

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

YONI SIBRIAN,
Petitioner.

v.

DAVID HARDIN,
In his Official capacity as Warden of
Glades County Detention Center; and

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS PURSUANT
TO 28 U.S.C. § 2241

TODD M. LYONS,
In his Official capacity as Acting Director,
U.S Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

Respondents.

_____ /

INTRODUCTION

1. This is a petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Petitioner, Yoni Sibrian, is a 29 year-old national of El Salvador who has lived in the US for 12 years, since 2013, and is currently detained by Respondents at the Glades County Detention Center, in Moore Haven, FL. He is married to a US citizen who filed a family petition on his behalf, and he filed an application for asylum in the US, which is pending with the US Citizenship and Immigration Service (USCIS). He has no criminal record.

2. Petitioner is being held under mandatory detention without eligibility for a bond hearing under the recently-decided Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) decision *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). He is asking this Court to order Respondents to grant him a bond hearing before an immigration judge, where he can demonstrate that he is not a flight risk nor a danger to the community, as required by the statutes and regulations governing immigration.
3. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, decided September 5, 2025, overturned 30 years of established immigration court practice. Petitioner believes the decision is based on the current administration's policy to detain and deport illegal aliens, not the law.
4. This BIA decision is erroneous, violates the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) §235(b) and §236, the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution, and international law, of which the US is signatory, relating to the treatment of asylees.
5. Under the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Loper Bright v. Raimondo*, federal courts should independently interpret the meaning and scope of §§ 235(b) and 236 using the traditional tools of statutory construction. Because the BIA's decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* is a deviation from the agency's long-standing interpretation of § 235 and 236; is not guidance issued contemporaneously with enactment of the relevant statutes; and contradicts the statutory interpretations of dozens of federal courts, a habeas court should give it no weight under *Loper*.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This Court has jurisdiction over this petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, which grants federal courts the authority to hear habeas corpus petitions from individuals held in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States. Jurisdiction is also proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
7. Venue is proper in the Middle District of Florida pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d) because Petitioner is detained at the Glades County Detention Center, which is located within this judicial district.

PARTIES

8. Petitioner **Yoni Sibrian** (A# ) is a citizen of El Salvador and is currently detained by the Respondents at the Glades County Detention Center, in Moore Haven, FL.
9. Respondent **David Hardin** is the Warden of Glades County Detention Center who has direct supervisory authority over Petitioner's detention. He is sued in his official capacity.
10. Respondent **Todd M. Lyons** is the Acting Director of the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and is sued in his official capacity.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

11. Petitioner, Yoni Sibrian, is a native and citizen of El Salvador who has resided in the United States for approximately twelve (12) years.

12. Petitioner entered the United States without inspection at Texas in 2013. Prior to the current detention, Petitioner had never been apprehended by authorities. Petitioner married a United States Citizen on August 13, 2025, and through this marriage he is stepfather to two United States Citizen children, ages 16 and 18.
13. Petitioner is actively pursuing legal protection and status within the United States, having filed an Application for Asylum and Withholding of Removal with USCIS on September 23, 2024.
14. Petitioner has no criminal record, and since his arrival in the United States he has maintained stable employment in the landscaping industry.
15. On November 19, 2025, Petitioner was stopped by a state trooper while operating a company vehicle during the course of his employment. He and his coworkers were transferred to a police station and subsequently taken into immigration custody.
16. Respondents continue to hold Petitioner in mandatory detention, refusing to grant him an individualized bond hearing before an Immigration Judge while he contests his removal from the US, relying on the recently-decided Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). Consequently, he is being denied the opportunity to demonstrate that he is neither a flight risk nor a danger to the community, as required by the law set forth in immigration statutes and regulations.

LEGAL CLAIMS

COUNT I: VIOLATION OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

15. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs.

16. The Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) establishes two distinct statutory categories for the treatment and detention of noncitizens:

- Section 235 (8 U.S.C. § 1225): This section governs the admission of aliens who arrive in the U.S. or are at the border seeking relief. It generally requires mandatory detention.
- Section 236 (8 U.S.C. § 1226): This section applies to aliens who are apprehended within the U.S. (in the interior). It allows for bond hearings for non-criminal aliens who may seek release by demonstrating they are not a danger to the community or a flight risk.

