

1 Bashir Ghazialam (CA Bar No. 212724)
2 LAW OFFICES OF BASHIR GHAZIALAM
3 P.O. Box 928167
4 San Diego, California 92192
5 Tel: (619) 795-3370
6 Fax: (866) 685-4543
7 bg@lobg.net

8 Attorney for Petitioner

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10
11 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12 Amit Kumar AMIT,

13 Petitioner-Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 Christopher J. LAROSE, Senior Warden,
16 Otay Mesa Detention Center, San Diego,
17 California;

18 Joseph FREDEN, Acting Field Office
19 Director, San Diego Office of Detention
20 and Removal, U.S. Immigrations and
21 Customs Enforcement; U.S. Department
22 of Homeland Security;

23 Todd M. LYONS, Acting Director,
24 Immigration and Customs Enforcement,
U.S. Department of Homeland Security;
Sirce OWEN, Acting Director for
Executive Office for Immigration Review;
Kristi NOEM, Secretary, U.S. Department
of Homeland Security;
Pam BONDI, Attorney General of the
United States;

Respondents-

Defendants.

Case No.: '25CV3224 CAB BLM

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS AND ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE WITHIN THREE DAYS;
COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

Challenge to Unlawful Incarceration
Under Color of Immigration Detention
Statutes; Request for Declaratory and
Injunctive Relief

Agency File No. 

1 Petitioner AMIT KUMAR AMIT petitions this Court for a writ of habeas corpus
2 under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 to remedy Respondents' detaining him unlawfully, and states as
3 follows:

4 INTRODUCTION

5
6 1. Petitioner, AMIT KUMAR AMIT ("Mr. Amit" or "Petitioner"), by and through his
7 undersigned counsel, hereby files this petition for writ of habeas corpus and complaint for
8 declaratory and injunctive relief to compel his immediate release from immigration
9 detention where he has been held by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS)
10 since being unlawfully re-detained on November 15, 2025, without first being provided a
11 due process hearing to determine whether his incarceration is justified. Petitioner was
12 previously released on April 25, 2023 by DHS on conditional parole pursuant to INA
13 section 236 (8 U.S.C. § 1226).

14
15 2. Petitioner further submits this habeas petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for a judicial
16 check on Respondents' administrative decisions to detain him under 8 U.S.C.
17 § 1225(b)(2), INA § 235(b)(2), despite the authority to do so in that Petitioner is not an
18 applicant for admission nor is he seeking admission. And because the government
19 purports to hold him under § 1225(b)(2), it has not provided him with an individualized
20 bond hearing to challenge his detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), INA § 236(a),
21 contravening his rights under the Immigration and Nationality Act and the Fifth
22 Amendment's Due Process Clause.

23
24 3. Petitioner seeks declaratory and injunctive relief to compel his immediate release
from the immigration jail where he has been held by the U.S. Department of Homeland

1 Security (DHS) since being unlawfully re-detained on November 15, 2025, without first
2 being provided a due process hearing to determine whether his incarceration is justified.

3 4. Absent review in this Court, no other neutral adjudicator will examine Petitioner's
4 plight: Respondents will continue to detain him in violation of the law essentially
5 indefinitely. Petitioner thus urges this Court to review the lawfulness of his detention;
6 declare that his detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) is unlawful; order either his
7 immediate release or that, at a minimum, Respondents provide him a bond hearing
8 complying with the procedural requirements in *Singh v. Holder*, 638 F.3d 1196 (9th Cir.
9 2011).

10
11 5. Petitioner must be released from custody unless and until DHS proves to a neutral
12 adjudicator, by clear and convincing evidence, material changed circumstances
13 (including that he is a flight risk and/or a danger to the community) that would justify
14 cancelling Petitioner's release from ICE custody on April 25, 2023 on conditional parole
15 pursuant to INA section 236 (8 U.S.C. § 1226) after a determination that he was neither a
16 flight risk nor a danger to the community.

17 6. The Due Process clause of the Fifth Amendment, as well as statutory and
18 regulatory authorities, require the government to provide noncitizens with notice and a
19 hearing prior to re-detention. Here Petitioner's rights were violated and continue to be
20 each day he is detained.

21 **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

22 7. Mr. AMIT KUMAR AMIT (Petitioner) is a married Indian citizen born in Panipat
23 district, Haryana, India.
24

1 8. Petitioner worked for the Indian National Lok Dal (INDL) party along with his
2 father. Petitioner fled India on February 23, 2023 fearing harm by [REDACTED]
3 [REDACTED] which opposes the INDL party and its members had attacked and threatened
4 Petitioner on multiple occasions.

5 9. Petitioner arrived in the United States on April 22, 2023 (he entered through the
6 U.S.-Mexico border near Lukeville, Arizona) where he was apprehended by Customs and
7 Border Patrol agents and he requested asylum.

8 10. Three days later, on April 25, 2023, after a determination that he was neither a
9 flight risk nor a danger to the community, Petitioner was released from ICE custody on
10 his own recognizance (conditional parole pursuant to INA section 236 (8 U.S.C.
11 § 1226)). Petitioner was also issued a Notice to Appear (NTA) before an immigration
12 judge in Santa Ana, California for his removal proceedings. Venue was later changed to
13 the Sacramento Immigration Court after Petitioner moved to Fresno, California. While in
14 removal proceedings, Petitioner timely filed his asylum application and at the time of his
15 re-arrest on November 15, 2025, those proceedings were still continuing. Petitioner was
16 issued employment authorization and a social security card.

17 11. On November 19, 2025, while working as rideshare driver and driving his vehicle
18 in San Diego, California, his vehicle was stopped by officers of who Petitioner believes
19 to be the U.S. National Guard, who demanded to know Petitioner's immigration status.
20 After Petitioner informed the officers that he had an asylum application pending, the
21 officers detained him and confiscated the car keys to the vehicle and contacted ICE.
22 Petitioner was detained for approximately one hour on the scene until ICE officers
23
24

1 arrived and detained him and ultimately transported him to the Otay Mesa Detention
2 Center.

3 12. Since his release on April 25, 2023 from ICE custody on his own recognizance
4 (conditional parole pursuant to INA section 236 (8 U.S.C. § 1226)), Petitioner had been
5 living in Fresno and building community ties there. He had committed no crimes and nor
6 was he arrested or accused of any crimes. At the time of his re-arrest on November 15,
7 2025, he was duly employed and supporting himself and his family.

8 13. Petitioner's proceedings in immigration court are continuing.

