

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

_____	)	
Cristobal GONZALEZ BAUTISTA	)	
	)	
Petitioner-Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	Civ. No. <u>1:26-cv-00101</u>
	)	
PAM BONDI,	)	
United States Attorney General;	)	
	)	DHS File Number: 
KRISTI LYNN NOEM,	)	
Secretary of the United States	)	
Department of Homeland Security;	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY
	)	AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF;
	)	PETITION FOR HABEAS CORPUS
TODD M. LYONS,	)	UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 2241
Director of United States	)	
Immigration and Customs Enforcement;	)	
	)	
MIGUEL VERGARA	)	
Field Office Director	)	
for Detention and Removal, U.S.	)	
Immigration and Customs Enforcement,	)	
	)	
CHARLOTTE COLLINS, Warden,	)	
T. Don Hutto Detention Center;	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
Respondents-Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT.....	4-5
INTRODUCTION.....	5-8
JURISDICTION AND VENUE.....	8-9
REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243, WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS ISSUANCE, RETURN, HEARING, AND DECISION.....	9
PARTIES.....	9-11
FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS	11-12
LEGAL FRAMEWORK: DUE PROCESS CLAUSE.....	13-20
CLAIM FOR RELIEF VIOLATION OF THE INA: REQUEST FOR RELIEF PURSUANT TO MALDONADO BAUTISTA.....	20-28
RELIEF SOUGHT.....	28-29
PRAYER FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.....	29
VERIFICATION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2242.....	30
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	31

APPENDIX

EXHIBIT A: MEDICAL RECORDS FOR PETITIONER'S WIFE AND DAUGHTER.....	32-58
EXHIBIT B: IEP REPORT FOR PETITIONER'S DAUGHTER.....	59-76
EXHIBIT C: IMMIGRATION JUDGE'S ORDER.....	77-78
EXHIBIT D: I-130 PETITION APPROVED.....	79
EXHIBIT E: DISMISSAL OF ILLEGAL DUMPING.....	80

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

This petition challenges the unlawful detention of Petitioner Cristobal GONZALEZ BAUTISTA (“Mr. Gonzalez Bautista”), a 41-year-old who has a United States Citizen wife and three United States Citizen children, and he has resided in the United States for more than 23 years. On or about October 24, 2025, Petitioner was arrested by immigration officials after his release from Caldwell County Jail. He has since been held at the T. Don Hutto Detention Center in Taylor, Texas, without a bond hearing. *See* Exh. 1, ICE Locator Search Results. The Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) asserts that Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), despite Congress’s separate detention framework in 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), which governs interior arrests and provides discretionary bond and immigration-judge (“IJ”) review.

DHS’s novel position—recently endorsed in *Matter of Yajure-Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 220 (B.I.A. 2025)—contradicts the Immigration and Nationality Act’s (INA) text, the canon against surplusage, longstanding administrative practice, and Due Process. It effectively erases section 236(a) of the INA, collapses Congress’s dual-track detention scheme, and imposes categorical detention on long-time residents like Mr. Gonzalez Bautista who present no danger and are not flight risks. On December 15, 2025, an Immigration Judge, Anibal D. Martinez, denied custody red

The human consequences are immediate and severe. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista **has a United States citizen wife and three United States citizen children.** His thirteen-year-old daughter, [REDACTED], **has suffered from** [REDACTED] **since the age of one and has also been diagnosed with** [REDACTED]. In addition, [REDACTED] **receives** [REDACTED].

Mr. Gonzalez Bautista’s wife, Mrs. Gonzalez, has experienced significant mental health deterioration since her husband’s detention. **She has been diagnosed with anxiety, depressive symptoms, emotional distress, and functional impairment.** Mrs. Gonzalez experiences anticipatory grief, persistent fear, and emotional dysregulation when contemplating life without her husband, and she is currently taking prescribed medication to manage her anxiety and depression. **He also has an approved I-130 family petition that was approved on May 21, 2022, and was currently in the process in filing his I-601A waiver.**

Since Mr. Gonzalez Bautista’s detention, Mrs. Gonzalez and her twenty-one-year-old son

have been forced to seek employment in order to meet the family's basic financial needs. However, due to her mental health conditions and caregiving responsibilities, Mrs. Gonzalez is unable to maintain full-time employment or adequately provide for herself and her three children without her husband's support. The Constitution, the INA, and basic principles of fairness do not permit this outcome. Petitioners respectfully request immediate release or, at minimum, a prompt custody redetermination under § 236(a).

The Petitioner, Cristobal Gonzalez Bautista ("Mr. Gonzalez Bautista"), respectfully petitions this Honorable Court for a Writ of Habeas Corpus to remedy Petitioner's unlawful detention and attempted removal from the United States by Respondents.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This lawsuit seeks the immediate release of Plaintiff-Petitioner Cristobal Gonzalez Bautista ("Petitioner"), age 41, from unlawful detention in violation of his constitutional and statutory rights.
2. On or about October 24, 2025, Mr. Gonzalez Bautista was arrested immigration officials after his release from Caldwell County Jail. He was arrested for a warrant that was issued for his arrest for *Illegal Dumping in Caldwell County*. Once he was taken into County Jail, the charge of Illegal Dumping was Dismissed. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista was then taken into immigration custody. He remains in civil detention in the custody of ICE at T. Don Hutto Detention Center at Taylor, Texas. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista does not have any other criminal record or any other issues that impact his good moral character.
3. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista has lived in the United States for over 23 years. He is the father and sole provider to his United States Citizen wife and three United State Citizen Children, ages 21, 13, and 8. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista and his family live in Dale, Texas. He supports his family through his construction and concrete business. His detention is a substantial deprivation and burden that puts Petitioner and his family at risk of losing their housing, vehicles, and medical care without his parental, emotional, and financial support.

