

1 TODD BLANCHE  
 2 Deputy Attorney General of the United States  
 3 SIGAL CHATTAH  
 4 First Assistant United States Attorney  
 5 District of Nevada  
 6 Nevada Bar Number 8264  
 7 SUMMER A. JOHNSON  
 8 Assistant United States Attorney  
 9 VIRGINIA T. TOMOVA  
 10 Assistant United States Attorney  
 11 Nevada Bar No. 12504  
 12 CHRISTIAN R. RUIZ  
 13 Assistant United States Attorney  
 14 501 Las Vegas Blvd. So., Suite 1100  
 15 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
 16 Phone: (702) 388-6336  
 17 Fax: (702) 388-6336  
 18 [Summer.Johnson@usdoj.gov](mailto:Summer.Johnson@usdoj.gov)  
 19 [Virginia.Tomova@usdoj.gov](mailto:Virginia.Tomova@usdoj.gov)  
 20 [Christian.Ruiz@usdoj.gov](mailto:Christian.Ruiz@usdoj.gov)

12 *Attorneys for the Federal Respondents*

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 14 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

15 Victor Kalid JACOBO RAMIREZ,  
 16 Petitioners,  
 17 v.  
 18 Kristi NOEM et al.,  
 19 Respondents.

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

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

20 This joint status report is filed in compliance with the Court's order regarding  
 21 status of pre-certification discovery. ECF No. 43. According to the Court's order, this  
 22 report should be filed by 4:00 pm. *Id.* However, due to heavy workload, Petitioners  
 23 counsel's notification that she will need 30 minutes to review the joint status report, and  
 24 subsequent revisions from Petitioners' counsel, this joint status report was filed after the  
 25 4:00 pm deadline. Federal Respondents submitted the joint status report draft via PDF to  
 26 Petitioners' counsel at 3:57 pm. A few minutes after receiving the email, Petitioner's  
 27 counsel requested a Word version of the joint status report instead of a PDF to be able to  
 28 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.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1  
2 Dated: December 10, 2025

3 **Counsel for Plaintiffs**

4 **ACLU OF NEVADA**

5 */s/ Sadmira Ramic*

6 SADMIRA RAMIC

7 **UNLV IMMIGRATION CLINIC**

8 */s/ Michael Kagan*

9 MICHAEL KAGAN

10 Dated: December 10, 2025

11 **Counsel for Defendants**

12 **TODD BLANCHE**

13 Deputy Attorney General of the  
United States

14 **SIGAL CHATTAH**

15 First Assistant United States  
16 Attorney

17 */s/ Virginia T. Tomova*

18 TODD BLANCHE

19 VIRGINIA TOMOVA

20 SUMMER A. JOHNSON

21 CHRISTIAN R. RUIZ

22 Assistant United States Attorneys