

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
LAFAYETTE DIVISION**

PARISA ZEAIEAN FIROUZABADI,
Petitioner,

v.

Civil Action No. 6:25-cv-1018

DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity
as President of the United States;

PETE HEGSETH, in his official capacity as
Secretary of Defense;

KRISTI NOEM, in her official capacity as
Secretary of the Department of Homeland
Security;

PAMELA BONDI, in her official capacity as
Attorney General of the United States;

TODD LYONS, in his official capacity as
Acting Director and Senior Official
Performing the Duties of the Director of U.S.
Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

BRIAN S. ACUNA, in his official capacity
as Acting Field Office Director of the New
Orleans Field Office of U.S. Immigration and
Customs Enforcement, Enforcement and
Removal Operations;

Respondents.

VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2241

1. This case asks whether local police can use false pretenses to lure a non-citizen graduate student, who entered the United States legally and has no criminal record, out of her domicile—in order to give Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) the opportunity to arrest and detain her, despite the presence of no exigent circumstances and for reasons that appear tied wholly to her Iranian nationality.

2. Until the afternoon of June 22, 2025—the day after the United States dropped bunker-busting bombs on Iran—Petitioner Parisa Zeaiean Firouzabadi (“Petitioner” or “Parisa”) and her husband, Pouria Pourhosseinhendabad (“Pouria”), lived together in their off-campus apartment in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. That Sunday afternoon, their life changed dramatically. They received a knock on their apartment door around 5 p.m. from state police officers dressed in dark blue uniforms. Those officers informed the couple that they were investigating a hit-and-run accident that the two had reported a couple weeks prior.

3. When the officers asked the couple to show them the car so that they could assess the damage, Parisa and Pouria complied. Together, the couple exited their apartment and led the way to the parking lot. Once outside and in the parking lot, Parisa and Pouria were immediately met by federal government agents, some of whom, upon information and belief, were employed by ICE. Those agents handcuffed and arrested the couple. ICE did not provide or present a warrant for the arrest of either one.

4. Parisa is now detained at the South Louisiana ICE Processing Center (“SLIPC”) in Basile, Louisiana. She has no criminal record in the United States, which she entered legally on August 12, 2023.

5. As of June 26, 2025—four (4) days after the date of her arrest and detention—Parisa had not been served with a Notice to Appear (“NTA”) or a Notice of Custody Determination.

6. Then, on June 27, 2025, an NTA was uploaded into the Immigration Court electronic record that curiously listed a document date of June 23, 2025—the day *after* Parisa’s arrest, suggesting that the charges themselves were nonexistent on the date of her arrest. That NTA alleged that Parisa had failed to maintain her nonimmigrant status because her visa revocation on September 27, 2023 was issued pursuant to “P3A11 grounds (to violate any law of the United States relating to espionage or sabotage).”

7. The outrageous P3A11 aspect of the allegation was rescinded by ICE 10 days later, on July 7, 2025, and corrected to reflect that Parisa was now only being charged as deportable based on her visa revocation—despite the fact that she had been actively enrolled, attending classes, and working at Louisiana State University (“LSU”) on the date of her arrest.

8. Upon information and belief, students whose visas are revoked, but who remain enrolled in the academic programs that formed the basis of their then-revoked student visas, remain in lawful nonimmigrant status. In accordance with due process, they are not, as here, detained in the absence of a Notice of Custody Determination, let alone an Arrest Warrant, and where they present no danger to the community or are not a flight risk. Parisa’s detention—which occurred on the heels of the United States’ bombing of Iran and as part of a concerted, public effort by the Executive Branch to round up suspected Iranian terrorists—is unlawful, as it appears based solely on her Iranian nationality.

9. By way of background, when Parisa learned of her visa revocation on October 3, 2023, she spoke with LSU personnel who informed her that her visa revocation did not affect her enrollment status at LSU. They told her that the visa was required to get into the country, but that its revocation did not affect her ability to continue her studies in the United States—provided that she did not

attempt to leave the country and return because, at that point, she would be barred from re-entering as a result of the now-revoked visa.¹

10. Parisa, by and through undersigned counsel, submits this petition for a writ of habeas corpus (“Petition”) to remedy her unlawful detention pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, the All-Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651, and the due process and equal protection clauses of the United States Constitution. In support of this Petition, Parisa alleges as follows.

INTRODUCTION

Parisa Was Pursuing Graduate Work at the Time of her Unlawful Arrest By ICE, Which State Police Perpetrated Under False Pretenses.