4. Petitioner has no previous record of criminal charges. He was arrested on or about September 10, 2025, for Illegal Dumping, in Caldwell County. After, Petitioner was processed, records indicated that subject was illegally present in the United States, and an ICE Hold was lodged with the Caldwell County Jail. The Illegal Dumping charge was then Dismissed on October 22, 2021, due to Defendant Remediated Property. He was then detained by immigration after his case was dismissed and released from Caldwell County on or about October 24, 2025.
5. Petitioner's detention became unlawful when Petitioner was not entitled to bond due to the Board of Immigration Appeals published opinion in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025) on September 5, 2025 which rendered pursuing a bond futile for non-citizens that entered the United States without inspection. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista entered without inspection in 2002.
6. Petitioner is represented in immigration removal proceedings by counsel. Petitioner has filed an application for Cancellation of removal for certain non-permanent residents pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(b)(1) as he has been physically present in the United States for over 20 years and been a person of good moral character during that period. Moreover, he has a United States Citizen wife and three United States Citizen children upon whom his removal would cause exceptional and extremely unusual hardship.
7. Petitioner respectfully requests this Court grant the instant petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and enjoin Respondent's continued detention of Petitioner to ensure his due process rights and his ability to provide care for his wife and children, who have needs that require Petitioner's presence and support. In the alternative, he respectfully requests the Court order Respondents to show cause why this Petition should not be granted within three days. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2243. His continued detention is an unlawful violation of due process, incorrect interpretation of immigration law, and is *ultra vires*.
8. Petitioner Cristobal Gonzalez Bautista 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) have refused to abide by the declaratory judgment issued on behalf of the certified class in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*.

9. On November 20, 2025, the district court granted partial summary judgment on behalf of individual plaintiffs and on November 25, 2025, certified a nationwide class and extended declaratory judgment to the certified class. *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 3289861, at *11 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2025) (order granting partial summary judgment to named Plaintiffs-Petitioners); *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 3288403, at *9 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2025) (order certifying Plaintiffs-Petitioners' proposed nationwide Bond Eligible Class, incorporating and extending declaratory judgment from Order Granting Petitioners' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment).
10. The declaratory judgment held that the Bond Denial Class members are detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), and thus may not be denied consideration for release on bond under § 1225(b)(2)(A). *Maldonado Bautista*, 2025 WL 3289861, at *11.
11. Nonetheless, the Executive Office for Immigration Review and its subagency the Immigration Court and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) have blatantly refused to abide by the declaratory relief and have unlawfully ordered that Petitioner be denied the opportunity to be released on bond.
12. Petitioner Cristobal Gonzalez Bautista is a member of the Bond Eligible Class, as he:
 - does not have lawful status in the United States and is currently detained at the T. DON HUTTO DETENTION CENTER. He was apprehended by immigration authorities on October 24, 2025;
 - entered the United States without inspection over 23 years ago and was not apprehended upon arrival, *cf. id.*; and
 - is not detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231.

13. After apprehending Petitioner on October 24, 2025, the DHS placed him in removal proceedings pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. DHS has charged Petitioner as being inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i), as someone who entered the United States without inspection.
14. The Court should expeditiously grant this petition.
15. Respondents are bound by the judgment in *Maldonado Bautista*, as it has the full “force and effect of a final judgment.” 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a). Nevertheless, Respondents continue to flagrantly defy the judgment in that case and continue to subject Petitioner to unlawful detention despite his clear entitlement to consideration for release on bond as a Bond Eligible Class member.
16. Immigration judges have informed class members in bond hearings that they have been instructed by “leadership” that the declaratory judgment in *Maldonado Bautista* is not controlling, even with respect to class members, and that instead IJs remain bound to follow the agency’s prior decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).
17. On or about October 24, 2025, ICE Officers arrested Mr. Gonzalez Bautista, after he was released from Caldwell County Jail. He remains in civil detention in the custody of ICE at T. Don Hutto Detention Center at Taylor, Texas.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

21. Petitioner is detained in civil immigration custody in Williamson County at the T. Don Hutto Detention Center, Taylor, Texas. He has been detained since or about, October 24, 2025. He has no criminal convictions.
22. This action arises under the Constitution of the United States and the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”), 8 U.S.C. § 1101 *et seq.*
23. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), and where applicable Article I § 9, cl. 2 of the United States Constitution (Suspension Clause). 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.

24. Venue is proper in the Western District of Texas, Austin Division, under 28 U.S.C. § 1391, because Petitioner is detained in this District and a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims in this action took place in this District. Venue is also proper under 28 U.S.C. § 2243 because the immediate custodians of Petitioner reside in this District.

III. REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243, Writ of Habeas Corpus Issuance, Return, Hearing, and Decision

25. The Court either must grant the instant petition for writ of habeas corpus or issue an order to show cause to Respondents, unless Petitioner is not entitled to relief. If the Court issues an order to show cause, Respondents must file a response “within three days” unless this Court permits additional time for good cause, which is not to exceed twenty days. 28 U.S.C. § 2243.

26. 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 writ of habeas corpus, challenging illegality of detention, is reduced to a sham if the trial courts do not act within a reasonable time. *Rhueark v. Wade*, 540 F. 2d 1282, 1283 (5th Cir. 1976); *Jones v. Shell*, 572 F.2d 1278, 1280 (8th Cir. 1978). Due to the nature of this proceeding, Petitioner asks this Court to expedite proceedings in this case as necessary and practicable for justice.

27. The Court should grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus “forthwith,” as the legal issues have already been resolved for class members in Maldonado Bautista.

IV. PARTIES

28. Petitioner is Mr. Gonzalez Bautista. He is 41 years old. He was born in Mexico in 1984 and came to the United States in 2002. Prior to his detention, he was living with and supporting his U.S. citizen wife and children in Dale, Texas. Petitioner is the subject

of a removal proceeding based upon the charges of being present in the U.S. without being “admitted or paroled, or [having] arrived in the [U.S.] at any time or place other than as designated by the Attorney General” under INA § 212(a)(6)(A)(i), codified at 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i).

