

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Jovan Hernandez Rubio

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Stephanie R Taylor, Austin Immigration Law Group, 1503
E. 38th 1/2 St. Austin, Texas 78722 512-410-7313

DEFENDANTS

S. Ortega, K. Noem, DHS, P. Bondi, EOIR, C. Collins

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF
THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff ☐ 3 Federal Question
(U.S. Government Not a Party)
- ☒ 2 U.S. Government Defendant ☐ 4 Diversity
(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- | | PTF | DEF | | PTF | DEF |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Citizen of This State | ☐ 1 | ☐ 1 | Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State | ☐ 4 | ☐ 4 |
| Citizen of Another State | ☐ 2 | ☐ 2 | Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State | ☐ 5 | ☐ 5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | ☐ 3 | ☐ 3 | Foreign Nation | ☐ 6 | ☐ 6 |

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander ☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability ☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury ☐ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability ☐ 367 Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY ☐ 370 Other Fraud ☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage ☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 690 Other LABOR ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act ☐ 720 Labor/Management Relations ☐ 740 Railway Labor Act ☐ 751 Family and Medical Leave Act ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation ☐ 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION ☐ 462 Naturalization Application ☐ 465 Other Immigration Actions	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS ☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent ☐ 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application ☐ 840 Trademark ☐ 880 Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016 SOCIAL SECURITY ☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS ☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) ☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ☐ 480 Consumer Credit (15 USC 1681 or 1692) ☐ 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts ☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act ☐ 896 Arbitration ☐ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	CIVIL RIGHTS ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/Accommodations ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment ☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other ☐ 448 Education	PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: ☒ 463 Alien Detainee ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence ☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penalty Other: ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement			

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☒ 1 Original Proceeding ☐ 2 Removed from State Court ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened ☐ 5 Transferred from Another District (specify) ☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer ☐ 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):
28 USC 2241Brief description of cause:
Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.

DEMAND \$

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND: ☐ Yes ☒ No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions):

JUDGE

DOCKET NUMBER

DATE

01/08/2026

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

/s/ Stephanie R. Taylor

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT #

AMOUNT

APPLYING IFP

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

Jovan HERNANDEZ RUBIO,

Petitioner,

v.

Sylvester ORTEGA, Field Office Director of
Enforcement and Removal Operations, San
Antonio Field Office, Immigration and Customs
Enforcement; Kristi NOEM, Secretary, U.S.
Department of Homeland Security; U.S.
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY; Pamela BONDI, U.S. Attorney
General; EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR
IMMIGRATION REVIEW; Charlotte
COLLINS, Warden of T. Don Hutto Detention
Center,

Respondents.

Case No. 1:26-cv-00040

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS**

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner Jovan HERNANDEZ RUBIO brings this petition for a writ of habeas corpus to seek enforcement of their rights as members of the Bond Denial Class certified in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM (C.D. Cal.) Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents at the T. Don Hutto Detention Center. He now faces unlawful detention because the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) assert that 8 U.S.C. § 1225, not § 1226, governs his custody and forecloses bond, in violation of Petitioner's due process rights.

2. Furthermore, Respondents have refused to abide by the declaratory judgment issued on behalf of the certified class in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*. On November 20, 2025, the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California granted partial summary judgment for the case's four petitioners, holding that this government policy is inconsistent with the plain language of the INA and that petitioners are properly subject to detention under § 1226(a), and thus eligible for a bond determination. On November 25, 2025, the Court certified a nationwide class of noncitizens who are in immigration detention and being denied access to a bond hearing based on the government's allegation that they entered the United States without admission or inspection.

3. Petitioner Jovan HERNANDEZ RUBIO is a member of the Bond Eligible Class, as he: (1) is alleged to have entered the United States without inspection, (2) was not apprehended upon arrive and (3) is not subject to mandatory detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231.

4. The Petitioner came to the United States when he was twelve years old. He graduated from Travis High School in Austin, Texas. He has a 16-year-old US Citizen son. He

was detained by Immigration and Customs Enforcement on December 24, 2025 after serving a 12-day sentence for Obstruction of a Highway in Travis County. On January 8, 2026, an Immigration Judge denied the Petitioner's request for bond citing jurisdictional issues.

5. Because Respondents are detaining Petitioner in violation of the plain language interpretation of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as well as in violation of the declaratory judgment issued in *Maldonado Bautista*, the Court should accordingly order that within one day, Respondent DHS must release Petitioner.

JURISDICTION

6. Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents. Petitioner is detained at the T. Don Hutto Detention Center.

7. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(5) (habeas corpus), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), and Article I, section 9, clause 2 of the United States Constitution (the Suspension Clause).

8. This Court may grant relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*, and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

VENUE

9. Pursuant to *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493-500 (1973), venue lies in the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, the judicial district in which Petitioner currently is detained.

10. Venue is also properly in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because Respondents are employees, officers, and agencies of the United States, and because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in the Western District of Texas.

REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

11. The Court should grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus “forthwith,” as the legal issues have already been resolved by this Court in numerous cases with similar facts.