9 14. Petitioner has now lived for over two years in the United States and has built
10 extensive community ties. He has had no encounters with the immigration system nor the
11 criminal justice system prior to his recent arrest and to date, he has never been convicted
12 of any crime.
13

14 CUSTODY

15 15. Petitioner is currently in Respondents' legal and physical custody. They are
16 detaining him at the at the Otay Mesa Detention Center in San Diego, California.
17 CoreCivic, Inc., a Maryland corporation, operates that facility. He is under Respondents'
18 and their agents' direct control. Prior to his arrest and re-detention Petitioner was not
19 provided with a constitutionally and statutorily compliant bond hearing.
20

21 JURISDICTION

22 16. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241; Art. I, § 9, cl. 2 of the United
23 States Constitution; and 28 U.S.C. § 1331, as Petitioner is presently in Respondents'
24

1 custody under the United States' color of authority, and such custody violates the United
2 States' Constitution, laws, or treaties. Its jurisdiction is not limited by a petitioner's
3 nationality, status as an immigrant, or any other classification. *See Boumediene v. Bush*,
4 553 U.S. 723, 747 (2008). This Court may grant relief under U.S. CONST. art. I, § 9, cl. 2;
5 U.S. CONST. amends. V and VIII; 28 U.S.C. §§ 1361 (mandamus), 1651 (All Writs Act),
6 2241 (habeas corpus).
7

8 17. Specifically, this Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 to review
9 Petitioner's re-detention without being provided an individualized bail hearing prior to
10 his re-detention and before a neutral adjudicator under § 1226(a), as well as Petitioner's
11 challenge to being subjected to mandatory detention under Section 1225(b)(2). Federal
12 district courts possess broad authority to issue writs of habeas corpus when a person is
13 held "in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States"
14 (28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3)), and this authority extends to immigration detention challenges
15 that survived the REAL ID Act's jurisdictional restrictions.
16

17 18. Because Petitioner seeks the traditional habeas remedy of release from allegedly
18 unlawful detention rather than additional administrative review of his underlying claims,
19 his petition presents precisely the type of threshold legality-of-detention question that §
20 2241 was designed to address. *See INS v. St. Cyr*, 533 U.S. 289, 301 (2001); *see also*
21 *Lopez-Marroquin v. Barr*, 955 F.3d 759, 759 (9th Cir. 2020) (citing *Singh*, 638 F.3d at
22 1211-12)). And no court has ruled on the legality of Petitioner's detention.
23
24

1 **REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243**

2 19. The Court must grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus or issue an order to
3 show cause (OSC) to Respondents “forthwith,” unless the petitioner is not entitled to
4 relief. 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If an OSC is issued, the Court must require Respondents to file a
5 return “within *three days* unless for good cause additional time, *not exceeding twenty*
6 *days*, is allowed.” *Id.* (emphasis added).

7
8 20. Courts have long recognized the significance of the habeas statute in protecting
9 individuals from unlawful detention. The Great Writ has been referred to as “perhaps the
10 most important writ known to the constitutional law of England, affording as it does a
11 *swift* and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or confinement.” *Fay v. Noia*,
12 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963) (emphasis added).

13
14 21. Habeas corpus must remain a swift remedy. Importantly, “the statute itself directs
15 courts to give petitions for habeas corpus ‘special, preferential consideration to insure
16 expeditious hearing and determination.’” *Yong v. INS*, 208 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir.
17 2000) (internal citations omitted). The Ninth Circuit warned against any action creating
18 the perception “that courts are more concerned with efficient trial management than with
19 the vindication of constitutional rights.” *Id.*

20 **VENUE**

21
22 22. Venue is properly before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because the
23 Respondents are employees or officers of the United States, acting in their official
24 capacity; because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim

1 occur in San Diego County in the Southern District of California where Petitioner is
2 currently detained, and because there is no real property involved in this action.

3 INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

4 23. The decision to re-arrest and re-detain Petitioner was made by the San Diego field
5 office of ICE, and until he was unlawfully re-detained by ICE, his case was pending
6 before the Sacramento Immigration Court. He was then transferred to Otay Mesa
7 Detention Center in San Diego, California and his hearing continues to be pending before
8 the Sacramento Immigration Court.
9

10 EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

11 24. In habeas claims, exhaustion of administrative remedies is prudential, not
12 jurisdictional. *Hernandez v. Sessions*, 872 F.3d 976, 988 (9th Cir. 2017). A court may
13 waive the prudential exhaustion requirement if “administrative remedies are inadequate
14 or not efficacious, pursuit of administrative remedies would be a futile gesture,
15 irreparable injury will result, or the administrative proceedings would be void.” *Id.*
16 (*quoting Laing v. Ashcroft*, 370 F.3d 994, 1000 (9th Cir. 2004) (citation and quotation
17 marks omitted)). Petitioner asserts that exhaustion should be waived because
18 administrative remedies are (1) futile and (2) his continued detention results in irreparable
19 harm.
20

21 25. Pursuant to the Board’s recent precedential decisions in *Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I&N
22 Dec. 66 (BIA 2025) and *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), an
23 immigration judge would not take jurisdiction over any custody redetermination hearing.
24

1 Per those decisions, contravening decades of law and practice by Respondents, Petitioner
2 is erroneously deemed an applicant for admission ineligible for a bond hearing before an
3 immigration judge (IJ).

4 26.No statutory exhaustion requirements apply to Petitioner’s claim of unlawful
5 custody in violation of his due process rights, and there are no administrative remedies
6 that he needs to exhaust. *See Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm. v. Reno*, 70 F.3d
7 1045, 1058 (9th Cir. 1995) (finding exhaustion to be a “futile exercise because the agency
8 does not have jurisdiction to review” constitutional claims); *In re Indefinite Det. Cases*,
9 82 F. Supp. 2d 1098, 1099 (C.D. Cal. 2000) (same).

11 27.Exhausting administrative remedies here is futile because Respondents contend
12 Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention. As such, no request to release Petitioner
13 from custody would be considered by ICE. Moreover, Immigration Judges in this district
14 claim to have no jurisdiction to conduct a custody redetermination hearing as to
15 individuals procedurally situated like Petitioner. Indeed, in contravention to the INA and
16 long-standing precedent and practice, the Board of Immigration Appeals and Attorney
17 General have deemed no noncitizen eligible for bond before an immigration judge (with
18 the exception of noncitizens who entered the U.S. on a visa). As such, any attempts to
19 exhaust administrative remedies would be entirely futile.

21 28.More importantly, every day that Petitioner remains detained causes him harm that
22 cannot be repaired. His continued detention puts his physical and mental health at greater
23 risk, further warranting a finding of irreparable harm and the waiver of the prudential
24

1 exhaustion requirement. The Court must consider this in its irreparable harm analysis of
2 the effects on Petitioner as her detention continues. *See De Paz Sales v. Barr*, No. 19-CV-
3 07221-KAW, 2020 WL 353465, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2020) (noting that the
4 petitioner “continues to suffer significant psychological effects from his detention,
5 including anxiety caused by the threats of other inmates and two suicide attempts,” in
6 finding that petitioner would suffer irreparable harm warranting waiver of exhaustion
7 requirement).