29. He has been in civil immigration detention since October 24, 2025.
30. Respondent Pamela Bondi is named in their official capacity as the U.S. She is responsible for the administration and policy of the immigration courts, which resulted in the denying of this noncitizen’s attempt to seek a custody redetermination from the U.S. Department of Justice under 8 C.F.R. §1003.19.
31. Respondent Kristi Noem is named in their official capacity as the Secretary of U.S. Department of Homeland Security. DHS is a department of the executive branch of the U.S. government that is tasked with, among other things, administering and enforcing the federal immigration laws. Secretary Noem is ultimately responsible for the actions of ICE; specifically, they are responsible for the administration of the immigration laws pursuant to Section 103(a) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a). Secretary Noem is legally responsible for the Office of the Principle Legal Advisor of ICE, and in any effort to detain and remove the Petitioner and as such is a legal custodian of Petitioner.
32. Respondent Todd M. Lyons is named in their official capacity as the Acting Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. ICE is the agency within DHS that is specifically responsible for managing all aspects of the immigration enforcement process, including immigration detention. ICE is responsible for apprehension, incarceration, and removal of noncitizens from the United States and as such Acting Director Lyons is a legal custodian of Petitioner.
33. Respondent Miguel Vergara is named in their official capacity as the Field Office Director for the San Antonio Field Office of ICE. Director Vergara is responsible for the enforcement of the immigration laws within this district, and for ensuring that ICE

officials follow the agency's policies and procedures. Director Vergara is a legal custodian of Petitioner.

34. Respondent Charlotte Collins is named in their official capacity as the warden of the T. Don Hutto Detention Center. They have immediate physical custody of Petitioner pursuant to an agreement with ICE to detain noncitizens and is a legal custodian of Petitioner.

V. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

35. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista was by Immigration Officials on October 24, 2025, near Austin, Texas. ICE has held him without bond. Section 236 of the INA is codified at 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and noncitizens held under its authority have a right to have their custody determination reviewed by an IJ. *See id.*
36. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista entered without inspection in 2001. A request for bond is futile under Board of Immigration Appeals published opinion in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). Following the interpretation of the aforementioned BIA decision, Immigration Judges do not have jurisdiction to hear the bond request or grant a bond to Petitioner due to being present in the United States without admission.
37. It has been widely reported that ICE internally released "interim guidance" regarding a change in their longstanding interpretation of which noncitizens are eligible for release on bond; specifically, ICE is now arguing that only those already admitted to the U.S. (typically requiring lengthy legal efforts with representation of counsel, such as adjusting status to a legal permanent resident or refugee) are eligible to be released from custody during their removal proceedings, and that all others are subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225, instead of 8 U.S.C. § 1226, and will remain detained with only extremely limited parole options at ICE's discretion. Ex. 1, Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Application for Admission (July 8, 2025). This is a reversal of ICE's established practice of releasing from custody the majority of

noncitizens in removal proceedings, who are found not to pose a flight risk or a danger to the community, on bond.

38. This novel interpretation means that potentially millions noncitizens who entered the United States without inspection (who have not already been formally admitted or paroled) that are contacted by ICE in the interior of the U.S. will be treated as if they were an “arriving alien” at the border and subject to mandatory detention, regardless of how long they have been present in the United States or other equities (such as complete lack of criminal history or U.S. citizen family members including dependent children). ICE will now argue all of these noncitizens are not even entitled to a bond hearing by an IJ on the issue of release from custody during the pendency of removal proceedings.
39. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista remains in detention and separated from his family and community. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista, thirteen-year-old daughter, [REDACTED], has suffered from [REDACTED] since she was one year old and has also been diagnosed with a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] also receives [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista’s wife, Mrs. Gonzalez has been diagnosed with anxiety, depressive symptoms, emotional distress, and functional impairment, since her husband’s detention. Ms. Gonzalez experiences anticipatory grief, fear, and emotional dysregulation when contemplating life without her husband. She has been taking medication for her anxiety and depression. Since Mr. Gonzalez Bautista’s, detention, Mrs. Gonzalez and her twenty-one year old son have had to seek employment in order to make ends meets. However, she is unable to work a fulltime job and provide for herself and three children.
40. In addition, Mr. Gonzalez Bautista is unable to support and provide for his family because he is detained and unable to continue as a breadwinner. His USC wife is unable to work a fulltime due to the demands of caring for her younger children.
41. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista’s continued detention separates him from his family, prohibits his removal defense in many ways, including by making it difficult to communicate with witnesses, gather evidence, and afford legal representation, among other related harms.

He remains detained from his family, his counsel, and support system and continues to be subjected to the aforementioned harms.

VI. LEGAL FRAMEWORK: Due Process Clause

42. “It is well established that the Fifth Amendment entitles [noncitizens] to due process of law in deportation proceedings.” *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 523 (2003) (quoting *Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 306 (1993)). “Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that [the Due Process] Clause protects.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).
43. Due Process requires that there be “adequate procedural protections” to ensure that the government’s asserted justification for a noncitizen’s physical confinement “outweighs the ‘individual’s constitutionally protected interest in avoiding physical restraint.’” *Id.* at 690 (quoting *Kansas v. Hendricks*, 521 U.S. 346, 356 (1997)). In the immigration context, the Supreme Court only recognizes two purposes for civil detention: preventing flight and mitigating the risks of danger to the community. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690; *Demore*, 538 U.S. at 528. A noncitizen may only be detained based on these two justifications if they are otherwise statutorily eligible for bond. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690.
44. “The fundamental requirement of due process is the opportunity be heard at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner.” *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 333 (1976). To determine what process Petitioner is due, this Court should consider (1) the private interest affected by the government action; (2) the risk that current procedures will cause an erroneous deprivation of that private interest, and the extent to which that risk could be reduced by additional safeguards; and (3) the government’s interest in maintaining the current procedures, including the governmental function involved and the fiscal and administrative burdens that the substitute procedural requirement would entail. *Id.* at 335.

