdna.splcenter.org/sites/default/files/downloads/casere/Renteria-Villegas_ThirdAmended_Complaint.pdf