UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

GILBERTO PEREIRA BRITO, FLORENTIN AVILA LUCAS, and JACKY CELICOURT, individually and on behalf of all those similarly situated,

Plaintiff-Petitioners,

v.

WILLIAM BARR, et al.,

Defendant-Respondents.

Case No. 19-11314-PBS

STATUS REPORT REGARDING
PLAINTIFF-PETITIONER PEREIRA
BRITO

Undersigned counsel are providing this status report to supplement paragraph 21 of the Affidavit of Sidra Vitale, Esq. with Regard to Gilberto Pereira Brito (filed under seal).

On June 18, 2019, Mr. Pereira Brito's immigration counsel filed a second "changed circumstances" motion for a new bond hearing. That motion cited the recent dismissal of the 2009 charge against Mr. Pereira Brito (*see* Jun. 19, 2019 Status Report, D.E. 24), as well as the information presented in the first "changed circumstances" motion (*see* Vitale Aff't ¶20).

On June 20, 2019, the immigration court denied the second "changed circumstances" motion for lack of jurisdiction because Mr. Pereira Brito's appeal of the original bond denial is pending. *See* Ex. A (June 20, 2019 Order). The immigration court also ruled that it had lacked jurisdiction over the first "changed circumstances" motion for the same reason. *See id*.

Mr. Pereira Brito's immigration counsel is seeking reconsideration of the "no jurisdiction" decision under settled BIA precedent that the immigration court does, in fact, have jurisdiction to consider Mr. Pereira Brito's motions for a new bond hearing based on changed circumstances,

even while the original bond denial is on appeal. *See Matter of Valles-Perez*, 21 I&N Dec. 769, 772 (BIA 1997) ("[W]hen appropriate, an Immigration Judge may entertain a bond redetermination request, even when a previous bond redetermination decision by the Immigration Judge has been appealed to the Board."); *see also* BIA Practice Manual § 7.2(a) ("Continuing jurisdiction – An alien may ask the Immigration Judge or DHS to change a bond decision . . even if . . . the alien appealed a previous bond decision to the Board.").

Mr. Pereira Brito remains detained at the Plymouth County Correctional Facility.

Respectfully submitted,

GILBERTO PEREIRA BRITO, FLORENTIN AVILA LUCAS, and JACKY CELICOURT, individually and on behalf of all those similarly situated,

By their attorneys,

/s/ Susan M. Finegan

Susan M. Finegan (BBO # 559156)
Susan J. Cohen (BBO # 546482)
Andrew Nathanson (BBO # 548684)
Mathilda S. McGee-Tubb (BBO # 687434)
Ryan Dougherty (BBO # 703380)
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C.
One Financial Center
Boston, MA 02111
(617) 542-6000
smfinegan@mintz.com
sjcohen@mintz.com
annathanson@mintz.com
msmcgee-tubb@mintz.com
rtdougherty@mintz.com

Matthew R. Segal (BBO # 654489)
Daniel McFadden (BBO # 676612)
Adriana Lafaille (BBO # 680210)
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
FOUNDATION OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC.
211 Congress Street
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 482-3170
msegal@aclum.org
dmcfadden@aclum.org
alafaille@aclum.org

Gilles R. Bissonnette (BBO # 669225)
Henry R. Klementowicz (BBO # 685512)
SangYeob Kim (N.H. Bar No. 266657)*
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
FOUNDATION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
New Hampshire Immigrants' Rights Project
Concord, NH 03301
Tel.: 603.333.2081
gilles@aclu-nh.org
henry@aclu-nh.org
sangyeob@aclu-nh.org

Michael K. T. Tan*
ACLU FOUNDATION IMMIGRANTS' RIGHTS
PROJECT
125 Broad Street, 18th Floor
New York, New York 10004
Tel: 212-549-2660
mtan@aclu.org

Attorneys for Petitioners

Dated: June 24, 2019

^{*}Admitted pro hac vice

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 24, 2019, the above-captioned document was filed through the ECF system and will be sent electronically to the registered participants as identified on the Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF), and paper copies will be sent to those indicated as non-registered participants.

/s/ Susan M. Finegan
Susan M. Finegan

89005640v.1

EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION REVIEW IMMIGRATION COURT BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE MATTER OF)
PEREIRA BRITO, Gilberto) A#
PEREIRA BRITO, Gilberto Respondent IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS
ORDER OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE
Upon consideration of Counsel's Motion for Bond Redetermination, it is hereby ordered that the
motion be [] GRANTED DENIED because:
_ Grant Fig. 1
DHS does not oppose the motion.
The respondent does not oppose the motion.
A response to the motion has not been filed with the court.
Good cause has been established for the motion. The court agrees with the reasons stated in the opposition to the motion.
[] The motion is untimely per
VI Other: Ti
the court lacks surisdiction on the bund proceedings : Additionally the court vacates it's 6-10-19 order on the respond pour motion for band redetermination fluid on 5/30/19, as the court lacked surisdiction as the band appeal was pendingat that home.
the court lacks jurisdiction on the bund proceedings :
Additionally the court vacates it's 6-10-19 ander on the record
pour monon or band redetermination field on 5/30/19 as the cont
lacked sunsdiction as the band appeal was pendingat that time.
Deadlines:
The application(s) for relief must be filed by
[] The respondent must comply with DHS biometrics instructions by
1 2.001 1
(120/19 He ///////
DATE Jenpifer Mulcahy
Immigration Judge
CERTIFICATE OF CERTIFICE
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
This document was served by: [] Mail [] Personal Service To: [] Alien c/o Custodial Officer [] Alien's Atty/Rep [] DHS
Date: (0)21/19 By: Court Staff \N)