A. Immigration and Nationality Act

45. Title 8 of the United States Code, Section 1221 *et seq.*, controls the United States Government's authority to detain noncitizens during their removal proceedings.
46. The INA authorizes detention for noncitizens under four distinct provisions:
- a. **Discretionary Detention.** 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) generally allows for the detention of noncitizens who are in regular, non-expedited removal proceedings; however, permits those noncitizens who are not subject to mandatory detention to be released on bond or on their own recognizance.
 - b. **Mandatory Detention of "Criminal" Noncitizens.** 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c) generally requires the mandatory detention of noncitizens who are removable because of certain criminal or terrorist-related activity after they have been released from criminal incarceration.
 - c. **Mandatory Detention of "Applicants for Admission."** 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) generally requires detention for certain noncitizen applicants for admission, such as those noncitizens arriving in the U.S. at a port of entry or other noncitizens who have not been admitted or paroled into the U.S. and are apprehended soon after crossing the border.
 - d. **Detention Following Completion of Removal Proceedings.** 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a) generally requires the detention of certain noncitizens who are subject to a final removal order during the 90-day period after the completion of removal proceedings and permits the detention of certain noncitizens beyond that period. *Id.* at § 1231(a)(2), (6).
47. The instant case concerns the detention provisions at §§ 1226(a) and 1225(b). Both detention provisions, §§ 1226(a) and 1225(b), were enacted as part of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act ("IIRIRA") of 1996, Pub. L.

No. 104--208, Div. C, §§ 302--03, 110 Stat. 3009- 546, 3009--582 to 3009--583, 3009--585. Section 1226(a) was most recently amended earlier this year by the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No.119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025).

48. Following enactment of the IIRIRA, the Executive Office for Immigration Review drafted new regulations explaining that, in general, people who entered the country without inspection were not considered detained under § 1225(b) and that they were instead detained under § 1226(a) after an arrest warrant was issued by the Attorney General. See *Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum Procedures*, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997) (“Despite being applicants for admission, aliens who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as aliens who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination”) (emphasis added).
49. For nearly thirty years, the practice of the government, specifically ICE and Executive Office for Immigration Review, which operate under DHS, was that most individual noncitizens that were apprehended in the interior of the United States after they had been living in the U.S. for more than two years (as opposed to “arriving” at a point of entry, border crossing, or being apprehended near the border and soon after entering without inspection) received a bond hearing. If determined to not be a danger to the community or a flight risk and, as a result, granted a change in custody status, the individuals were released from detention either on their own recognizance or after paying the bond amount set by the IJ in full. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2)(A).
50. Recently, ICE has—without warning and without any publicly stated rationale—reversed course and adopted a policy of attempting to treat all individual noncitizens that were not previously admitted to the U.S. that are contacted in the interior of the U.S. at any time after their entry as “arriving” and ineligible for bond regardless of the particularities of their case. As a result, ICE is now ignoring particularities that have historically been highly relevant to determinations whether a noncitizen such remain or

custody or be released—such as: when, why, or how they entered the U.S.; whether they have criminal convictions; whether they present a danger to the community or flight risk; whether they have serious medical conditions requiring ongoing care; whether U.S. citizen family members dependent upon them to provide necessary care; or, whether the noncitizen's detention is in the community's best interest. ICE now reasons that the mandatory detention provision of § 1225(b)(2)(A) applies to all people who enter without inspection who are alleged to be subject to grounds of inadmissibility at § 1182.

51. As a result of ICE's interpretation and practice change, individual noncitizens, including long-time U.S. community members and even those who have had their particular circumstances reviewed and were ordered to be released upon posting bond by an IJ, continue to be detained by ICE. Here, Petitioner's circumstances were not reviewed because of ICE's and the BIA's erroneous interpretation of the statutory scheme.
52. The government's erroneous interpretation of the INA as it relates to noncitizens subject to mandatory detention defies the plain text of 8 U.S.C. § 1226. The government's assertion is laid out in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*. The government assertion that Petitioner is detained under § 1225—even though he was arrested and detained under § 1226—is meritless. Petitioner came to be in immigration proceedings based on a DHS filing that clearly identified him as subject to detention “pursuant to the authority contained in section 236”; (section 236 of the INA is codified at 8 U.S.C. § 1226.). For decades, § 1225 has applied only to noncitizens “seeking admission into the country”—i.e., new arrivals. *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 289. This contrasts with § 1226, which applies to noncitizens “already in the country.” *Id.* at 289. Petitioner has been in the United States for over 10 years.
53. This new interpretation is now advanced by the government after decades of consistent use to the contrary. The government's position contravenes the plain language of the INA and its regulations and has been consistently rejected by courts. *See, e.g., Gonzalez*

Guerrero v. Noem, No. 1:25-CV-01334-RP (W.D. Tex. Oct. 27, 2025) (granting preliminary injunction and vacating the BIA decision for bond denial under Matter of Yajure Hurtado) (citing *Buenrostro-Mendez*, 2025 WL 2886346, at *3 (“As almost every district court to consider this issue has concluded, ‘the statutory text, the statute’s history, Congressional intent, and § 1226(a)’s application for the past three decades’ support finding that § 1226 applies to these circumstances.”)) (citing *Pizarro Reyes*, 2025 WL 2609425, at *4); see also *Lopez-Arevelo*, 2025 WL 2691828, at *7 (“In recent weeks, courts across the country have held that this new, expansive interpretation of mandatory detention under the INA is either incorrect or likely incorrect.”); *Rodriguez*, 2025 WL 2782499, at *1 & n.3 (W.D. Wash. Sep. 30, 2025) (collecting cases and noting that “[e]very district court to address” the statutory question “has concluded that the government’s position belies the statutory text of the INA, canons of statutory interpretation, legislative history, and longstanding agency practice”); *Belsai D.S. v. Bondi*, No. 25-cv-3682, 2025 WL 2802947, at *6 (D. Minn. Oct. 1, 2025) (joining the “chorus” of courts concluding that § 1226 applies); *Hernandez Ramiro v. Bondi*, No. 5:25-CV-01207-XR (W.D. Tex. Sept. 30, 2025) (granting temporary restraining order and stating “ Respondents pointed to the Board’s determination regarding the applicability of § 1225 for support. But ‘the Court does not find that the [Board]’s alleged change in the interpretation of the subject statutes controls the Court’s authority here.’ *Kostak v. Trump*, No. CV 3:25-1093, 2025 WL 2472136, at *2 (W.D. La. Aug. 27, 2025) (citing *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369, 395 (2024)). Besides, the Board’s interpretation has been subject to criticism upon judicial review. See *Lopez-Arevelo v. Ripa*, No. EP-25-CV-337-KC, 2025 WL 2691828, at *7 (W.D. Tex. Sept. 22, 2025) (“In recent weeks, courts across the country have held that this new, expansive interpretation of mandatory detention under the INA is either incorrect or likely incorrect.”); *Martinez*, 2025 WL 2084238; *Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-cv-11571-JEK, 2025 WL 1869299 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025); *Rodriguez v. Bostock*, No. 3:25-cv-05240-TMC, 2025 WL 1193850 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 24, 2025). See also “More than 100 Judges have ruled against Trump’s admin’s mandatory detention policy” by Kyle Cheney, POLITICO, published October 21, 2025, <https://www.politico.com/news/2025/10/31/trump-administration-mandatory->