11. On the evening of June 21, 2025, local time, the United States of America launched airstrikes against three nuclear facilities located in Iran.²

12. When the B-2 Spirit bombers dropped bunker-busting bombs and Tomahawk missiles in Iran—approximately 7,500 miles away, in Baton Rouge, Louisiana—30-year-old Parisa, a graduate student in material sciences, was asleep, lying next to her husband, Pouria, also a PhD candidate at LSU.

13. When Parisa awoke on June 22, 2025, she was looking forward to a normal Sunday with her husband, which typically included sleeping in and some focused work in their respective fields before preparing dinner.

¹ See, e.g. <https://www.hunton.com/insights/legal/international-students-face-visa-revocations-and-status-terminations-what-does-that-mean-for-higher-education-institutions#:~:text=A%20visa%20revocation%2C%20while%20significant,valid%20F%2D1%20student%20status> (“A visa revocation, while significant, only impacts a person’s ability to return to the United States following international travel. It does not impact status. An F-1 student can have their F-1 visa revoked, expire or cancelled, but can still remain in the United States with their valid F-1 student status.”)

² John Gambrell, *Alarm grows after the US inserts itself into Israel’s war against Iran with strikes on nuclear sites*, Associated Press (Jun. 23, 2025), <https://apnews.com/article/israel-iran-war-nuclear-trump-bomber-news-06-22-2025-c2baca52babe915e033ae175ce8b2687>.

14. That all changed at 5 p.m. CST, when state police officers knocked on her apartment door. When she and her husband answered, the two officers in Parisa's line of sight began asking her and her husband about a minor hit-and-run, of which the couple had been victims a couple weeks prior. The officers asked if the couple would be willing to come outside to show them the damage to the vehicle.

15. The couple complied. Indeed, it never dawned on either of them that they were being lured outside on false pretenses in the absence of a judicial warrant. So they led the two officers standing before them—as well as the two officers they then encountered standing at the bottom of the stairs—to the parking lot.

16. It was there, in the parking lot, that she and her husband were confronted by several vans—what appeared to be seven (7) in total, a number of which were manned by federal agents, some of whom were wearing full face masks and tactical gear. The agents placed Parisa and her husband in handcuffs and took their phones, apartment keys, and car keys.

17. There was no opportunity to show state police the damage to their car from the hit-and-run, as that was clearly not the intention of their visit to the couple's home on June 22, 2025.

18. After her arrest, state police brought Parisa to an unmarked facility in Baton Rouge where she was held until 4 or 5 a.m. She was then transported, along with her husband, to a county jail in Hancock County, Mississippi.

19. Parisa was next separated from her husband and transported to SLIPC.

20. On June 27, 2025, an NTA dated June 23, 2025 (the day *after* Parisa's arrest) was uploaded into the Immigration Court electronic record. It showed that, the day *after* her arrest, she was being charged with overstaying a visa revoked on September 27, 2023, pursuant to grounds related to espionage or sabotage against the United States. (Her visa had in fact been revoked on September

28, 2023 and she was informed of this fact on October 3, 2023; but no reasons for the revocation had ever been provided to her then.)

21. That outrageous allegation concerning espionage or sabotage was corrected on July 7, 2025, and served on Parisa on July 8, 2025. Thereafter, in the absence of the unfounded allegation of espionage or sabotage, she was accused of being deportable based solely on the visa revocation.

22. But she still remains jailed despite the fact that, upon information and belief, students whose visas are revoked, but who continue to stay enrolled in their academic programs, are not detained by ICE. Instead, they are generally provided with time to either leave the country or repair their revoked visa status.

23. In short, Parisa appears to have been arrested and detained on June 22, 2025, because she was listed as an Iranian living in the United States.

24. The post-hoc justification for her arrest appears to have come later.

25. Parisa is currently jailed at SLIPC despite neither being a danger to her community or a flight risk.

26. She is concerned that her detention will interfere with her graduate degree program, classes for which resume next month.

Parisa's 2-Year History in the United States

27. At the time of her arrest, Parisa had been living in her Brightside Drive apartment in Baton Rouge for two (2) years.

28. Parisa came to the United States on an F-1 student visa from Iran on August 12, 2023 when she was 28 years old.

29. She was provided with notice of its September 28, 2023 revocation on October 3, 2023. But no details as to why it had been revoked were provided.

30. Parisa immediately consulted with personnel at LSU, who informed her that—as long as she stayed enrolled in her program and maintained good standing—she would not have any issues. They, nonetheless, told her that if she tried to leave the country and reenter, she would not be allowed to do so because she no longer has a visa to grant her entry into the United States.

31. Parisa took this advice to heart and continued graduate school, understanding that she could not leave the United States during the course of her schoolwork.

