

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

KILMAR ARMANDO
ABREGO GARCIA, *et al.*,

*

Plaintiffs,

*

Civil Action No. 8:25-cv-00951-PX

v.

*

KRISTI NOEM, Secretary,
United States Department
of Homeland Security, *et al.*,

*

*

*

Defendants.

*

ORDER

The Defendants ask this Court to extend the deadline to respond to its Order at ECF No. 51, arguing that the Defendants require several days to “meaningful[ly] review the Supreme Court’s decision,” issued last night at 7:00 PM, and that it is “impracticable for Defendants to comply with the Court’s 9:30 AM deadline only a few hours after the Supreme Court issued an order in this case.” ECF No. 55. This, Defendants say, supports extension of the filing deadline until April 15, 2025. The Court largely rejects the Defendants’ request.

First, the Defendants’ act of sending Abrego Garcia to El Salvador was wholly illegal from the moment it happened, and Defendants have been on notice of the same. Indeed, as the Supreme Court credits, “the United States acknowledges that Abrego Garcia was subject to a withholding order forbidding his removal to El Salvador, and that the removal to El Salvador was therefore illegal.” *Noem v. Abrego Garcia*, 604 U.S. ____ (2025), Slip Op. at 1. Second, the Defendants’ suggestion that they need time to meaningfully review a four-page Order that reaffirms this basic principle blinks at reality. Third, the Defendants misconstrue the Supreme Court’s Order stating that the original deadline at ECF No. 21 is “no longer effective,” as

somehow suggesting that the Court’s amended Order requiring prompt attention to this matter is “inconsistent” with the Supreme Court’s directive. Nothing could be further from the truth. As the Supreme Court plainly stated, “the Government should be prepared to share **what it can concerning the steps it has taken** and the prospect of further steps,” Slip Op. at 2—all against the backdrop of this Court’s needing to “ensure that the Government lives up to its obligations to follow the law.” *Id.* at 4 (Sotomayor, J., concurring).

Accordingly, the Court GRANTS in part the request and will extend the filing deadline until 11:30 AM today. The hearing date and time will remain unchanged.

April 11, 2025
Date

/S/
Paula Xinis
United States District Judge