detention-deportation-00632086. (“More than 100 federal judges have now ruled at least 200 times that the Trump administration’s effort to systematically detain immigrants facing possible deportation appeared to violate their rights or was just flatly illegal...” The overwhelming majority of district courts across the country, including this Court, that have considered [the Trump administration’s] new statutory interpretation have found it incorrect and unlawful,” ruled U.S. District Judge Richard Boulware, an appointee of Barack Obama.”). See also Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997) (explaining that “[d]espite being applicants for admission, aliens who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as aliens who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination”).

54. This new interpretation is inconsistent with the plain language of the INA. First, the government disregards a key phrase in § 1225. “[I]n the case of an alien who is an applicant for admission, if the examining immigration officer determines that an alien *seeking admission* is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, the alien shall be detained for a proceeding under section 1229a[.]” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) (emphasis added). In other words, mandatory detention applies when “the individual is: (1) an ‘applicant for admission’; (2) ‘seeking admission’; and (3) ‘not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted.’” *Martinez*, 2025 WL 2084238, at *2.
55. The “seeking admission” language, “necessarily implies some sort of present tense action.” *Martinez*, 2025 WL 2084238, at *6; *see also Matter of MD-C-V-*, 28 I. & N. Dec. 18, 23 (B.I.A. 2020) (“The use of the present progressive tense ‘arriving,’ rather than the past tense ‘arrived,’ implies some temporal or geographic limit ”); *U.S. v. Wilson*, 503 U.S. 329, 333 (1992) (“Congress’ use of verb tense is significant in construing statutes.”).
56. In other words, the plain language of § 1225 applies to immigrants currently seeking admission into the United States at the nation’s border or another point of entry. It does

not apply to noncitizens “already present in the United States”—only § 1226 applies in those cases. *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 303.

57. When interpreting a statute, “every clause and word . . . should have meaning.” *United States ex rel. Polansky, M.D. v. Exec. Health Res., Inc.*, 599 U.S. 419, 432 (2023) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). And “the words of the statute must be read in their context and with a view to their place in the overall statutory scheme.” *Gundy v. United States*, 588 U.S. 128, 141 (2019) (quotation omitted). The government’s position requires the Court to ignore critical provisions of the INA.
58. Second, the government’s interpretation would render newly enacted portions of the INA superfluous. “When Congress amends legislation, courts must presume it intends its amendment to have real and substantial effect.” *Van Buren v. United States*, 593 U.S. 374, 393 (2021). Congress passed the Laken Riley Act (the “Act”) in January 2025. The Act amended several provisions of the INA, including §§ 1225 and 1226. Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No. 119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025). Relevant here, the Act added a new category of noncitizens subject to mandatory detention under § 1226(c)—those already present in the United States who have also been arrested, charged with, or convicted of certain crimes. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E); 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A). Of course, under the government’s position, these individuals are already subject to mandatory detention under § 1225—rendering the amendment redundant. Likewise, mandatory-detention exceptions under § 1226(c) are meaningful only if there is a default of discretionary detention—and there is, under § 1226(a). *See Rodriguez*, 2025 WL 1193850, at *12.
59. Additionally, “[w]hen Congress adopts a new law against the backdrop of a longstanding administrative construction, the court generally presumes that the new provision works in harmony with what came before.” *Monsalvo v. Bondi*, 604 U.S. ___, 145 S. Ct. 1232, 1242 (2025). Congress adopted the Act against the backdrop of decades of agency practice applying § 1226(a) to immigrants like Petitioner, who are present in the United States but have not been admitted or paroled. *Rodriguez*, 2025 WL 1193850, at *15; *Martinez*, 2025 WL 2084238, at *4; 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997)

(“Despite being applicants for admission, aliens who are present without having been admitted or paroled . . . will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination.”).

60. Section 1226(a) applies by default to all persons “pending a decision on whether the [noncitizen] is to be removed from the United States.” Removal hearings for noncitizens under 1226(a) are held under § 1229a, which “decid[e] the inadmissibility or deportability of a[] [noncitizen].”

61. By contrast, § 1225(b) applies to people arriving at U.S. ports of entry or who recently entered the United States.

62. Accordingly, the mandatory detention provision of § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to Petitioner. Petitioner’s continued detention is unlawful.

B. Board of Immigration Appeals

63. It is not necessary for Petitioner to first seek a bond hearing before the immigration judge given that his bond eligibility is foreclosed by *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*. Appealing the immigration judge’s decision that he lacks jurisdiction to consider bond is an act in futility. The appeal would go to the same body that issued the erroneous *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* decision.

VII. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution

64. Petitioner repeats and incorporates by reference all allegations above as though set forth fully herein.

65. The Due Process Clause asks whether the government's deprivation of a person's life, liberty, or property is justified by a sufficient purpose. Here, there is no question that the government has deprived Petitioner of his liberty.
66. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista's continued detention violates his right to substantive and procedural due process guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.
67. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides that "[n]o person shall...be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." As a noncitizen who shows well over "two years" physical presence in the United States (he has 10 years), Petitioner is entitled to Due Process Clause protections against deprivation of liberty and property. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 693 ("[T]he Due Process Clause applies to all 'persons' within the United States, including aliens, whether their presence here is lawful, unlawful, temporary, or permanent."). Any deprivation of this fundamental liberty interest must be accompanied not only by adequate procedural protections, but also by a "sufficiently strong special justification" to outweigh the significant deprivation of liberty. *Id.* at 690.
68. Respondents have deprived Mr. Gonzalez Bautista of his liberty interest protected by the Fifth Amendment by detaining him since October 24, 2025.
69. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista's detention is improper because he has been deprived of a bond hearing. A hearing is if anything a right to be heard, and here the immigration judge considered it a foregone conclusion that he was ineligible for bond, without considering the law or entertaining his counsel's arguments. Like the accused in criminal cases, habeas is proper. *See Moore v. Dempsey*, 261 U.S. 86 (1923); *Johnson v. Zerbst*, 304 U.S. 458 (1938); *Burns v. Wilson*, 346 U.S. 137, 154 (1953).
70. Respondents' actions in detaining Mr. Gonzalez Bautista without any legal justification violate the Fifth Amendment.