32. In or around March of 2024, Parisa applied for asylum—a form of protection granted to individuals who cannot return to their home countries due to persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution based on specific grounds, like political opinion or membership in a particular social group. That application remains pending before the United States Citizenship and Immigration Service.

33. This fact remained true on June 22, 2025, when she was abruptly arrested by ICE and taken into custody.

34. The only thing that had markedly changed in Parisa’s life between the date of her visa revocation and June 22 was that, on that date, mere hours after the bombing of Iran, the United States government had started hunting Iranians on its own soil. As the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) would later announce in a June 24, 2025, press release, DHS’s decision to round up Iranians living in the United States in the days following the bombing of Iran was part of a “commitment to keeping known and suspected terrorists out of American communities.”³

35. Tellingly, Parisa’s arrest was not touted by DHS in its June 24, 2025 release that identified by name and photograph 11 Iranians arrested around the country in the days immediately

³ Department of Homeland Security, *ICE Arrests 11 Iranian Nationals Illegally in the U.S. Over the Weekend* (Jun. 24, 2025), <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2025/06/24/ice-arrests-11-iranian-nationals-illegally-us-over-weekend>.

following the bombing. A DHS spokesperson announced that the department “has been full throttle on identifying and arresting known or suspected terrorists and violent extremists that illegally entered this country”⁴

36. But Parisa has never once fit that bill. To the contrary, she was admitted into the United States in lawful nonimmigrant student status for the duration of her studies and has no criminal record.

37. Because Parisa’s detention is not premised on her being a danger to the community or a flight risk, her detention violates the due process clause of the United States Constitution, which forbids the government from depriving any person, including noncitizens, of their liberty without due process of law. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001).

38. Parisa also never received appropriate documentation of her arrest and reason for detention. The law requires that when the government makes a custody determination, they need to provide you with a written Notice of Custody Determination, Form I-286. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 236.1(g). Separately, when the government serves an NTA, they must also serve you with a warrant for your arrest. *See* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1229, 1230; 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.2(a), 236.1(b). The government has failed to serve Parisa or her immigration attorney, for that matter, with a Notice of Custody Determination and did not serve the warrant for her arrest when they issued her NTA, as required by law.

39. Parisa’s detention, which was perpetrated by a ruse, also violates the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution—which protects individuals, including immigrants, from unlawful and unreasonable seizures. *See Lewis v. United States*, 385 U.S. 206, 209 (1986).

⁴ *Id.*

40. Her detention also violates the Equal Protection Clause, which prohibits discriminating against individuals based solely on their nationality. *See Korematsu v. United States*, 323 U.S. 214 (1944) (“All legal restrictions which curtail the civil rights of a single racial group are immediately suspect.”); *Trump v. Hawaii*, 585 U.S. 667 (2018) (“*Korematsu* was gravely wrong the day it was decided. . . .”). Because her detention is tied to unlawful discrimination on the basis of national origin—in short, the categorical rounding up of Iranians, regardless of criminal history or documentation, including here, a valid I-20, showing her active enrollment at LSU—she is entitled to immediate release.⁵

41. Because Parisa’s unlawful arrest and detention bears no reasonable relationship to the government’s legitimate purposes for detention—protecting against danger and flight risk—as a matter of due process, she is entitled to immediate release as being an Iranian national is not unlawful in and of itself.

42. Parisa respectfully petitions this Court for a writ of habeas corpus to remedy her unlawful detention and order her release because there is no basis for her detention.

43. In addition, Parisa asks this Court for an order prohibiting Respondents from transferring her out of the district to ensure this Court’s jurisdiction over her habeas petition, and to ensure she is provided with daily legal calls with her habeas counsel to protect her rights to fully pursue her habeas claim with unobstructed assistance of her pro bono counsel.

⁵ Another Iranian national in Louisiana, Mandonna Kashanian, was arrested and detained by ICE on the same day as Parisa and for ostensibly the same reason: for being an Iranian national in the United States at the time that the country decided to bomb Iran. She was nevertheless released in short order. *See Jack Brook, Iranian mother released from ICE detention after Republican House Majority Leader intervenes*, Associated Press (Jul. 9, 2025), <https://apnews.com/article/ice-iranian-woman-release-detain-louisiana-mandonna-kashanian-3d5c868bbc43f152b7e8ec54db7fe49a>.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

44. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus authority); 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question jurisdiction); U.S. CONST. art. I, § 9, cl. 2 (Suspension Clause); and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202 (Declaratory Judgment Act).