9 29. Health concerns are one factor the Court should consider in its irreparable harm
10 analysis of the effects on Petitioner as his detention continues. *See De Paz Sales v. Barr*,
11 No. 19-CV-07221-KAW, 2020 WL 353465, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2020) (noting that
12 the petitioner “continues to suffer significant psychological effects from his detention,
13 including anxiety caused by the threats of other inmates and two suicide attempts,” in
14 finding that petitioner would suffer irreparable harm warranting waiver of exhaustion
15 requirement).

17 **PARTIES**

18 30. Mr. Amit Kumar AMIT (Petitioner) is an Indian citizen born in New Delhi, India.
19 He an asylum seeker from India on account of his political opinion and membership in
20 the Congress Party.

21 31. Petitioner is currently in Respondents’ legal and physical custody at the Otay Mesa
22 Detention Center in San Diego, California. CoreCivic, Inc., a Maryland corporation,
23 operates that facility.
24

1 32. Respondent Joseph FREDEN is the Acting Field Office Director of ICE in San
2 Diego, California and is named in his official capacity. ICE is the component of DHS that
3 is responsible for detaining and removing noncitizens according to immigration law and
4 oversees custody determinations. In his official capacity, he is the legal custodian of
5 Petitioner.

6 33. Respondent Todd M. LYONS is the Acting Director of ICE and is named in his
7 official capacity. Among other things, ICE is responsible for the administration and
8 enforcement of the immigration laws, including the removal of noncitizens. In his official
9 capacity as head of ICE, he is the legal custodian of Petitioner.

10 34. Respondent Sirce OWEN is the Acting Director of EOIR and has ultimate
11 responsibility for overseeing the operation of the immigration courts and the Board
12 of Immigration Appeals, including bond hearings. Executive Office for Immigration
13 Review (EOIR) is the federal agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the
14 INA in removal proceedings, including for custody redeterminations in bond
15 hearings. She is sued in her official capacity.

16 35. Respondent Kriti NOEM is the Secretary of the DHS and is named in her official
17 capacity. DHS is the federal agency encompassing ICE, which is responsible for the
18 administration and enforcement of the INA and all other laws relating to the immigration
19 of noncitizens. In her capacity as Secretary, Respondent Noem has responsibility for the
20 administration and enforcement of the immigration and naturalization laws pursuant to
21 section 402 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, 107 Pub. L. No. 296, 116 Stat. 2135
22
23
24

1 (Nov. 25, 2002); *see also* 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a). Respondent Noem is the ultimate legal
2 custodian of Petitioner.

3 36. Respondent Pam BONDIE is the Attorney General of the United States and the most
4 senior official in the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) and is named in her official
5 capacity. She has the authority to interpret the immigration laws and adjudicate removal
6 cases. The Attorney General delegates this responsibility to the Executive Office for
7 Immigration Review (EOIR), which administers the immigration courts and the BIA.
8

9 37. Respondent Christopher LAROSE is the Warden of the Otay Mesa Detention
10 Center where Petitioner is being held. Respondent Christopher LaRose oversees the day-
11 to-day operations of the Otay Mesa Detention Center and acts at the Direction of
12 Respondents Freden, Lyons and Noem. Respondent Christopher LaRose is a custodian of
13 Petitioner and is named in their official capacity.

14 LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND ANALYSIS

15 38. The Due Process clause of the Constitution, Congress's statutes and implementing
16 regulations as well as precedential decisions narrow DHS's authority to unilaterally
17 revoke any noncitizen's immigration bond or conditional parole and re-arrest the
18 noncitizen at any time, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(b); 8 C.F.R. § 236.1(c)(9).
19

20 39. ICE can release a noncitizen from custody after the noncitizen "demonstrate[s] to
21 the satisfaction of the officer that such release would not pose a danger to property or
22 persons" and that the noncitizen is "likely to appear for any future proceeding." §
23 1236.1(c)(8).3 "Release [therefore] reflects a determination by the government that the
24

1 noncitizen is not a danger to the community or a flight risk.” *Saravia v. Sessions*, 280 F.
2 Supp. 3d 1168, 1176 (N.D. Cal. 2017), *aff’d sub nom. Saravia for A.H. v. Sessions*, 905
3 F.3d 1137 (9th Cir. 2018).

4 40. Petitioner was released from ICE custody on April 25, 2023 on conditional parole
5 pursuant to INA section 236 (8 U.S.C. § 1226) after determining he was neither a flight
6 risk nor a danger to the community.

7 41. Respondents now purport to hold Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) since
8 November 15, 2025, despite lacking authority to hold him under § 1225(b)(2), and
9 without giving him an individualized bail hearing before a neutral adjudicator under §
10 1226(a). That violates Petitioner’s rights under the INA, the APA and the Fifth
11 Amendment’s Due Process Clause.
12

13 42. Petitioner was arrested and is detained despite the fact that Respondents failing to
14 provide him notice and a pre-deprivation hearing before a neutral arbiter demonstrating
15 materially changed circumstances justifying his re-detention, and despite the fact that he
16 is not an applicant for admission seeking admission to the United States as required by
17 Section 1225(b)(2). Instead, Petitioner has been residing in the U.S. for over nine years
18 and as such is subject to Section 1226(a).
19

20 **Statutory Framework Regarding Re-Detention**

21 43. The INA prescribes three basic forms of detention for the vast majority of
22 noncitizens in removal proceedings conducted pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a.
23
24

1 44.First, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 authorizes the detention of noncitizens in § 1229a removal
2 proceedings before an immigration judge (IJ). Individuals covered by § 1226(a) detention
3 are generally entitled to a bond hearing at the outset of their detention, see 8 C.F.R. §§
4 1003.19(a), 1236.1(d), while certain noncitizens who have been arrested, charged with, or
5 convicted of certain crimes are subject to mandatory detention. See 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c).
6

7 45.Second, the INA provides for mandatory detention of noncitizens subject to an
8 Expedited Removal order imposed pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and for other
9 noncitizen applicants for admission to the U.S. who are deemed not clearly entitled to be
10 admitted. See 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).
11

12 46.Last, the INA provides for detention of noncitizens who have been ordered
13 removed, including individuals in withholding-only proceedings. See 8 U.S.C. §
14 1231(a)–(b).
15

16 47.This case partly concerns the detention provisions at 8 U.S.C. §§ 1226(a) and
17 1225(b)(2).
18

19 48.The detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) were enacted as part of the
20 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996, Pub. L.
21 No. 104–208, Div. C, §§ 302–03, 110 Stat. 3009–546, 3009–582 to 3009–583, 3009–
22 585. Section 1226(a) was most recently amended in early 2025 by the Laken Riley Act,
23 Pub. L. No. 119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025).
24

49.Following the enactment of the IIRIRA, EOIR drafted new regulations applicable
to proceedings before immigration judges explaining that, in general, people who entered

1 the country without inspection – also referred to as being “present without admission” –
2 were not considered detained under § 1225 and that they were instead detained under §
3 1226(a). See Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of
4 Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum Procedures, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312,
5 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997).

