

KEKER, VAN NEST & PETERS LLP  
STEVEN P. RAGLAND - # 221076  
sragland@keker.com  
CODY S. HARRIS - # 255302  
charris@keker.com  
CARLOS C. MARTINEZ - # 354616  
cmartinez@keker.com  
LISA C. LU - # 364259  
llu@keker.com  
633 Battery Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
Telephone: 415 391 5400  
Facsimile: 415 397 7188

CALIFORNIA COLLABORATIVE FOR  
IMMIGRANT JUSTICE  
PRIYA ARVIND PATEL - # 295602  
priya@ccijjustice.org  
MARIEL VILLARREAL - # 317048  
mariel@ccijjustice.org  
1999 Harrison Street #1800  
Oakland, California 94612  
Tel: (650) 762-8990

PRISON LAW OFFICE  
MARGOT MENDELSON - # 268583  
mmendelson@prisonlaw.com  
TESS BORDEN - MJP # 805022, *pro hac vice*  
tess@prisonlaw.com  
PATRICK BOOTH - # 328783  
patrick@prisonlaw.com  
ALISON HARDY - # 135966  
ahardy@prisonlaw.com  
RANA ANABTAWI - # 267073  
rana@prisonlaw.com  
1917 Fifth Street  
Berkeley, California 94710-1916  
Tel.: (510) 280-2621

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION  
FOUNDATION  
KYLE VIRGIEN - # 278747  
kvirgien@aclu.org  
FELIPE HERNANDEZ - # 338468  
npp\_fernandez@aclu.org  
MARISOL DOMINGUEZ-RUIZ - # 345416  
mdominguez-ruiz@aclu.org  
425 California Street, 7th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Tel.: (415) 343-0770

CARMEN IGUINA GONZALEZ - # 277369  
ciguinagonzalez@aclu.org  
915 15th Street, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel.: (202) 393-4930

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Fernando Gomez Ruiz, Fernando Viera Reyes, Jose Ruiz Canizales, Yuri Alexander Roque Campos, Sokhean Keo, Gustavo Guevara Alarcon, Alejandro Mendiola Escutia and all others similarly situated*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FERNANDO GOMEZ RUIZ; FERNANDO  
VIERA REYES; JOSE RUIZ CANIZALES;  
YURI ALEXANDER ROQUE CAMPOS;  
SOKHEAN KEO; GUSTAVO GUEVARA  
ALARCON; and ALEJANDRO MENDIOLA  
ESCUTIA, on behalf of themselves and all  
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS

Case No. 3:25-cv-09757-MMC

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO SHORTEN  
TIME FOR BRIEFING AND HEARING  
ON CORECIVIC, INC.'S MOTION TO  
INTERVENE**

Judge: Hon. Maxine M. Chesney

Date Filed: November 12, 2025

1 ENFORCEMENT; TODD M. LYONS,  
2 Acting Director, U.S. Immigration and  
3 Customs Enforcement; SERGIO  
4 ALBARRAN, Acting Director of San  
5 Francisco Field Office, Enforcement and  
6 Removal Operations, U.S. Immigration and  
7 Customs Enforcement; U.S. DEPARTMENT  
8 OF HOMELAND SECURITY; KRISTI  
9 NOEM, Secretary, U.S. Department of  
10 Homeland Security,

Defendants.

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-3, Plaintiffs respectfully move to shorten the time for briefing and hearing on Prospective Intervenor CoreCivic, Inc.'s Motion to Intervene (ECF No. 82). A shortened briefing and hearing schedule is warranted to promote judicial efficiency and prevent unnecessary prejudice to Plaintiffs.

Expedited resolution of the Motion to Intervene will conserve judicial and party resources and avoid unnecessary briefing on CoreCivic's separately filed Motion to Stay Pending Appeal ("Motion to Stay") (ECF No. 86). CoreCivic filed its Motion to Stay simultaneously with its Motion to Intervene. If the Court denies intervention, CoreCivic's Motion to Stay will be moot because CoreCivic would not be a party to this action. Resolving the Motion to Intervene first, on shortened time, would therefore streamline the issues before the Court and eliminate potentially unnecessary stay briefing.