45. Federal district courts have jurisdiction to hear habeas claims by noncitizens challenging both the lawfulness and the constitutionality of their detention. *See Demore v. Hyung Joon Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 516–17 (2003); *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 687. Parisa’s current detention, as imposed by Respondents, constitutes a “severe restraint[] on [her] individual liberty,” such that she is “in custody in violation” of the law. *See Hensley v. Mun. Ct., San Jose Milpitas Jud. Dist.*, 411 U.S. 345, 351 (1973); 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3).

46. Venue properly lies with this Court under 28 U.S.C. §1391(e) because Petitioner is physically present and in the custody of Respondents at SLIPC, located in Basile, Louisiana, within the jurisdiction of the Western District of Louisiana. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d).

47. Venue is proper within the Lafayette Division because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims in this action took place in this District. SLIPC is located within the Lafayette Division. W.D. La. Local Civ. R. 77.3.

PARTIES

48. Petitioner Parisa Zeaiean Firouzabadi is a 30-year-old Iranian woman who was detained by Respondents on June 22, 2025. She has been residing in the United States since her legal arrival in August of 2023. Parisa is a graduate student at LSU and is married to fellow LSU student Pouria Pourhosseinhendabad, who is pursuing a PhD in mechanical engineering. Parisa is currently detained at SLIPC.

49. Respondent Donald J. Trump is named in his official capacity as President of the United States. In this role, he is ultimately responsible for the policies and actions of the executive branch, including those of DHS, which oversees ICE.

50. Respondent Pete Hegseth is named in his official capacity as Secretary of Defense. In this capacity, he oversees the Department of Defense and acts as the principal defense policy maker and advisor concerning international conflicts. He is sued in his official capacity.

51. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of DHS. As such, Respondent Noem is responsible for the administration of immigration laws and policies pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1103. She supervises DHS's components including ICE and, as such, she is a legal custodian of Petitioner. She is sued in her official capacity.

52. Respondent Pamela Bondi is the Attorney General of the United States. As Attorney General, Respondent Bondi oversees the immigration court system, including the immigration judges who conduct bond hearings as her designees, and is responsible for the administration of immigration laws pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1103(g). She is legally responsible for administering Petitioner's removal and bond proceedings, including the standards used in those proceedings, and as such, she is Parisa's legal custodian. She is sued in her official capacity.

53. Respondent Todd Lyons is the acting ICE Director and Senior Official Performing the Duties of the Director. In that capacity, he is a legal custodian of Parisa. He is sued in his official capacity

54. Respondent Brian S. Acuna is ICE's Acting Field Office Director for the New Orleans Field Office of ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations. As Field Office Director, Respondent Acuna oversees ICE's enforcement and removal operations in the New Orleans District, which

includes Louisiana. Petitioner is currently detained within this area of responsibility and, as such, Respondent Acuna is a legal custodian of Parisa. He is sued in his official capacity.

EXHAUSTION OF REMEDIES

55. No statutory exhaustion requirement applies to a petition challenging immigration detention under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. *See, e.g., Montano v. Texas*, 867 F.3d 540, 542 (5th Cir. 2017) (“Unlike 28 U.S.C. § 2254, Section 2241’s text does not require exhaustion.”); *Robinson v. Wade*, 686 F.2d 298, 303 n.8 (5th Cir. 1982) (“[S]ection 2241 contains no statutory requirement of exhaustion like that found in section 2254(b)”). Parisa’s claims—that her detention is unconstitutional pursuant to the Fourth Amendment and the due process and equal protection clauses of the Constitution—is unrelated to any legitimate governmental purpose and, as such, are not subject to any statutory requirement of administrative exhaustion, rendering exhaustion not a jurisdictional prerequisite. *See McCarthy v. Madigan*, 503 U.S. 140, 144 (1992).

56. To the extent that any prudential considerations might lead the Court to consider requiring exhaustion as a matter of discretion, the Supreme Court has recognized that courts should not require exhaustion where there is an “unreasonable or indefinite timeframe for administrative action.” *Id.* at 147. Exhaustion is thus not appropriate where the petitioner “may suffer irreparable harm if unable to secure immediate judicial consideration of [her] claim.” *Id.* Because she is in detention, and each day she sits there is an injury, only this Court has the capacity to timely free her from custody.

**STATEMENT OF FACTS AND
PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

In 2023, Parisa Comes to the US to Begin Post-Graduate Work at LSU.

57. Parisa is a 30-year-old graduate student at LSU in Baton Rouge, Louisiana and a citizen and native of Iran.

58. In 2023, Parisa married her husband Pouria in Tehran, Iran.

59. They both came to the United States in 2023 for Parisa's graduate studies. Her husband subsequently applied for an F-1 visa, which was granted upon his admission to pursue his own PhD in material science in the Mechanical Engineering Department at LSU.