6
7 50. Thus, in the decades that followed, most people who entered without inspection
8 and were placed in standard § 1229a removal proceedings received bond hearings before
9 IJs, unless their criminal history rendered them ineligible. That practice was consistent
10 with many more decades of prior practice, in which noncitizens who were not deemed
11 “arriving” were entitled to a custody hearing before an IJ or other hearing officer. See 8
12 U.S.C. § 1252(a) (1994); see also H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 229 (1996) (noting that
13 § 1226(a) simply “restates” the detention authority previously found at § 1252(a)).
14

15 51. This practice both pre- and post-enactment of IIRIRA is consistent with the fact
16 that noncitizens present within the United States – as opposed to noncitizens at the border
17 seeking admission – have constitutional rights. “[T]he Due Process Clause applies to all
18 ‘persons’ within the United States, including aliens, whether their presence here is lawful,
19 unlawful, temporary, or permanent.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001).
20

21 52. This year the Board issued two decisions abruptly departing from not only the
22 plain language of Sections 1225 and 1226 but also contravening decades of practice as
23 well as Ninth Circuit and Supreme Court precedent.
24

1 53. On May 15, 2025, the Board issued *Matter of Q Li*, 29 I&N Dec. 66 (BIA 2025)
2 stating that an applicant for admission who is arrested and detained without a warrant
3 while arriving in the United States, whether or not at a port of entry, and subsequently
4 placed in removal proceedings is detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), and is ineligible for
5 any subsequent release on bond under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).
6

7 54. On September 5, 2025, the Board issued *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec.
8 216 (BIA 2025) stating that all noncitizens who entered without inspection are applicants
9 for admission and are subject to mandatory detention under Section 1225(b)(2).
10

11 55. The overwhelming majority of district courts across the country (including this
12 Court), however, have rejected the BIA's decisions in *Matter of Q Li* and *Matter of*
13 *Yajure Hurtado*. Courts have instead held that Section 1225 governs detention of
14 noncitizens who are at the border "seeking admission" to the United States, while Section
15 1226 governs those within the United States.

16 56. Indeed, the Board's decisions in *Matter of Q Li* and *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*
17 conflict with not only the plain reading of Sections 1225 and 1226 but are also contrary to
18 Ninth Circuit and Supreme Court precedent.

19 57. The Supreme Court has explained that Section 1226 is the "default rule" and
20 "applies to aliens already present in the United States." *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S.
21 281, 288, 301 (2018). Moreover, section 1225(b) "applies primarily to aliens seeking
22 entry into the United States" and authorizes DHS to "detain an alien without a warrant at
23 the border." *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 297, 302.
24

1 58. In *Torres v. Barr*, 976 F.3d 918, 926 (9th Cir. 2020), the en banc Court held that
2 “the phrase ‘at the time of application for admission’...refers to the particular point in
3 time when a noncitizen submits an application to physically enter into the United States.”
4 976 F.3d at 924. The Ninth Circuit held that “inadmissibility must be measured at the
5 point in time that an immigrant actually submits an application for entry into the United
6 States.” *Torres v. Barr*, 976 F.3d at 923. Under section 212(a)(7), a noncitizen only
7 makes an application for admission when they seek permission to physically enter the
8 United States. *Id.* at 924.

10 59. In short, *Torres* clarified there is a temporal limitation to a classification of
11 applicant for admission. See *United States v. Gambino-Ruiz*, 91 F.4th 981, 989 (9th Cir.
12 2024) (stating that “*Torres* merely rejected the view that an alien remains in a perpetual
13 state of applying for admission”).

15 60. In sum, Petitioner is not detained under Section 1225 because he is not an applicant
16 for admission per Supreme Court and Ninth Circuit precedent, nor is he “seeking
17 admission” to the United States. As such, he is subject to Section 1226(a). This is
18 consistent with the conditional release provided to Petitioner after he entered without
19 inspection and was released into the U.S. over nine years ago.

21 **Materially Changed Circumstances – Right to a Hearing Prior to Re-**
22 **incarceration.**

23 61. The Board of Immigration Appeals has clearly identified limits to DHS’s authority
24 to re-detain noncitizens: “where a previous bond determination has been made by an

1 immigration judge, no change should be made by [the DHS] absent a change of
2 circumstance,” a position adopted by the Ninth Circuit. *Matter of Sugay*, 17 I. & N. Dec.
3 637, 640 (BIA 1981); *see also Panosyan v. Mayorkas*, 854 F. App’x 787, 788 (9th Cir.
4 2021)(“Thus, absent changed circumstances ... ICE cannot re-detain Panosyan.”).

5
6 62.The government has further clarified in litigation that the showing of changed
7 circumstances applies “both where the prior bond determination was made by an
8 immigration judge *and* where the previous release decision was made by a DHS officer.”
9 *Saravia v. Barr*, 280 F. Supp. 3d at 1197 (emphasis added).

10 63.Further, DHS has in practice limited its authority and “generally only re-arrests
11 [noncitizens] pursuant to § 1226(b) after a *material* change in circumstances,” not just
12 any changed circumstances. *Id.* (quoting Defs.’ Second Supp. Br. at 1, Dkt. No. 90)
13 (emphasis added).

14
15 64.Guidance from *Matter of Sugay* and DHS practice alone —that ICE should not re-
16 arrest a noncitizen absent changed circumstances— are insufficient to protect Petitioner’s
17 weighty interest in his freedom from detention. Federal district courts in California have
18 repeatedly recognized that the demands of due process and the limitations on DHS’s
19 authority to revoke a noncitizen’s bond or parole require a pre-deprivation hearing for a
20 noncitizen on bond, like Petitioner, before ICE re-detains him, to comport with the Due
21 Process clause of the Constitution. *See, e.g., Meza v. Bonnar*, 2018 WL 2554572 (N.D.
22 Cal. June 4, 2018); *Ortega v. Bonnar*, 415 F. Supp. 3d 963 (N.D. Cal. 2019); *Vargas v.*
23 *Jennings*, No. 20-CV-5785-PJH, 2020 WL 5074312, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 2020);
24

1 *Jorge M. F. v. Wilkinson*, No. 21-CV-01434-JST, 2021 WL 783561, at *2 (N.D. Cal.
2 Mar. 1, 2021)

3 65. Just in the last few months, several federal courts in California have agreed that
4 immigration re-detention after being released in the community warrants a hearing. *See*
5 *Diaz v. Kaiser*, No. 3:25-CV-05071, 2025 WL 1676854 (N.D. Cal. June 14, 2025); *Singh*
6 *v. Andrews*, No. 1:25-CV-00801, 2025 WL 1918679 (E.D. Cal. July 11, 2025); *Pinchi v.*
7 *Noem*, — F. Supp. 3d —, —, No. 5:25-cv-05632-PCP, 2025 WL 2084921 (N.D.
8 Cal. July 24, 2025); *Victor Amado Rodriguez-Flores v. F. Semaia et al.*, No. CV 25-6900
9 *JGB (JCX)*, 2025 WL 2684181 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 14, 2025).