Plaintiffs accordingly propose the following schedule for the Motion to Intervene:

- Plaintiffs' deadline to file their opposition to the Motion to Intervene will be shortened from March 17, 2026 to **March 13, 2026**;
- CoreCivic's deadline to file its reply brief in support of the Motion to Intervene will be shortened from March 24, 2026 to **March 20, 2026**;
- The hearing on the Motion to Intervene will be advanced from April 10, 2026 to **March 27, 2026** or the soonest date thereafter that is convenient for the Court.

Alongside this shortened briefing and hearing schedule for the Motion to Intervene, Plaintiffs propose that CoreCivic's Motion to Stay be deemed submitted on the date this Court grants the Motion to Intervene, should such an order be issued, or denied as moot if intervention is denied. Plaintiffs' proposal would not otherwise alter the case schedule.

Good cause exists to shorten time. CoreCivic has long been aware of this litigation and the relief sought by Plaintiffs. Indeed, Defendants submitted declarations from CoreCivic employees in litigating the preliminary injunction. *See* ECF No. 38. CoreCivic nevertheless waited three weeks after the Court had entered the preliminary injunction and then filed its motions two days before the Court's conference regarding monitor appointment. Absent expedited resolution of the Motion to Intervene, Plaintiffs will be required to expend resources briefing a stay motion

1 brought by a non-party, while simultaneously preparing their opposition to intervention and  
2 continuing to advance the monitor selection process and compliance with the Court's prior orders.  
3 That potentially unnecessary expenditure of time and resources would result in substantial  
4 prejudice to Plaintiffs.

5 Plaintiffs' proposal will in no way prejudice CoreCivic. CoreCivic recently sought to  
6 expedite briefing and advance the hearing date on its own motions, indicating that it is prepared to  
7 brief and argue these issues on a shortened schedule. ECF No. 88. Plaintiffs' proposed schedule is  
8 consistent with that position and would simply prioritize resolution of the Motion to Intervene.

9 Counsel for Plaintiffs contacted counsel for CoreCivic with the above proposal on the  
10 evening of March 5, 2026. *See* Decl. of Steven P. Ragland in Support of Pls.' Motion to Shorten  
11 Time for Briefing and Hearing on CoreCivic, Inc.'s Motion to Intervene ("Ragland Decl.") ¶ 2.  
12 Counsel for CoreCivic did not respond to Plaintiffs' proposal. *Id.*

13 As required by Civil Local Rule 6-3(a)(5), Plaintiffs disclose there have been several  
14 previous time modifications for this case. On December 15, 2025, the Court entered the parties'  
15 stipulation modifying the briefing and hearing schedule on Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary  
16 Injunction and Motion for Class Certification. ECF No. 26. On December 22, 2025, the Court  
17 entered the parties' stipulation modifying the briefing and hearing schedule on Plaintiffs' Motion  
18 for Preliminary Injunction. ECF No. 36. On January 12, 2026, the Court entered the parties'  
19 stipulation modifying the briefing and hearing schedule on Plaintiffs' Motion for Class  
20 Certification and Defendants' Motion to Transfer. ECF No. 44. On January 27, 2026, the Court  
21 entered an order continuing the parties' initial CMC and associated deadlines. ECF No. 57. On  
22 February 17, 2026, the Court entered an Order continuing Defendants' responsive pleading  
23 deadline. ECF No. 74.

## 24 CONCLUSION

25 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court grant this Motion  
26 and adopt the accompanying [Proposed] Order setting expedited briefing and hearing schedule  
27 described above.  
28

1 Dated: March 6, 2026

2  
3 Respectfully submitted,

4 /s/ Steven Ragland

5 KEKER, VAN NEST & PETERS LLP  
6 STEVEN P. RAGLAND  
7 CODY S. HARRIS  
CARLOS C. MARTINEZ  
LISA C. LU

/s/ Margot Mendelson

PRISON LAW OFFICE  
MARGOT MENDELSON  
TESS BORDEN  
PATRICK BOOTH  
ALISON HARDY  
RANA ANABTAWI

8  
9 CALIFORNIA COLLABORATIVE FOR  
10 IMMIGRANT JUSTICE  
PRIYA ARVIND PATEL  
11 MARIEL VILLARREAL

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION  
FOUNDATION  
KYLE VIRGIEN  
FELIPE HERNANDEZ  
MARISOL DOMINGUEZ-RUIZ  
CARMEN IGUINA GONZALEZ

12  
13 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*