60. On August 12, 2023, Parisa arrived in the United States on an F-1 nonimmigrant visa for students.

61. On September 28, 2023, the United States Department of State revoked her F-1 visa under Section 222(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

62. Parisa immediately spoke with LSU personnel, who informed her that the visa revocation did not affect her ability to pursue her studies in the United States and that—as long as she stayed enrolled and maintained good standing at LSU—her SEVIS record and her attendant I-20 would remain active. If Parisa sought to leave the country, however, they informed her that she would not be allowed back in as a result of the now-revoked visa.

63. Parisa thus continued her studies, all the while maintaining her nonimmigrant status and pursuing her PhD studies at LSU.

On June 21, 2025, the US Strikes Iran, and on the Following Day Parisa and Other Law-Abiding Iranians Are Arrested.

64. On June 21, 2025, the United States intervened in the conflict between Iran and Israel, striking three Iranian nuclear sites.⁶

65. Shortly after the bombing campaign, several members of the federal government indicated that immigration enforcement efforts were being focused on Iranian nationals with terrorist ties on United States soil. Respondent DHS issued a public press release touting its success in arresting Iranian nationals with suspected or known terrorist ties.

66. For example, Executive Associate Director of Enforcement and Removal Operations, Tom Homan, stated that Respondents had arrested over 100 Iranians as part of a campaign against Iranian “sleeper cells.”⁷

67. On Sunday morning, June 22, 2025, at 10 a.m., an Iranian national made headlines when she was arrested in New Orleans, Louisiana despite being a longtime resident.⁸

68. On Sunday, June 22, at 5 p.m., in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Parisa was at her apartment with her husband when they were lured to their arrests.

69. Around 5 p.m. CST that day, seven (7) vehicles carrying police officers and other government agents, a number of whom, upon information and belief, were ICE officers, arrived in the parking lot of Parisa’s apartment complex.

70. Four police officers entered her apartment building.

⁶ Swapna Venugopal Ramaswamy et. Al., *Iran warns it ‘reserves all options’ after US airstrikes on nuclear sites: Recap* (Jun. 22, 2025 10:07 AM), <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2025/06/21/trump-us-strikes-iran-nuclear-sites/84303364007/>.

⁷ Cameron Arcand, et. al., *ICE arrests 100+ Iranian nations across US amid sleeper cell concerns* (Jun. 26, 2025 11:55 AM), <https://www.foxnews.com/politics/ice-arrests-100-iranian-nationals-across-us-amid-sleeper-cell-concerns>.

⁸ Mandy Taheri, *Iranian Woman Who Has Lived in US for Four Decades Detained by ICE* (Jun. 29, 2025 10:08 AM), <https://www.newsweek.com/iranian-woman-who-has-lived-us-four-decades-detained-ice-2092082>.

71. Two of them proceeded to knock on her door, while the other two watched from the stairwell of the building.

72. The officers in Parisa's line of sight and present at her door asked her about a hit-and-run that she and her husband had reported a couple weeks prior.

73. The couple assured the officers that the damage to the vehicle was minor and that, as such, they did not wish to take the matter further.

74. The officers nonetheless asked the couple to show them the vehicle so they could assess the damage.

75. In an effort to aid the police with their investigation, Parisa and her husband escorted the two officers, which turned into a total of four officers when they arrived at the bottom of the stairwell, out of the apartment building and into the parking lot.

76. Unbeknownst to Parisa, several more officers, as well as, upon information and belief, ICE and FBI agents—some wearing full face masks and tactical gear—were waiting in the parking lot for Parisa.

77. Upon her and her husband's arrival in the parking lot, ICE asked Parisa if she was Pouria, whereupon she explained that Pouria was her husband, pointing at him. The agents proceeded to handcuff both Parisa and Pouria, taking their phones, car keys, and apartment keys in the process. They then placed each in a different unmarked vehicle.

78. No warrants were shown to either Pouria or Parisa.

79. Both were transported to, on information belief, the local ICE office in Baton Rouge where they were asked a series of questions.

80. At the office, Parisa was told her visa had been revoked. She was additionally asked a series of questions, reminiscent of her student visa interview, which appeared to be a means by which to confirm her identity.

81. Parisa stayed at the local ICE building in Baton Rouge until 4 or 5 a.m., at which point she and her husband were transferred to Hancock County, Mississippi, after which Parisa was transferred to SLIPC, where she remains detained today.

82. At no point during or after the arrest was Parisa shown a warrant. And she still has yet to be served with either the Arrest Warrant or a Notice of Custody Determination, in contravention of ICE's statutory and regulatory obligations.