10
11 66. It follows that prior to re-detaining Petitioner who had previously been released
12 pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(b), DHS should have provided him with a pre-detention
13 hearing and notice of such hearing at which DHS had the burden of proving that
14 Petitioner's conditional parole should be canceled.

15
16 67. Instead, Respondents unlawfully re-arrested and re-detained Petitioner without
17 having an immigration judge or a neutral adjudicator assess whether circumstances have
18 materially changed since his release on April 25, 2023 by DHS on conditional parole
19 pursuant to INA section 236 (8 U.S.C. § 1226).

20 **Petitioner's due process rights**

21
22 68. The government cannot deprive any person of "life, liberty, or property, without
23 due process of law[.]" U.S. Const. Amend. V. Due process extends to "all 'persons'
24

1 within the United States, including [non-citizens], whether their presence here is lawful,
2 unlawful, temporary, or permanent.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001).

3 **A. Petitioner’s Liberty Interest is protected**

4 69. “Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other
5 forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that [the Due Process] Clause
6 protects.” *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690.

7
8 70. A continued liberty interest also exists where an individual was detained and is
9 subsequently released, even if conditionally released and even when an initial decision to
10 detain or release the individual is discretionary. *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471, 481-
11 82 (1972). “[S]ubject to the conditions of his parole, [a parolee] can be gainfully
12 employed and is free to be with family and friends and to form the other enduring
13 attachments of normal life.” *Id.* at 482. The parolee relies “on at least an implicit promise
14 that parole will be revoked only if he fails to live up to the parole conditions.” *Id.* The
15 Court explained that “the liberty of a parolee, although indeterminate, includes many of
16 the core values of unqualified liberty and its termination inflicts a grievous loss on the
17 parolee and often others.” *Id.* In turn, “[b]y whatever name, the liberty is valuable and
18 must be seen within the protection of the [Fifth] Amendment.” *Morrissey*, 408 U.S. at
19 482; *see also Young v. Harper*, 520 U.S. 143, 152 (1997) (holding that individuals placed
20 in a pre-parole program created to reduce prison overcrowding have a protected liberty
21 interest requiring pre-deprivation process); *Gagnon v. Scarpelli*, 411 U.S. 778, 781-82
22
23
24

1 (1973) (holding that individuals released on felony probation have a protected liberty
2 interest requiring pre-deprivation process).

3 71. As the First Circuit has explained, when analyzing the issue of whether a specific
4 conditional release rises to the level of a protected liberty interest, “[c]ourts have resolved
5 the issue by comparing the specific conditional release in the case before them with the
6 liberty interest in parole as characterized by *Morrissey*.” *Gonzalez-Fuentes v. Molina*,
7 607 F.3d 864, 887 (1st Cir. 2010) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). *See*
8 *also, e.g., Hurd v. District of Columbia*, 864 F.3d 671, 683 (D.C. Cir. 2017) (“a person
9 who is in fact free of physical confinement—even if that freedom is lawfully revocable—
10 has a liberty interest that entitles him to constitutional due process before he is re-
11 incarcerated”) (citing *Young*, 520 U.S. at 152, *Gagnon*, 411 U.S. at 782, and *Morrissey*,
12 408 U.S. at 482).

13
14
15 72. The protectable liberty interest created by conditional parole also applies to
16 immigration detention. “[T]he government’s discretion to incarcerate non-citizens is
17 always constrained by the requirements of due process.” *Hernandez v. Sessions*, 872 F.3d
18 976, 981 (9th Cir. 2017). “Just as people on preparole, parole, and probation status have a
19 liberty interest, so too does [a noncitizen released from immigration detention] have a
20 liberty interest in remaining out of custody on bond.”). *Ortega v. Bonnar*, 415 F. Supp.
21 3d 963, 969 (N.D. Cal. 2019). Even where “a decision-making process involves
22 discretion does not prevent an individual from having a protectable liberty interest.” *Id.* at
23
24

1 970 (N.D. Cal. 2019); *Romero v. Kaiser*, No. 22-cv-02508, 2022 WL 1443250, at *2
2 (N.D. Cal. May 6, 2022).

3 73.The protected liberty interest is even more substantial when balancing the
4 nonpunitive purpose of immigration detention against the “irreparable harms imposed on
5 anyone subject to immigration detention,” including “subpar medical and psychiatric care
6 in ICE detention facilities, the economic burdens imposed on detainees and their families
7 as a result of detention, and the collateral harms to children of detainees whose parents
8 are detained.” *Hernandez v. Sessions*, 872 F.3d 976, 995 (9th Cir. 2017).

10 74.“[R]elease from ICE custody constitute[s] an ‘implied promise’ that [the
11 noncitizen’s] liberty would not be revoked unless she ‘fail[s] to live up to the conditions
12 of her release.’ The regulatory framework makes clear that those conditions [a]re that [the
13 noncitizen] remain[s] neither a danger to the community nor a flight risk. *Pinchi v. Noem*,
14 — F. Supp. 3d —, —, No. 5:25-cv-05632-PCP, 2025 WL 2084921, at *8 (N.D.
15 Cal. July 24, 2025) (citing *Morrissey*, 408 U.S. at 482).

17 75.A noncitizen released from custody pending removal proceedings therefore has a
18 protected liberty interest in remaining out of custody. *See Diaz v. Kaiser*, No. 3:25-CV-
19 05071, 2025 WL 1676854 (N.D. Cal. June 14, 2025); *Romero v. Kaiser*, No. 22-cv-
20 02508, 2022 WL 1443250, at *2 (N.D. Cal. May 6,2022); *see also Ramirez Clavijo v.*
21 *Kaiser*, 25-cv-06248-BLF, at 6 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2025)(gathering cases).
22
23
24

1 76. Petitioner has a substantial liberty interest in not being detained. He has been living
2 in the United States for over two years, has been working and supporting himself and his
3 family, and has developed extensive community ties.

4 **B. Petitioner's Liberty Interest Mandated a Hearing Before any Re-Arrest and**
5 **Revocation of Parole**

6 77. "Adequate, or due, process depends upon the nature of the interest affected. The
7 more important the interest and the greater the effect of its impairment, the greater the
8 procedural safeguards the [government] must provide to satisfy due process." *Haygood v.*
9 *Younger*, 769 F.2d 1350, 1355-56 (9th Cir. 1985) (en banc) (citing *Morrissey*, 408 U.S. at
10 481-82). This Court must "balance [Petitioner's] liberty interest against the
11 [government's] interest in the efficient administration of" its immigration laws in order to
12 determine what process he is owed to ensure that ICE does not unconstitutionally deprive
13 him of his liberty. *Id.* at 1357.