71. The government's detention of Mr. Gonzalez Bautista is unjustified. Respondents have not demonstrated that Petitioner needs to be detained. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690 (finding immigration detention must further the twin goals of (1) ensuring the noncitizen's appearance during removal proceedings and (2) preventing danger to the community). There is no credible argument that Petitioner cannot be safely released back to his community and family.

72. For these reasons, Petitioner's detention violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
Violation of Immigration and Nationality Act

73. Petitioner repeats and incorporates by reference all allegations above as though set forth fully herein.

74. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista was detained pursuant to authority contained in section 236 of the INA; section 236 is codified at 8 U.S.C. § 1226. Despite this, the government asserts that he is detained subject to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).

75. The mandatory detention provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to all noncitizens residing in the United States who are subject to the grounds of inadmissibility. Mandatory detention does not apply to those who previously entered the country and have been residing in the United States prior to being apprehended and placed in removal proceedings by Respondents. Such noncitizens are detained under § 1226(a) and are eligible for release on bond, unless they are subject to § 1225(b)(1), § 1226(c), or § 1231.

76. Respondents have wrongfully adopted a policy and practice of arguing all noncitizens, such as Petitioner, are subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2).

77. The unlawful application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner violates the INA.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Fifth Amendment – Due Process

**Denial of Opportunity to Contest Mis-Inclusion in Mandatory Category of
Detention**

78. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

79. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista has a vested liberty interest in preventing his removal because he is eligible for Cancellation of Removal for Certain Non-Legal Permanent Residents and is entitled to pursue that relief outside of detention by showing he is neither a danger to the community nor a flight risk. He is separated now from his U.S. Citizen wife and three U.S. citizen children, notwithstanding the dictates of 8 U.S.C. §1226(a) that he may seek redetermination of his custody status with an IJ and prove he is not a flight risk or danger.

80. For all of the above reasons, Respondents' attempts to detain Petitioner without a meaningful opportunity to be heard violate his Procedural Due Process rights under the Fifth Amendment.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

81. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

82. Respondents' continued efforts to deny his bond violate the INA, Administrative Procedures Act (APA), and the U.S. Constitution.

83. As set forth in Count Two and Three, federal regulations and case law provide the procedure for a respondent in removal proceedings like him to seek a bond determination by an IJ.
84. In being denied the opportunity to return to his family, and pursue Cancellation of Removal in a non-detained court setting where he is free to gather the necessary hardship and good moral character evidence, Mr. Gonzalez Bautista would be deprived of the right to freedom to lawfully pursue his rights in this civil matter. The Government's "no-review" provisions are a violation of his procedural and substantive due process and without any statutory authority. There is no time-frame or procedure for requesting DHS to itself review its custody decision, and removal proceedings in this case will proceed during that time while Plaintiff remains in custody.
85. The actions by Respondents would improperly alter the substantive rules concerning mandatory custody status without the required notice-and-comment period and would be in violation of the INA and its regulations. These actions by Respondents violate the APA. Under the APA, this Court may hold unlawful and set aside an agency action which is "contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege or immunity." 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(B). The regulations at 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19(h)(1)(B) and 1003.19(h)(2)(B) providing no review of DHS custody decision for arriving aliens in removal proceedings are in violation of substantive and procedural due process as guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution. It is ultra vires because it exceeds the authority granted ICE by Congress at 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). For these reasons, this Honorable Court should order the immigration judge to conduct a Matter of Joseph hearing to determine whether or not Plaintiff is properly designated an arriving alien subject to mandatory detention during the pendency of his removal proceedings.

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION:
STAY OF REMOVAL CLAIM**

86. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

87. The denial of a bond hearing, followed by removal of Mr. Gonzalez Bautista from the United States would cause him irreversible harm and injury because he is mis-classified by the Government as subject to mandatory detention.
88. The Court should grant the stay of Petitioner's removal to protect his statutory rights under the INA and the APA. In attempting to assert his rights, the Government has railroaded him and deprived him of freedom and liberty to contest his removal while free on bond, or at the very least, of his ability to prove he is not subject to mandatory detention and that he merits release on bond.

**SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
SUSPENSION CLAUSE CLAIM**

89. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.
90. If 8 U.S.C. § 1252 stripped the Court jurisdiction from this matter, it would be unconstitutional as applied because it would deny Mr. Gonzalez Bautista the opportunity for meaningful review of the unlawfulness of his detention and removal.
91. To invoke the Suspension Clause, a petitioner must satisfy a three-factor test: "(1) the citizenship and status of the detainee and the adequacy of the process through which that status determination was made; (2) the nature of the sites where apprehension and then detention took place; and (3) the practical obstacles inherent in resolving the prisoner's entitlement to the writ." *Boumediene v. Bush*, 553 U.S. 723, 766 (2008). Mr. Gonzalez Bautista satisfies these three requirements and may invoke the Suspension Clause.
92. First, although Mr. Gonzalez Bautista is not a U.S. citizen or resident, **he has lived here for over 20 years**, and he qualifies under the INA to seek Cancellation of Removal, because he has lived here for twenty continuous years,

because he can show twenty years' good moral character, and because he can show his U.S. citizen wife and children will suffer exceptional and extremely unusual hardship if he were removed to Mexico. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista has significant family connections in the United States, U.S. citizen wife and three U.S. citizen children. **He also has an approved I-130 petition that was approved on May 21, 2022, and was currently in the process in filing his I-601A waiver.** All of which establishes a substantial legal relationship with the United States.

93. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista satisfies the second factor because he was apprehended by DHS and remains detained in the United States.

