

TODD BLANCHE
Deputy Attorney General of the United States
SIGAL CHATTAH
First Assistant United States Attorney
District of Nevada
Nevada Bar Number 8264
SUMMER A. JOHNSON
Assistant United States Attorney
VIRGINIA T. TOMOVA
Assistant United States Attorney
Nevada Bar No. 12504
CHRISTIAN R. RUIZ
Assistant United States Attorney
501 Las Vegas Blvd. So., Suite 1100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Phone: (702) 388-6336
Fax: (702) 388-6336
Summer.Johnson@usdoj.gov
Virginia.Tomova@usdoj.gov
Christian.Ruiz@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for the Federal Respondents

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Victor Kalid JACOBO RAMIREZ,

Petitioners,

v.

Kristi NOEM et al.,

Respondents.

Case No. 2:25-cv-02136-RFB-MDC

**Joint Status Report Regarding Pre-
Certification Discovery in Compliance
with Court's Order ECF No. 43**

This joint status report is filed in compliance with the Court's order regarding status of pre-certification discovery. ECF No. 43. According to the Court's order, this report should be filed by 4:00 pm. *Id.* However, due to heavy workload, Petitioners counsel's notification that she will need 30 minutes to review the joint status report, and subsequent revisions from Petitioners' counsel, this joint status report was filed after the 4:00 pm deadline. Federal Respondents submitted the joint status report draft via PDF to Petitioners' counsel at 3:57 pm. A few minutes after receiving the email, Petitioner's counsel requested a Word version of the joint status report instead of a PDF to be able to make edits. Running into the same issue with Petitioner's counsel previously, Counsel for

1 Federal Respondents explained to Plaintiff's counsel that due to departmental policies
2 Word versions of documents cannot be sent, but only PDF versions and that she needed
3 to email her revisions. By 4:47 pm, and after not receiving a Word version of the status
4 report, Petitioner's counsel sent edits by comment in the PDF. After written exchanges,
5 revisions and telephone conferences between the parties, regarding the scope of and
6 language in the protective order, the parties were not able to agree on the terms of such
7 order, which resulted in motion work. ECF No. 17. On November 17, 2025, Federal
8 Respondents filed a motion for protective order. ECF No. 25. On November 19, 2025,
9 Defendant John Mattos filed a joinder to the motion for protective order. ECF No. 28.
10 On November 19, 2025, Petitioners filed a response to the motion for protective order.
11 ECF No 30. On November 21, 2025, the Court signed the Protective Order. ECF No. 34.
12 The signing of the protective order was a condition precedent to any pre-certification
13 discovery, including the production of the list of the 185 detainees, identified as applicants
14 for admission by DHS and subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).
15 Federal Respondents were ready to produce such list within a day or two after the
16 protective order was in place. However due to the few weeks delay in getting a protective
17 order in place, the initial 185 detainees list, was no longer current and needed to be
18 updated to reflect the correct information about the detainees. Since the execution of the
19 protective order on November 21, 2025, Federal Respondents have worked diligently with
20 DHS to get an updated detainees list.

21 On December 1, 2025, Petitioners' counsel requested an update on the status of the
22 detainees list. In that same email, Petitioners' counsel referenced prior discussions from
23 November 6 in which it was represented that the list would be provided within a day after
24 the signing and filing of the protective order. However, that representation was referring to
25 the initial detainees list with the understanding that it would not take weeks to get a
26 protective order in place. On December 3, 2025, Counsel for Federal Respondents
27 informed Petitioners' counsel that she was checking with DHS on whether the initial 185
28 detainees list is current since the execution of the protective order and that an update

1 hopefully would be provided within the next day or two. After an update was not
2 provided, on December 10, 2025, Petitioners' counsel followed up on the status of the
3 updated detainees list, expressed concern that the information had not been provided, and
4 also reminded Federal Respondents that a joint status report was due by 4:00 pm. On the
5 same day, counsel for Federal Respondents was informed by DHS that the individual who
6 compiled the initial detainees list had just returned from an unexpected leave.
7 Accordingly, Federal Respondents notified counsel for Petitioners, that due to an
8 unexpected leave of the individual who compiled the initial detainees' list, an update on
9 the timing of production of such list will occur within the next day or so. For these
10 reasons, the parties respectfully request that the Court sets another deadline to December
11 12, 2025 for the parties to file an updated status report regarding the production of the
12 updated detainees list.

1
2 Dated: December 10, 2025

Dated: December 10, 2025

3 **Counsel for Plaintiffs**

Counsel for Defendants

4 **ACLU OF NEVADA**

TODD BLANCHE
Deputy Attorney General of the
United States
SIGAL CHATTAH
First Assistant United States
Attorney

5 /s/ Sadmira Ramic

6 SADMIRA RAMIC

7
8 **UNLV IMMIGRATION CLINIC**

/s/ Virginia T. Tomova

9 /s/ Michael Kagan

10 MICHAEL KAGAN

TODD BLANCHE
VIRGINIA TOMOVA
SUMMER A. JOHNSON
CHRISTIAN R. RUIZ
Assistant United States Attorneys