15 78. The three-factor *Mathews* test (adopted by the Court of Appeals for the Ninth
16 Circuit, see *Rodriguez Diaz v. Garland*, 53 F.4th 1189, 1206-07 (9th Cir. 2022)), helps
17 the Court assess adequate safeguards: "[F]irst, the private interest that will be affected by
18 the official action; second, the risk of an erroneous deprivation of such interest through
19 the procedures used, and the probative value, if any, of additional or substitute procedural
20 safeguards; and finally the government's interest, including the function involved and the
21 fiscal and administrative burdens that the additional or substitute procedural requirements
22 would entail." *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 335 (1976).
23
24

1 79. The Due Process Clause typically requires a hearing of some sort before the
2 government may deprive a person of liberty. *Zinermon v. Burch*, 494 U.S. 113, 127
3 (1990) (*see also United States v. Raya-Vaca*, 771 F.3d 1195, 1204 (9th Cir. 2014) (“Due
4 process always requires, at a minimum, notice and an opportunity to respond.”). Post-
5 deprivation remedies may satisfy the requirements of due process only in a “special case”
6 where they are “the only remedies the State could be expected to provide” and where
7 “one of the variables in the *Mathews* equation—the value of post deprivation
8 safeguards—is negligible in preventing the kind of deprivation at issue” such that “the
9 State cannot be required constitutionally to do the impossible by providing post
10 deprivation process.” *Zinermon*, 494 U.S. at 985.

12 **1. Petitioner has a substantial liberty interest in staying out of detention**

13 80. An individual's interest in not being detained is “the most elemental of liberty
14 interests[.]” *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507, 529, 124 S.Ct. 2633, 159 L.Ed.2d 578
15 (2004). “Freedom from bodily restraint has always been at the core of the liberty
16 protected by the Due Process Clause.” *Foucha v. Louisiana*, 504 U.S. 71, 80 (1992). This
17 liberty interest also exists where ICE decides to unilaterally nullify its own prior parole
18 decision and take away his physical freedom, *i.e.*, his “constitutionally protected interest
19 in avoiding physical restraint.” *Singh v. Holder*, 638 F.3d 1196, 1203 (9th Cir. 2011)
20 (internal quotation omitted). Courts have routinely agreed that “a petitioner’s interest in
21 remaining out of custody as ‘substantial.’” *Rodriguez-Flores v. Semaia*, No. 2:25-CV-
22 06900, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 14, 2025) (citing *Diaz v. Kaiser*, No. 3:25-CV-05071, 2025
24

1 WL 1676854 (N.D. Cal. June 14, 2025)). The longer the individual has been released, the
2 more important his liberty interest grows. *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471, 482 (1972).

3 **2. There is a risk of erroneous deprivation that the additional procedural**
4 **safeguard of a pre-detention hearing would help protect against.**

5 81. Even if the Government believes “it has a valid reason” to re-detain noncitizens, it
6 “does not eliminate its obligation to effectuate the detention in a manner that comports
7 with due process.” *Guillermo M.R. v. Kaiser*, — F. Supp. 3d —, —, No. 25-cv-
8 05436-RFL, 2025 WL 1983677, at *7 (N.D. Cal. July 17, 2025) (finding “undeniably
9 stark” risk of erroneous deprivation where the Government contends that
10 “notwithstanding a neutral arbiter’s determination that Petitioner should be released, ICE
11 is entitled to unilaterally terminate the IJ’s order by re-detaining Petitioner without a
12 hearing for at least six months, based on ICE’s own determination in its sole discretion
13 that additional conditions of release unilaterally set by ICE had been violated”); *see also*
14 *Singh v. Andrews*, No. 1:25-CV-00801, 2025 WL 1918679 (E.D. Cal. July 11, 2025).

15 82. Where the petitioner “has not received any bond or custody ... hearing, the risk of
16 an erroneous deprivation [of liberty] is high because neither the government nor
17 [Petitioner] has had an opportunity to determine whether there is any valid basis for her
18 detention.” *Pinchi v. Noem*, — F. Supp. 3d —, —, No. 5:25-cv-05632-PCP, 2025
19 WL 2084921, at *8 (N.D. Cal. July 24, 2025) (citation omitted). A pre-detention hearing
20 significantly decreases that risk because the government has to prove to a neutral
21 adjudicator by clear and convincing evidence that circumstances have materially changed
22
23
24

1 to justify re-detention, and a hearing is likelier to produce accurate determinations
2 regarding factual disputes, such as whether a certain occurrence constitutes a “changed
3 circumstance.” *See Chalkboard, Inc. v. Brandt*, 902 F.2d 1375, 1381 (9th Cir.1989)
4 (when “delicate judgments depending on credibility of witnesses and assessment of
5 conditions not subject to measurement” are at issue, the “risk of error is considerable
6 when just determinations are made after hearing only one side”).

8 83.Further, the risk of an erroneous deprivation of liberty under *Mathews* can be
9 decreased where a neutral decisionmaker, rather than ICE alone, makes custody
10 determinations. *Diouf v. Napolitano* (“*Diouf II*”), 634 F.3d 1081, 1091-92 (9th Cir.
11 2011); *see also Castro-Cortez v. INS*, 239 F.3d 1037, 1049 (9th Cir. 2001), *abrogated on*
12 *other grounds by Fernandez-Vargas v. Gonzales*, 548 U.S. 30 (2006) (“A neutral judge
13 is one of the most basic due process protections.”)

15 84.Any argument that noncitizens can request a custody determination hearing once
16 re-detained goes against the due process safeguards envisioned in the Constitution,
17 because such hearing happens after the fact and cannot prevent an erroneous deprivation
18 of liberty. *Domingo v. Kaiser*, No. 25-cv-05893 (RFL), 2025 WL 1940179, at *3 (N.D.
19 Cal. July 14, 2025) (“Even if Petitioner-Plaintiff received a prompt post-detention bond
20 hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and was released at that point, he will have already
21 suffered the harm that is the subject of his motion: that is, his potentially erroneous
22 detention.”). Further, custody determination hearings are routinely conducted in
23
24

1 immigration court and this is not a “special case” that warrants post-deprivation remedies
2 because other remedies are impractical the way it was in *Zinerman*.

3 85. Consequently ICE was required to provide Petitioner with notice and a hearing
4 prior to any re-incarceration and revocation of his conditional parole. *See Morrissey*, 408
5 U.S. at 481-82; *Haygood*, 769 F.2d at 1355-56; *Jones*, 393 F.3d at 932; *Zinerman*, 494
6 U.S. at 985; *see also Youngberg v. Romeo*, 457 U.S. 307, 321-24 (1982); *Lynch v. Baxley*,
7 744 F.2d 1452 (11th Cir. 1984) (holding that individuals awaiting involuntary civil
8 commitment proceedings may not constitutionally be held in jail pending the
9 determination as to whether they can ultimately be recommitted). Under *Mathews*, “the
10 balance weighs heavily in favor of [Petitioner’s] liberty” and required a pre-deprivation
11 hearing before a neutral adjudicator, which ICE failed to provide.
12