94. Finally, there are no serious, practical obstacles to resolving this present matter. This Court is equipped to deciding whether Mr. Gonzalez Bautista is entitled to the writ.

95. There is no adequate alternative to a habeas petition. The refusal of the immigration court to grant Mr. Gonzalez Bautista the right to show he is mis-classified and that he is not subject to mandatory detention, such that he may return to his family and pursue cancellation, without proper notice or due process, deprives him of his constitutional rights. The BIA cannot adequately and expeditiously review these issues.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

96. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in the above paragraphs of this Petition.

97. This Court has the discretion to enter a temporary restraining order and a preliminary injunction. *See Haitian Refugee Center v. Nelson*, 872 F.2d 1555, 1561-1562 (11th Cir. 1989). "To be entitled to a preliminary injunction, the applicants must show (1) a substantial likelihood that they will prevail on the merits, (2) a substantial threat that they will suffer irreparable injury if the injunction is not granted, (3) their substantial injury outweighs the threatened harm to the party whom they seek to enjoin, and (4) granting the preliminary injunction will not disserve the public interest." *Tex. Med.*

Providers Performing Abortion Servs. v. Lakey, 667 F.3d 570, 574 (5th Cir. 2012). All four elements must be demonstrated to obtain injunctive relief. *Id.*

98. Respondents' actions have caused Petitioner harm that warrants immediate relief. There is substantial likelihood that Mr. Gonzalez Bautista will prevail on the merits of his habeas claim as more than 100 federal judges have found the BIA decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* to be an incorrect interpretation of the law. There is substantial threat of irreparable injury if the injunction is not granted. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista, thirteen-year-old daughter, [REDACTED], has suffered from [REDACTED] since she was one year old and has also been diagnosed with [REDACTED]. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista's wife, Mrs. Gonzalez has been diagnosed with anxiety, depressive symptoms, emotional distress, and functional impairment, since her husband detention. Ms. Gonzalez experiences anticipatory grief, fear, and emotional dysregulation when contemplating life without her husband. She has been taking medication for her anxiety and depression. In addition, she is the sole caregiver to their children. Continued detention of Mr. Gonzalez Bautista will result in further economic instability placing Mrs. Gonzalez at risk of losing their housing and vehicles. In addition, his children suffering from a psychological crisis related to Post-traumatic Stress Disorder. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista detention further exacerbates their depression. The substantial and irreparable injury that Mr. Gonzalez Bautista's wife and children face substantially outweighs any potential threat to the government. Mr. Gonzalez Bautista has no pending criminal history and is established community member. It will not disserve the public interest in granting the preliminary injunction as it is in the public interest to keep families united and supporting each other. Granting a preliminary injunction is proper in this case. *See, e.g., Gonzalez Guerrero v. Noem*, No. 1:25-CV-01334-RP (W.D. Tex. Oct. 27, 2025) (granting preliminary injunction and vacating the BIA denial of bond jurisdiction under *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*).

CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violation of the INA:

Request for Relief Pursuant to *Maldonado Bautista*

1. Petitioner repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
2. As a member of the Bond Eligible Class, Petitioner is entitled to consideration for release on bond under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).
3. The order granting partial summary judgment in *Maldonado Bautista* holds that Respondents violate the INA in applying the mandatory detention statute at § 1225(b)(2) to class members.
4. 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.”
5. 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).
6. By denying Petitioner a bond hearing under § 1226(a) and asserting that he 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*.

VIII. RELIEF SOUGHT

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court:

- (1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- (2) Declare that ICE’s October 24, 2025, apprehension and detention of Mr. Gonzalez Bautista was an unlawful exercise of authority because the ICE officer provided no reason that he presents a danger to the community or is flight risk;
- (3) Issue an order directing Respondents to show cause why the writ should not be granted;

- (4) Order Respondents to file with the Court a complete copy of the administrative file from the Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security;
- (5) Enjoin ICE from transferring Mr. Gonzalez Bautista outside of the Western District of Texas while this matter is pending;
- (6) Grant the writ of habeas corpus ordering Respondents to release Mr. Gonzalez Bautista on his own recognizance, parole, or reasonable conditions of supervision, or order the Respondents to conduct a bond hearing under which it correctly applies the statutes and no longer mis-classifies him as subject to mandatory detention, in the alternative order a hearing under *Matter of Jospeh*;
- (7) Grant any other relief that this Court deems just and proper.

PRAYER FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2243, Petitioner respectfully requests expedited consideration. Each day of unlawful detention inflicts irreparable harm on Petitioner and his U.S. citizen wife and children, depriving them of their husband and father's care, stability, and support. Prompt judicial intervention is necessary to protect Petitioner's constitutional rights and his family's well-being.

Iris A. Albizu Rivera (TX Bar #24082611)
P.O. Box 202943
Austin TX 78720
Telephone: (512) 861-5638
Facsimile: (866) 584-6996
Email: iris@albizulaw.com
Attorney for Petitioner

VERIFICATION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2242

I represent Petitioner, Cristobal Gonzalez Bautista, and submit this verification on his behalf.

I hereby verify that the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated this 15th day of January 2026.

Iris A. Albizu Rivera (TX Bar #24082611)
P.O. Box 202943
Austin TX 78720
Telephone: (512) 861-5638
Facsimile: (866) 584-6996
Email: iris@albizulaw.com
Attorney for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on January 15, 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 Thompson
1001 Welch
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 Warden as Petitioner's immediate custodian.

Dated this 15th day of January, 2025.

Iris A. Albizu Rivera (TX Bar #24082611)
P.O. Box 202943
Austin TX 78720
Telephone: (512) 861-5638
Facsimile: (866) 584-6996
Email: iris@albizulaw.com
Attorney for Petitioner



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW
PEARSALL IMMIGRATION COURT

Respondent Name:

GONZALEZ BAUTISTA, CRISTOBAL
NMN

To:

Lopez, Lizbeth
1005 E. 40th Street
Austin, TX 78705

A-Number:



Riders:

In Custody Redetermination Proceedings

Date:

12/15/2025

ORDER OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE

The respondent requested a custody redetermination pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 1236. After full consideration of the evidence presented, the respondent's request for a change in custody status is hereby ordered:

☒ Denied, because

The respondent is an applicant for admission and is therefore subject to mandatory detention pursuant to INA section 235(b)(2). See, Matter of Q.Li, 29 I&N Dec. 66, 67-68 (BIA 2025) (addressing the definition of an applicant for admission and mandatory detention); see also, Jennings v. Rodriguez, 583 U.S. 281, 288 & 300 (2018). See also, Yajure Hurtado, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).