83. On June 27, 2025—after languishing in detention for nearly a week without any written documentation explaining her arrest and subsequent detention—Parisa's NTA was uploaded to the Immigration Court electronic record. That document reflects that she was being charged with failing to maintain her nonimmigrant student status, which had been revoked on September 27, 2023, because, at the time, she had been suspected of espionage or sabotage against the United States. That document was curiously dated, June 23, 2025—the day *after* Parisa's arrest.

84. Ten days later, on July 7, 2025, the outrageous espionage or sabotage allegation was removed from Parisa's immigration charges and the charge against her became one of a visa revocation only.

85. She was nevertheless not released, despite neither being a danger to the community or a flight risk—the only two purposes civil immigration detention is allowed to serve.

LEGAL BACKGROUND AND ARGUMENT

Parisa's Arrest Violates the Fourth Amendment's Guarantee Against Unlawful Seizures.

86. Like all people in the United States, when she was safely residing in her apartment, Parisa was safe from unlawful government intrusion—a fact Respondents knew all too well. *See People v. Reyes*, 83 Cal. App. 4th 7 (Cal. 4th Dist. Ct. App. 2000) (finding that a ruse that undermines the voluntariness of consent, such as luring someone outside under false pretenses unrelated to criminal activity, can invalidate subsequent actions like searches or arrests); *Ciampi v. City of Palo Alto*, 790 F. Supp. 2d 1077 (N. D. Cal. 2011) (holding that deception becomes unlawful when it intrudes on a person's reasonable expectation of privacy or misrepresents the scope or purpose of an investigation); *see also SEC v. ESM Gov't Sec., Inc.*, 645 F.2d 320 (5th Cir. 1981) (similar).

87. To circumvent these Fourth Amendment protections, Parisa was led outside of the constitutional safety of her apartment through deception, also known as a “ruse” for purposes of the Fourth Amendment.

88. The Supreme Court has held that the Constitution provides “checks upon official deception for the protection of the individual.” *Lewis v. United States*, 385 U.S. at 209. These checks include, for example, an analysis of exigent circumstances that may permit a ruse. *Id.*

89. The way that state police presented themselves to Parisa—as though they were investigating the hit-and-run of which Parisa had been a victim weeks prior—constitutes a ruse because it was an official deception that was used to arrest and detain her.

90. The Fourth Amendment only permits ruses where there are exigent circumstances that can justify the use of stratagem or deception. *Id.* at 206. None existed here.

91. In this case, there were no exigent circumstances, let alone any circumstances, to justify the use of a “ruse” to take Parisa into custody.

92. The Supreme Court has ruled that a consensual encounter becomes a seizure when “in view of all the circumstances surrounding the incident, a reasonable person would have believed that he was not free to leave.” *United States v. Mendenhall*, 446 U.S. 544, 554 (1980). Such circumstances could include “the threatening presence of several officers, the display of a weapon by an officer, some physical touching of the person, or the use of language or tone of voice indicating that compliance with the officer’s request might be compelled.” *Id.*

93. The officers that knocked on Parisa’s door presented themselves in a way that indicated they were investigating a crime—the hit-and-run that Parisa had suffered a couple weeks prior. Multiple officers were present and were speaking to Parisa in an authoritative tone. Under these circumstances, Parisa had a reasonable belief that she was not free to leave them at the door and shut it.

94. The Supreme Court defines submission based on what a person was doing before the show of authority. For example, “a fleeing man is not seized until he is physically overpowered, but one sitting in a chair may submit to authority by not getting up to run away.” *Brendlin v. California*, 551 U.S. 249, 262 (2007).

95. Parisa did not run away or attempt to flee from the police officers in her apartment building or the ICE agents approaching her in the parking lot, thus effectively submitting herself to the agents before she was physically captured.

96. Parisa reasonably believed that she had no choice but to submit to the officer’s authority. The moment she submitted to their authority—when she agreed to walk state police out to the parking lot—she was effectively seized.

Parisa’s Detention Violates Both Procedural and Substantive Due Process.

97. Parisa’s detention also violates her due process rights.

98. The Supreme Court has long made clear that, where the government seeks to deprive an individual of a “particularly important individual interest[],” it must bear the burden of justifying this deprivation by clear and convincing evidence. *See, e.g., Addington v. Texas*, 441 U.S. 418, 424 (1979). In cases like Parisa’s, where she has complied with her nonimmigrant status for the last two years and was suddenly arrested without explanation, and then with an explanation (espionage or sabotage) that was then rescinded to reflect simple visa revocation, there is a significant interest at stake and a “clear and convincing” evidence standard provides the appropriate level of procedural protection in ensuring people are not detained for purposes that contradict the regulatory purposes of immigration detention. *See id.* at 423; *see also Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690-91.