13 86. Further, immigration detention is civil (as opposed to criminal), and its primary
14 purpose is to ensure a noncitizen’s appearance during removal proceedings and protect
15 against danger to the community; it cannot be punitive. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678,
16 690, 697 (2001). Due process thus also requires consideration of alternatives to detention
17 at any custody redetermination hearing that may occur, and where alternatives to
18 detention that could mitigate risk of flight exist, detention is not warranted. *See Bell v.*
19 *Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520, 538 (1979). In fact here Petitioner was released on a \$1,500.00
20 Immigration Judge bond and has since then complied with the conditions of his release.
21

22 ///
23
24

3. The government’s interest in detaining Petitioner is minimal, and in fact the procedural requirements of a hearing would promote judicial and administrative efficiency given the government’s limited resources

87. The efficient allocation of the government’s limited fiscal resources further supports holding a hearing prior to re-detaining noncitizens. The “fiscal and administrative burdens” as a result of the due process safeguard are nonexistent. *See Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 334-35 (1976). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has long recognized that “[t]he costs to the public of immigration detention are ‘staggering,’” *Hernandez v. Sessions*, 872 F.3d 976, 996 (9th Cir. 2017); *Diaz*, 2025 WL 1676854, at *3. In 2017 – with inflation numbers are likely higher today– immigration detention cost “\$158 each day per detainee, amounting to a total daily cost of \$6.5 million.” *Hernandez*, 872 F.3d at 996. On the other hand, “[i]n immigration court, custody hearings are routine and impose a minimal cost.” *Pinchi v. Noem*, — F. Supp. 3d —, —, No. 5:25-cv-05632-PCP, 2025 WL 2084921, at *10 (N.D. Cal. July 24, 2025) (citing *Singh v. Andrews*, No. 1:25-CV-00801, 2025 WL 1918679, at *8 (E.D. Cal. July 11, 2025)). The cost of re-detaining an immigrant who was previously released “pending any bond hearing would significantly exceed the cost of providing [the immigrant] with a pre-detention hearing.” *Pinchi*, 2025 WL 2084921, at *10.

88. ICE’s new policy to make a minimum number of arrests each day under the new administration¹ does not constitute a material change in circumstances and cannot stand

¹ See “Trump officials issue quotas to ICE officers to ramp up arrests,” *Washington Post* (January 26, 2025), available at: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/immigration/2025/01/26/ice-arrests-raids-trump-quota/>.

1 to replace regulations enacted by Congress that allow the release of noncitizens in the
2 first place. It is “arbitrary, capricious [and] an abuse of discretion” “in excess of statutory
3 jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)-
4 (C). Even if the government “ultimately demonstrates to a neutral decisionmaker by clear
5 and convincing evidence that her detention is necessary to prevent danger to the
6 community or flight,” then the only potential injury the government faces is a short delay
7 in detaining” Petitioner. *Pinchi*, 2025 WL 2084921, at *12. “Faced with ... a conflict
8 between minimally costly procedures and preventable human suffering, [the Court has]
9 little difficulty concluding that the balance of hardships tips decidedly in plaintiff[’s]
10 favor.” (internal citations omitted). *Id.*

11
12 89. Consequently the government’s interest in keeping Petitioner in detention without
13 a due process hearing is outweighed by Petitioner’s significant private interest in his
14 liberty. The scale tips sharply in favor of releasing Petitioner from custody unless and
15 until the government demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that he is a flight
16 risk or danger to the community. It becomes abundantly clear that the *Mathews* test
17 favors Petitioner when the Court considers that the process Petitioner seeks—release
18 from custody pending notice and a hearing regarding whether his conditional parole
19 should be revoked and, if so, whether a new bond amount should be set—is a standard
20 course of action for the government. In the alternative, providing Petitioner with a
21 hearing before this Court (or a neutral decisionmaker) to determine whether there is clear
22 and convincing evidence that Petitioner is a flight risk or danger to the community would
23
24

1 impose only a *de minimis* burden on the government, because the government routinely
2 provides this sort of hearing to detained individuals like Petitioner.

3 **Statutory Framework Regarding Detention – Section 1225 and Section 1226**

4 90. The Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) prescribes three basic forms of
5 detention for noncitizens in removal proceedings.
6

7 91. First, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 authorizes the detention of noncitizens in standard non-
8 expedited removal proceedings before an immigration judge (IJ). See 8 U.S.C. § 1229a.
9 Individuals in § 1226(a) detention are entitled to a bond hearing at the outset of their
10 detention, see 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19(a), 1236.1(d), while noncitizens who have been
11 arrested, charged with, or convicted of certain crimes are subject to mandatory detention,
12 see 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c).
13

14 92. Second, the INA provides for mandatory detention of noncitizens subject to
15 expedited removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and for other recent arrivals seeking
16 admission referred to under § 1225(b)(2).

17 93. Last, the Act also provides for detention of noncitizens who have been previously
18 ordered removed, including individuals in withholding-only proceedings, see 8 U.S.C.
19 § 1231(a)–(b).
20

21 94. This case concerns the detention provisions at §§ 1226(a) and 1225(b)(2).

22 95. The detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) were enacted as part of the
23 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996, Pub. L.
24 No. 104–208, Div. C, §§ 302–03, 110 Stat. 3009–546, 3009–582 to 3009–583, 3009–

1 585. Section 1226(a) was most recently amended earlier this year by the Laken Riley Act,
2 Pub. L. No.119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025).

3 96.Following enactment of the IIRIRA, EOIR drafted new regulations explaining that,
4 in general, people who entered the country without inspection were not considered
5 detained under § 1225 and that they were instead detained under § 1226(a). See
6 Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct
7 of Removal Proceedings; Asylum Procedures, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997).
8

9 97.Thus, in the decades that followed, most people who entered without inspection—
10 unless they were subject to some other detention authority—received bond hearings. That
11 practice was consistent with many more decades of prior practice, in which noncitizens
12 who were not deemed “arriving” were entitled to a custody hearing before an IJ or other
13 hearing officer. See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a) (1994); see also H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at
14 229 (1996) (noting that § 1226(a) simply “restates” the detention authority previously
15 found at § 1252(a)).
16

17 98.On September 5, 2025, the Board of Immigration Appeals issued a precedent
18 decision in *Matter of YAJURE HURTADO*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), finding that
19 noncitizens who entered the United States without inspection were ineligible for bond
20 redetermination hearings because they were seeking admission, and fell within 8 U.S.C. §
21 1225(b)(2)(A).
22

23 99.This legal theory that noncitizens who entered the United States without admission
24 or parole are ineligible for bond hearings has been universally rejected by the district

