

ERIC GRANT
United States Attorney
KIMBERLY A. SANCHEZ
Assistant United States Attorney
2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401
Fresno, CA 93721
Telephone: (559) 497-4000
Facsimile: (559) 497-4099

Attorneys for the United States of America

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ZOILA JUT SARAX DE VASQUEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

CHRISTOPHER CHESTNUT, Warden of the
California City Correctional Facility,

Respondents.¹

CASE NO. 1:25-CV-01999-DJC-JDP

OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR A TEMPORARY
RESTRAINING ORDER

¹ This Court should dismiss all respondents other than the Warden of the California City Correctional Facility because the only proper respondent to a habeas petition is the custodian having immediate custody of the petitioner. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2242; *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 430 (2004); *Doe v. Garland*, 109 F.4th 1188, 1197 (9th Cir. 2024).

I. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

On the face of the habeas petition, the petitioner does not appear to be a member of the class certified in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM (C.D. Cal), because (1) she entered the United States without inspection; (2) she was apprehended upon arrival; and (3) she is not subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231 at the time that DHS made its custody determination. In *Maldonado-Bautista*, the Central District of California: (1) declared that the class members are detained under section 1226(a) and are not subject to mandatory detention under section 1225(b)(2); (2) declared that pursuant to the government's regulations (8 C.F.R. 236.1, 1236.1, and 1003.19) the class members are detained under section 1226(a), are not subject to mandatory detention under section 1225(b)(2), and are entitled to consideration for release on bond by immigration officers and, if not released, a custody redetermination hearing before an immigration judge; and (3) vacated the Department of Homeland Security's July 8, 2025 "Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission" -- which takes the position that all applicants for admission within the meaning of 8 U.S.C. 1225(a) are subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. 1225(b) -- as contrary to law under the Administrative Procedures Act. See *Maldonado Bautista v. Noem*, No. 5:25-cv-01873, 2025 WL 3713987 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025).

In its order, the *Maldonado Bautista* court recognized that it could not extend the portions of its order declaring that the class members are detained under section 1226(a), not section 1225(b)(2), and that pursuant to the government's regulations the class members are detained under section 1226(a) and are eligible for release on bond, to class members beyond the Central District of California. See *Maldonado Bautista*, 2025 WL 37113987, at *29-30 (acknowledging that the court's jurisdiction to grant habeas relief is limited to those within the district and stating that its order does not require the government to provide habeas relief to all members across the nation). However, the court stated that it did have jurisdiction to extend its declaratory judgment regarding the illegality of DHS's July 8, 2025 guidance under the APA beyond the borders of the Central District of California. See *id.* The government has appealed the *Maldonado Bautista* judgment to the Ninth Circuit, see *Maldonado Bautista v. DHS*, 9th Cir. No. 25-7958, but neither the district court nor the Ninth Circuit has issued a stay of the district court's order.

II. DISCUSSION

The Petitioner is a citizen and national of Guatemala who entered the United States without inspection. She is an “applicant for admission” within the meaning of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a) and subject to mandatory detention by Immigration and Customs Enforcement under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) during the pendency of her removal proceedings. *See, e.g., Cortes Alonzo v. Noem et al.*, 1:25-cv-01519-WBS-SCR (E.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2025) (Docket No. 14).

Several district courts within the Ninth Circuit have recently denied motions for temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions for individuals, like the petitioner, who have been detained under section 1225(b)(2) following release on conditional parole. *See Altamirano Ramos v. Lyons*, No. 25-cv-09785, 2025 WL 3199872, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2025) (acknowledging that the court had previously rejected the government’s interpretation of § 1225(b)(2), but “after additional research and analysis, the court has concluded that Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(a), and that Petitioner is not eligible for a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)”; *Sixtos Chavez v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02325, 2025 WL 2730228 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2025), *appeal docketed*, No. 25-7077 (9th Cir. Nov. 7, 2025); *Valencia v. Chestnut*, No. 25-cv-01550, 2025 WL 3205133 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2025); *Alonzo v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-01519, 2025 WL 3208284 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2025).

Respondents further rely upon *In re Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I & N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). There, the BIA examined the plain language of § 1225, the INA’s statutory scheme, Supreme Court and BIA precedent, the legislative history of the INA and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (“IIRIRA”), Pub L. No. 104-208, and DHS’s prior practices. After doing so, the BIA held that “under a plain language reading of section 235(b)(2)(A) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), Immigration Judges lack authority to hear bond requests or to grant bond to aliens, like the respondent, who are present in the United States without admission.” 29 I & N Dec. at 225. This Court should rule the same. Petitioner’s prior release in the discretion of DHS, even if the release document cited 8 U.S.C. § 1226, does not have the effect of having converted petitioner’s presence in the United States into an “admission.” “[A]n alien who ‘arrives in the United States,’ or ‘is present’ in this country but ‘has not been admitted,’ is treated as ‘an applicant for admission.’” *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281 (2018). As an applicant for admission, petitioner is subject to mandatory

1 detention and thus ineligible for a bond hearing. Therefore, the Court should decline to enter a
2 preliminary injunction.

3 Nevertheless, counsel for the government has reviewed the cases cited in the Court's minute
4 order and there are no factual or legal issues in this case that render it distinct from the court's prior
5 orders, and others such as *Valencia Zapata v. Kaiser*, No. 25-cv-07492, 2025 WL 2741654 (N.D. Cal.
6 Sept. 26, 2025). Moreover, the government alerts the Court that two district courts within the Ninth
7 Circuit have recently vacated or stayed the Department of Homeland Security's July 8, 2025 "Interim
8 Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission" -- which takes the position that
9 all applicants for admission within the meaning of 8 U.S.C. 1225(a) are subject to mandatory detention
10 under 8 U.S.C. 1225(b) -- as contrary to law under the Administrative Procedure Act. *See Maldonado*
11 *Bautista v. Noem*, No. 5:25-cv-01873, 2025 WL 3713987 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025) (vacating the
12 guidance); *Garro Pinchi v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-05632, 2025 WL 3691938 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 19, 2025)
13 (staying the guidance within ICE's San Francisco area of responsibility, an area that includes the Eastern
14 District of California, pending final resolution of the APA claim). Although the government has
15 appealed the *Bautista Maldonado* judgment to the Ninth Circuit, *see Bautista-Maldonado v. DHS*, 9th
16 Cir. No. 25-7958, there is currently no stay in place of the district court's order from either the district
17 court or the Ninth Circuit.

18 The government also wishes to bring to the Court's attention the fact that the Ninth Circuit will
19 likely address the application of section 1225(b)(2) in *Rodriguez v. Bostock*, 9th Cir. No. 25-6842, an
20 appeal that is being considered for the oral argument calendar in March 2026.

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 The government does not oppose treating the motion for a temporary restraining order as a
2 motion for preliminary injunction. The government also does not request a hearing.

3
4 Dated: December 29, 2025

ERIC GRANT
United States Attorney

5
6 By: /s/ Kimberly A. Sanchez
KIMBERLY A. SANCHEZ
Assistant United States Attorney
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28