12. Habeas corpus is “perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law . . . affording as it does a *swift* and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or confinement.” *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963) (emphasis added). “The application for the writ usurps the attention and displaces the calendar of the judge or justice who entertains it and receives prompt action from him within the four corners of the application.” *Yong v. I.N.S.*, 208 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted).

PARTIES

13. Petitioner Jovan HERNANDEZ RUBIO, has been in immigration detention since December 24, 2025. Petitioner has resided in Austin, Texas since 1996.

14. Respondent Sylvester M. ORTEGA is the Director of the San Antonio Field Office of ICE’s Enforcement and Removal Operations division. As such, Sylvester M. ORTEGA is Petitioner’s immediate custodian and is responsible for Petitioner’s detention and removal. He is named in his official capacity.

15. Respondent Kristi NOEM is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. She is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), and oversees ICE, which is responsible for Petitioner’s detention. Ms. NOEM has ultimate custodial authority over Petitioner and is sued in her official capacity.

16. Respondent Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is the federal agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA, including the detention and removal of noncitizens.

17. Respondent Pamela BONDI is the Attorney General of the United States. She is responsible for the Department of Justice, of which the Executive Office for Immigration Review and the immigration court system it operates is a component agency. She is sued in her official capacity.

18. Respondent Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) is the federal agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA in removal proceedings, including for custody redeterminations in bond hearings.

19. Respondent Charlotte COLLINS is employed by CoreCivic as Warden of the T. Don Hutto Detention Center, where Petitioner is detained. She has immediate physical custody of Petitioner. She is sued in her official capacity.

CLAIM FOR RELIEF:

20. Petitioner repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

21. A district court may grant a writ of habeas corpus if the petitioner's detention is in violation of the Constitution or federal law. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3).

22. As a member of the Bond Eligible Class, Petitioner is entitled to consideration for release on bond under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). Respondents are obligated to apply the law to all class members, as determined in the binding, final judgment issued in *Maldonado Bautista*. Despite being bound by the ruling there, which has the full "force and effect of a final judgment." 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a), Respondents continue to assert the position that an individual who is alleged to have entered without inspection is considered an "applicant for admission" and therefore ineligible for release on bond.

23. It is a "basic proposition that all orders and judgments of courts must be complied with promptly," *Maness v. Meyers*, 419 U.S. 449, 458 (1975), and thus, in "suits against

government officials and departments, [courts] assume that they will comply with declaratory judgments.” *United Aeronautical Corp. v. United States Air Force*, 80 F.4th 1017, 1031 (9th Cir. 2023). This is because declaratory judgments like the one in *Maldonado Bautista* have “the same effect as an injunction in fixing the parties’ legal entitlements.” *Florida ex rel. Bondi v. U.S. Dep’t of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 780 F. Supp. 2d 1307, 1316 (N.D. Fla. 2011).

24. The order granting class certification in *Maldonado Bautista* further orders that “[w]hen considering this determination with the MSJ Order, the Court extends the same declaratory relief granted to Petitioners to the Bond Eligible Class as a whole.” *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 3289861, at *14 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2025). Respondents are parties to *Maldonado Bautista* and bound by the Court’s declaratory judgment, which has the full “force and effect of a final judgment.” 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a).

25. After reports of the Respondents’ failure to comply with the partial motion for summary judgement, on December 19, 2025, the district court granted a motion to clarify and entered a new order issuing a final judgment under Rule 54(b), making clear that all class members are entitled to benefit from the declaratory judgment confirming that they are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). Despite this, Respondents continue to violate the Court’s order.

26. By asserting that the Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2), Respondents violate Petitioner’s statutory rights under the INA and the Court’s judgment in *Maldonado Bautista*.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

- a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- b. Issue a writ of habeas corpus requiring that within one day, Respondents release Petitioner;

- c. Award Petitioner attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA), as amended, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and on any other basis justified under law; and
- d. Grant any other and further relief that this Court deems just and proper.

DATED this 8th day of January 2026.

Respectfully submitted,


Stephanie R Taylor
Austin Immigration Law Group, PLLC
1503 E 38th ½ St.
Austin, Texas 78722
Ph: 512-410-7313
Email: Stephanie@austinimmigration.org
Texas Bar No. 24067011
Attorneys for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on January 8, 2026, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and all accompanying exhibits to be served by certified mail, return receipt requested, on the following:

U.S. Attorney's Office for the Western District of Texas
Attn: Stephanie Rico | Civil Process Clerk
601 N.W. Loop 410, Suite 600
San Antonio, TX 78216

Warden, T. Don Hutto Detention Center
Charlotte Collins
1001 Welch Street,
P.O. Box 1063
Taylor, TX 76574

Service on the United States Attorney constitutes service on all named federal Respondents in this matter, and service has also been made directly on the Facility Administrator as Petitioner's immediate custodian.

Dated this 8th day of January, 2026.

/s/ Stephanie R Taylor

Attorney for Petitioner

Austin Immigration Law Group, PLLC

1503 E. 38th ½ St.

Austin, Texas 78722

Ph: 512-410-7313

Email: Stephanie@austinimmigration.org

Texas Bar No.: 24067011