1 courts. *Rodriguez v. Bostock*, No. 3:25-CV-05240-TMC, 2025 WL 2782499, at *9 (W.D.
2 Wash. Sept. 30, 2025); *Mosqueda v. Noem*, No. 5:25-CV-02304 CAS (BFM), 2025 WL
3 2591530, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2025); *Guzman v. Andrews*, No. 1:25-CV-01015-KES-
4 SKO (HC), 2025 WL 2617256, at *9 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025); *Vasquez Garcia v. Noem*,
5 3:25-cv-02180-DMS-MMP (SD. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025); *Benitez v. Noem*, No. 5:25-cv-
6 02190-RGK-AS) C.D. Cal. Aug. 26, 2025); *Arrazola Gonzalez v. Noem*, 5:25-cv-01789-
7 ODW-DFM (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2025); *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, 5:25-cv-
8 01873-SSS-BFM (C.D. Cal. July 28, 2025); *Carmona-Lorenzo v. Trump*, No.
9 4:25CV3172, 2025 WL 2531521, at *2 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025); *Perez v. Berg*, No.
10 8:25CV494, 2025 WL 2531566, at *2 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025); *Lopez-Campos v.*
11 *Raycraft*, No. 2:25-CV-12486, 2025 WL 2496379, at *8 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025);
12 *Jose J.O.E. v. Bondi*, No. 25-CV-3051 (ECT/DJF), 2025 WL 2466670, at *6 (D. Minn.
13 Aug. 27, 2025); *Kostak v. Trump*, No. CV 3:25-1093, 2025 WL 2472136, at *3 (W.D.
14 La. Aug. 27, 2025) *Rodriguez v. Bostock*, 2025 WL 1193850 (W.D. Wa. Apr. 24, 2025).

17 100. The Board’s interpretation defies the INA. The plain text of the statutory
18 provisions demonstrates that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to people like Petitioner.

19 101. Section 1226(a) applies by default to all persons “pending a decision on
20 whether the [noncitizen] is to be removed from the United States.” These removal
21 hearings are held under § 1229a, which “decid[e] the inadmissibility or deportability of
22 a[] [noncitizen].”
23
24

102. The text of § 1226 also explicitly applies to people charged as being inadmissible, including those who entered without inspection. See 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E). Subparagraph (E)’s reference to such people makes clear that, by default, such people are afforded a bond hearing under subsection (a). Section 1226 therefore leaves no doubt that it applies to people who face charges of being inadmissible to the United States, including those who are present without admission or parole.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Statutory Violation - Petitioners' Detention is in Violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)-(b)

105. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, the allegations in the paragraphs above.

106. Respondents lack statutory authority to detain Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), because that statute requires that the individual be an applicant for admission and seeking admission to the U.S.

1 107. As Petitioner does not meet these criteria, his detention must be governed by
2 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) which provides discretionary detention authority and requires ICE to
3 make an individualized custody determination.

4 108. Under § 1226(a), individuals may be detained as a matter of discretion,
5 released on their own recognizance, or released on bond of at least \$1,500.
6

7 109. Respondents' failure to apply the correct statutory framework violates the
8 INA and exceeds the government's detention authority.

9 110. Thus, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court order his release from
10 detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), INA § 236(a), for the duration of his removal
11 proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a, INA § 240. Alternatively, he requests that this Court
12 order a constitutionally adequate bond hearing complying with the procedural
13 requirements in *Singh*.
14

15 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

16 **Due Process**

17 **U.S. Const. amend. V**

18 111. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in the
19 preceding paragraphs.

20 112. Petitioner's continued detention without any bond hearing violates his right
21 to due process under the Fifth Amendment.

22 113. The Government may not deprive a person of life, liberty, or property
23 without due process of law. U.S. Const. amend. V. "Freedom from imprisonment— from
24

1 government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of
2 the liberty that the Clause protects.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).

3 114. Petitioner has a vested liberty interest in his conditional release. Due Process
4 does not permit the government to strip him of that liberty without a hearing before this
5 Court. *See Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471, 487-88 (1972).

7 115. Petitioner’s re-arrest without a hearing violated the Constitution both
8 substantively, because Respondents have no valid interest in detaining him since
9 circumstances have not changed, and procedurally, because he was not provided with a
10 pre-detention hearing.

11 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

12 **Petitioner’s Detention Violates the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)**
13 **Unlawful Denial of Bond**

14 116. Petitioner repeats re-alleges and incorporate by reference each and every
15 allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

16 117. Under the Administrative Procedures Act (“APA”), an agency must act in a
17 manner that is not arbitrary or capricious. See 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A) (directing courts to
18 “hold unlawful and set aside agency action” that is arbitrary and capricious); *Dep’t of*
19 *Com. v. New York*, 139 S. Ct. 2551, 2569 (2019) (requiring an agency to articulate a
20 “satisfactory explanation” for its action, “including a rational connection between the
21 facts found and the choice made”).

22 118. A court must “hold unlawful and set aside agency action” that is “arbitrary,
23 capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with the law,” that is
24

1 “contrary to constitutional right [or] power,” or that is “in excess of statutory jurisdiction,
2 authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)-(C).

3 119. The mandatory detention provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) does not apply
4 to noncitizens residing in the United States who are subject to the grounds of
5 inadmissibility because they originally entered the United States without inspection or
6 parole. Such noncitizens are detained under § 1226(a), unless they are subject to another
7 detention provision, such as § 1225(b)(1), § 1226(c) or § 1231.
8

9 120. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to bar Petitioner from receiving a bond
10 redetermination hearing before an immigration judge is arbitrary, capricious, and not in
11 accordance with law, and as such, it violates the APA. See 5 U.S.C. § 706(2).
12

13 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

14 WHEREFORE, the Petitioner prays that this Court grant the following relief:

- 15 (1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- 16 (2) Issue the writ of habeas corpus and order Respondents to show cause,
17 within three days of Petitioner’s filing this petition, why the relief he
18 seeks should not be granted; and set a hearing on this matter within five
19 days of Respondents’ return on the order to show cause (*see* 28 U.S.C.
20 § 2243);
- 21 (3) Enjoin Respondents from transferring Petitioner outside the jurisdiction
22 of the Southern District of California pending the resolution of this case;
- 23 (4) Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus requiring Respondents to release
24

Petitioner on the conditions of his prior conditional parole;

(5) Alternatively conduct an immediate bond hearing before this Court where DHS bears the burden of justifying Petitioner's continued detention by clear and convincing evidence and the Court takes into consideration alternatives to detention and Petitioner's ability to pay a bond;

(6) Alternatively, order an immediate bond hearing before a neutral decisionmaker where DHS bears the burden of justifying Petitioner's continued detention by clear and convincing evidence and where alternatives to detention and Petitioner's ability to pay a bond are considered;

(7) Award reasonable costs and attorney fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA"), as amended, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and on any other basis justified under law;

(8) Grant such further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: November 19, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Bashir Ghazialam
Bashir Ghazialam
Attorneys for Petitioner

VERIFICATION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. 2242

I am submitting this verification on behalf of the Petitioner because I am one of Petitioner's attorneys. I have discussed with the Petitioner the events described in the Petition and reviewed Petitioner's immigration file. Based on said review and those discussions, I hereby verify that the factual statements made in the attached Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed on this November 19, 2025, in San Diego, California.

/s/ Bashir Ghazialam
Bashir Ghazialam
Attorney for Petitioner