Moreover, The court in Bautista v. Noem, 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM (C.D. Cal.), granted class certification and partial summary judgment for the plaintiffs in that case, but did not issue a class-wide declaratory judgment. The court also did not issue a class-wide injunction. Rather, the court set a January 9, 2026 joint status report deadline and January 16, 2026 status conference. Until and unless the Bautista court issues a class-wide declaratory judgment or injunction, the Bautista court's opinion and partial grant of summary judgment does not constitute a judgment and therefore does not alter or negate the BIA's determination in Matter of Yajure Hurtado, 29 I & N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). See, e.g., Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b).

- ☐ Granted. It is ordered that Respondent be:
- ☐ released from custody on his own recognizance.
 - ☐ released from custody under bond of \$
 - ☐ other:

☐ Other:



Immigration Judge: Anibal D. Martinez 12/15/2025

Appeal: Department of Homeland Security: ☒ waived ☐ reserved
Respondent: ☐ waived ☒ reserved

Appeal Due: 01/14/2026

Certificate of Service

This document was served:

Via: [M] Mail | [P] Personal Service | [E] Electronic Service | [U] Address Unavailable

To: [] Alien | [] Alien c/o custodial officer | [E] Alien atty/rep. | [E] DHS

Respondent Name : GONZALEZ BAUTISTA, CRISTOBAL NMN | A-Number : 

Riders:

Date: 12/15/2025 By: Anibal D. Martinez, Immigration Judge

THIS NOTICE DOES NOT GRANT ANY IMMIGRATION STATUS OR BENEFIT.

Receipt Number 		Case Type I130 - PETITION FOR ALIEN RELATIVE
Received Date 06/28/2021	Priority Date 06/28/2021	Petitioner  SUAREZ-MALDONADO, DIANA
Notice Date 05/25/2022	Page 1 of 1	Beneficiary GONZALEZ-BAUTISTA, CRISTOBAL
SUAREZ-MALDONADO, DIANA 120 EILEENS WAY DALE TX 78616-2165		Notice Type: Approval Notice Section: Husband or wife of U.S Citizen, 201(b) INA

We have mailed an official notice about this case (and any relevant documentation) according to the mailing preferences you chose on Form G-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Accredited Representative. **This is a courtesy copy, not the official notice.**

What the Official Notice Said

The above petition has been approved. As the petitioner requests, we have sent the petition to the U.S. Department of State National Visa Center (NVC), 32 Rochester Avenue, Portsmouth, NH 03801-2909. The NVC processes all approved immigrant visa petitions that need consular action, including the collection of necessary forms and documents. It also determines which consular post is appropriate to complete visa processing. The NVC will then transfer the approved petition to the consular post once processing has been completed and an interview has been scheduled at the Embassy or Consulate.

The NVC will contact the beneficiary of this petition with further information about immigrant visa processing steps.

You should allow a minimum of 45 days for U.S. Department of State processing before contacting the NVC. If you have not received any correspondence from NVC within 45 days, you may contact the NVC at <https://nvc.state.gov/inquiry>.

For more information about NVC processing, please visit <https://nvc.state.gov>.

THIS FORM IS NOT A VISA AND MAY NOT BE USED IN PLACE OF A VISA.

The approval of this visa petition does not in itself grant any immigration status and does not guarantee that the alien beneficiary will subsequently be found to be eligible for a visa, for admission to the United States, or for an extension, change, or adjustment of status.

NOTICE: Although this application or petition has been approved, USCIS and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security reserve the right to verify this information before and/or after making a decision on your case so we can ensure that you have complied with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and other legal authorities. We may review public information and records, contact others by mail, the internet or phone, conduct site inspections of businesses and residences, or use other methods of verification. We will use the information obtained to determine whether you are eligible for the benefit you seek. If we find any derogatory information, we will follow the law in determining whether to provide you (and the legal representative listed on your Form G-28, if you submitted one) an opportunity to address that information before we make a formal decision on your case or start proceedings.

Please see the additional information on the back. You will be notified separately about any other cases you filed.

USCIS encourages you to sign up for a USCIS online account. To learn more about creating an account and the benefits, go to <https://www.uscis.gov/file-online>.

Vermont Service Center
U.S. CITIZENSHIP & IMMIGRATION SVC
38 River Road
Essex Junction VT 05479-0001

USCIS Contact Center: www.uscis.gov/contactcenter



CAUSE NO. 24 CR-50541

THE STATE OF TEXAS

VS.

Cristobal Gonzalez -
Bautista

IN THE COUNTY COURT
AT LAW OF
CALDWELL COUNTY, TEXAS

MOTION TO DISMISS

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

COMES NOW the State of Texas, by and through the Criminal District Attorney of Caldwell County, Texas, and files this Motion to Dismiss. The State requests that the Court dismiss the following:

- ☒ All allegations contained in the information/probation revocation matter in this cause.
____ Count(s) _____ appearing in the information in this cause.

The State would show that the dismissal requested herein is based upon the following:

- ____ The evidence is insufficient;
____ The Defendant was convicted in another case: _____;
____ The Defendant was convicted in Count _____ herein;
____ The Defendant is unapprehended;
____ The Defendant was re-charged by complaint and information regarding the subject offense;
____ Insufficient identification information exists by which to apprehend Defendant through existing warrant procedure;
☒ Other: Defendant remediated property.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, the State prays that this Motion be in all things heard and granted.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
ASST. CRIMINAL DISTRICT ATTORNEY
Caldwell County, Texas (512) 398-1811
P. O. BOX 869 Lockhart, Texas 78644

ORDER TO DISMISS

The foregoing Motion having been presented to me, and the same having been considered, it is therefore, ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that said Motion is hereby in all things GRANTED.

ENTERED this the 22 day of Oct, 2021.

[Signature]
PRESIDING JUDGE