99. To comport with substantive due process, civil immigration detention must bear a reasonable relationship to its two regulatory purposes—(1) to ensure the appearance of noncitizens at future hearings, and (2) to prevent danger to the community pending the completion of removal. *Id.*

100. This analysis is wholly inapplicable because—once again—Parisa is not a threat. She is not a danger to the community, as made evident by her complete lack of criminal history. And, at no point during or after the arrest was Parisa shown a warrant. And, she still has yet to be served with either the Arrest Warrant or a Notice of Custody Determination, in contravention of ICE’s statutory and regulatory obligations.

101. Parisa is currently enrolled at LSU. The government thus has no legitimate interest in detaining her. *See Demore*, 538 U.S. at 533 (O’Conner, J., concurring).

102. No public interest is served by detaining a 30-year-old graduate student who has entered the country legally and maintains her good standing at the university to which she was admitted and a clean (*i.e.*, nonexistent) criminal record.

Parisa’s Detention Appears Strictly and Unconstitutionally Based on Her National Origin.

103. Detention based strictly on national origin and for any purpose other than flight risk, danger, or imminent removal—particularly of a law-abiding individual who entered the country legally—violates the equal protection clause of the United States Constitution.

104. The “liberty protected by the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause contains within it the prohibition against denying to *any person* the equal protection of the laws [. . .] [T]he equal protection guarantee of the Fourteenth Amendment makes that Fifth Amendment right all the more specific and all the better understood and preserved.” *United States v. Windsor*, 570 U.S. 744, 774 (2013) (emphasis added).

105. The United States Supreme Court has made clear that the protections of the Fourteenth Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause are “precisely the same” as the Equal Protection guarantees under the Fourteenth Amendment. *See Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña*, 515 U.S. 200, 217 (1995).

106. Put simply, equal protection “is essentially a direction that all persons similarly situated should be treated alike.” *City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Ctr., Inc.*, 473 U.S. 432, 439 (1985).

107. The government’s actions violate this directive when, for example, an otherwise neutral law or policy (here, visa revocation) is applied in a discriminatory manner (resulting in the jailing of those of a particular nationality). *See, e.g., Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, 373-74 (1886).

108. On information and belief—premised on the fact that her NTA was issued *after* her arrest date; that she still has yet to receive a Notice of Custody determination; and that, when she

received her NTA, no arrest warrant was served on her—Respondents targeted Parisa for arrest and detention because she is Iranian. That is, on the basis of her national origin, rendering her detention unconstitutional.

109. Indeed, the government touted their efforts at rounding up Iranians over the weekend that Parisa was arrested as being in conjunction with the United States’ bombing of Iran—inexplicably asserting that the arrests of “130 Iranian nationals” across the country, of which Parisa appears to have been a part, were part of combating a “sleeper cell.”⁹

110. For someone with no criminal record and an impressive academic career, logic states that her arrest was for a singular purpose: to bump up the numbers of Iranians the United States could claim it rounded up in an effort to combat terrorism in the days after it bombed Iran.

111. Parisa’s arrest and detention are accordingly unlawful, warranting immediate release.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT ONE

Parisa’s Unlawful and Continued Seizure Violates the Fourth Amendment.

112. Parisa realleges and incorporates by reference all of the aforementioned allegations included in the above-numbered paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.

⁹ “[DHS] spokeswoman Tricia McLaughlin . . . didn’t offer any evidence of terrorist or extremist ties” with regard to the first 11 Iranians arrested for “immigration violations” during the weekend of U.S. missile strikes. Of the 670 Iranians in ICE custody nationwide, 130 (or nearly 20%) were detained within the days after U.S. airstrikes. See Kim Chandler, *After decades in the US, Iranians arrested in Trump’s deportation drive*, Associated Press (Jun. 28, 2025), <https://apnews.com/article/iran-immigration-arrests-us-trump-deportations-9a4136657bda3a277125738807848368>. This includes Donna Kashanian, who was in full compliance with her Order of Supervision when she was arrested June 22, 2025. See Mandy Taheri, *Iranian Woman Who Has Lived in US for Four Decades Detained by ICE*, Newsweek (Jun. 28, 2025) <https://www.newsweek.com/iranian-woman-who-has-lived-us-four-decades-detained-ice-2092082>. She was released on July 7, 2025. Jack Brook, *Iranian mother released from ICE detention after Republican House Majority Leader intervenes*, Associated Press (Jul. 9, 2025), <https://apnews.com/article/ice-iranian-woman-release-detain-louisiana-mandonna-kashanian-3d5c868bbc43f152b7e8ec54db7fe49a>.

113. Parisa was detained by federal immigration officials after local police lured her out of the safety and privacy of her domicile pursuant to a ruse.

114. Her arrest, which lacked a judicial warrant, was an unreasonable seizure that violated her right to be secure in her home.

115. Because Petitioner's ongoing detention was premised on an unconstitutional arrest, her detention is unlawful, and she should be released.

COUNT TWO

Parisa's Detention Violates the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Guarantees.

116. Parisa realleges and incorporates by reference all of the aforementioned allegations included in the above-numbered paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.

117. Parisa's detention violates her due process rights because her liberty is being restricted without justification (indeed, in the absence of a Notice of Custody Determination and a properly served Arrest Warrant) and to the extent a justification has been provided—her Iranian nationality—that justification is unconstitutional. *See Hensley*, 411 U.S. at 351; 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3).

118. The only permissible detention purposes for detention—preventing danger and flight risk—are not present here, infringing upon Parisa's liberty interest. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690-91.

119. For this reason, and because Parisa appears to have been strictly targeted based on her nationality, her detention is unconstitutional. She should accordingly be released.

COUNT THREE

Parisa's Detention Violates the Equal Protection Clause.

120. Parisa realleges and incorporates by reference all of the aforementioned allegations included in the above-numbered paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.

121. The U.S. Constitution guarantees equal protection of the law and bars discrimination on the basis of national origin. *See Yick Wo*, 118 U.S. at 373-74.

122. These protections are exactly the same under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. *See Adarand Constructors, Inc.*, 515 U.S. at 217.

123. The United States announced that it had bombed Iran on Saturday, June 21, 2025.

124. The United States later announced that it had carried out a nationwide campaign of arrests targeting Iranian nationals in the aftermath of the June 21, 2025, bombing campaign. Parisa's arrest and detention occurred on Sunday, June 22, 2025.

125. After residing in the United States as a student for nearly two years, Parisa's arrest occurred during Respondent's campaign targeting Iranians for arrest.

126. Parisa, a 30-year-old graduate student with no criminal history, poses neither a flight risk nor a danger to the community, rendering her detention, premised on her nationality, unconstitutional.

127. Her sudden arrest and subsequent detention appear based, on information and belief, on an illegitimate government motive: her national origin.

128. Because her detention is based on her national origin, and not on any legitimate government interest, her detention is unlawful. She should accordingly be released.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court:

- 1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- 2) Issue an order prohibiting Respondents from transferring Parisa outside of this judicial district during the pendency of these habeas proceedings;
- 3) Declare that Parisa's detention is unconstitutional;
- 4) Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus and order Parisa's immediate release;
- 5) Award Petitioner her costs and reasonable attorneys' fees in this action as provided for by the Equal Access to Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2412; and,
- 6) Grant such further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: July 15, 2025

/s/ Sarah E. Decker

Sarah E. Decker*

ROBERT F. KENNEDY HUMAN
RIGHTS

1300 19th Street NW, Suite 750

Washington, DC 20036

Tel.: (908) 967-3245

decker@rfkhumanrights.org

/s/ Sarah T. Gillman

Sarah T. Gillman*

ROBERT F. KENNEDY HUMAN
RIGHTS

88 Pine Street, 8th Floor, Suite 801

New York, New York 10005

Tel.: (646) 289-5593

gillman@rfkhumanrights.org

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Charles Andrew Perry

Charles Andrew Perry

LA Bar No. 40906

ACLU Foundation of Louisiana

1340 Poydras St., Ste. 2160

New Orleans, LA 70112

Tel: (504) 522-0628

aperry@laaclu.org

/s/Nora Ahmed

Nora Ahmed*

NY Bar No. 5092374

ACLU Foundation of Louisiana

1340 Poydras St., Ste. 2160

New Orleans, LA 70112

Tel: (504) 522-0628

nahmed@laaclu.org

Attorneys for Plaintiff

** Pro hac vice applications forthcoming*

28 U.S.C. § 2242 VERIFICATION STATEMENT

I am submitting this verification on behalf of the Petitioner because I am one of the Petitioner's attorneys. I have discussed with the Petitioner, and/or someone acting on her behalf, the events described in this Petition. On the basis of those discussions, I hereby verify that the statements made in this Petition are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: July 15, 2025

/s/ Charles Andrew Perry

Charles Andrew Perry

ACLU Foundation of Louisiana

LA Bar No. 40906

1340 Poydras St., Ste. 2160

New Orleans, LA 70112

Tel: (504) 522-0628

aperry@laaclu.org