17. The Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA), in its September 5, 2025 decision *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), held for the first time that all aliens who entered the U.S. without authorization are subject to Section 235 mandatory detention, as applicants for admission, regardless of their length of stay or ties to the U.S.

19. Federal courts have consistently held that INA § 236, not § 235(b)(2), authorizes the detention of noncitizens who previously entered without inspection and were apprehended in the interior of the country.

20. There are several reasons why the BIA's expansive interpretation of INA § 235(b)(2) misreads the statute:

- As the Supreme Court recognized in *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, § 235(b) is concerned "primarily [with those] seeking entry," and is generally imposed "at the Nation's borders and ports of entry".

- Throughout its text, § 235 refers to "inspections," a term that typically connotes an examination upon or soon after physical entry. This is further supported by citations such as INA § 235 (titled "Inspection by Immigration Officers"); INA §§ 235(b)(1) (referring to "inspections" in the title); and INA § 235(d)(1) (authorizing immigration officials to search certain conveyances in order to conduct "inspections" where noncitizens "are being brought into the United States"). The statute's text, referring to "inspections" and being concerned "primarily [with those] seeking entry," confirms that § 235(b) has a limited temporal and geographic scope and should be imposed "at the Nation's borders and ports of entry."
- Consistent with this focus on the moment of physical entry, § 235(b)(2) is limited to those in the process of "seeking admission." Petitioner in this case is patently in the country and not seeking admission. Similarly, the implementing regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 1.2 addresses noncitizens who are presently "coming or attempting to come into the United States." The statutory and regulatory text's use of the present and present progressive tenses excludes noncitizens apprehended in the interior like Petitioner, because they are no longer in the process of arriving in or seeking admission to the United States.

21. The INA's statutory structure confirms that § 236 also reaches individuals who have not been admitted and have entered without inspection.

- For example, Section 236(c) exempts specific categories of noncitizens from the default eligibility to seek release on bond in § 236(a), including noncitizens subject to certain grounds of inadmissibility.
- Moreover, Congress recently added new mandatory detention grounds to § 236(c) that apply only to noncitizens who have not been admitted, expressly including those who are inadmissible under § 212(a)(6)(A) or (7)—that is, persons who entered without being admitted. If § 236(a) did not apply to inadmissible noncitizens, the carve-out and recent amendments in § 236(c) would be rendered surplusage.

22. The statutory history also supports a limited reading of § 235(b)'s reach. When Congress amended § 235(b)'s predecessor statute to include individuals who had not been admitted, legislators expressed concerns about recent arrivals to the United States who lacked the documents to remain in the country. There was no suggestion in the legislative history that Congress intended to subject all people present in the United States after an unlawful entry to mandatory detention and thereby "sweep millions of noncitizens into § 235(b)".

23. Petitioner Yoni Sibrian entered the U.S. in 2013 and was apprehended in the interior of the U.S. on November 19, 2025— 12 years after his entry. He was undoubtedly not "in the process of entering or just entered the United States." This factual context places his detention squarely under the jurisdiction of § 236. As a result, the Petitioner, a long-term resident with strong U.S. ties, is not subject to mandatory detention under § 235. He is subject to the provisions of INA § 236(a), which permits release on bond upon showing that he is not a danger or a flight risk.

COUNT II: VIOLATION OF THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT, AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

24. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs.
25. The Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause provides that no person shall be "deprived of... liberty... without due process of law." This protection applies to all persons within the United States, regardless of immigration status.
26. Freedom from imprisonment lies at the heart of the liberty protected by habeas corpus (*Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 578, 690 (2001)). In civil proceedings, including deportation cases, detention is only justified in certain "special and narrow non-punitive circumstances," where a compelling justification outweighs the individual's constitutionally protected interest in avoiding physical restraint.
27. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that non-punitive detention violates the Constitution unless it is strictly limited and accompanied by a prompt individualized hearing before a neutral decisionmaker (*See, e.g., United States v. Salerno*, 481 U.S. 739, 750-51 (1987)).
29. Petitioner's continued mandatory detention without a bond is unconstitutional, especially given the lack of any criminal conviction. His mandatory detention under the BIA's *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* decision serves no legitimate governmental purpose and violates the Fifth Amendment.
31. Furthermore, the US is signatory to the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees. These treaties, reflecting fundamental norms of liberty, prohibit the arbitrary detention of individuals within the country who are pursuing asylum from

deportation, reinforcing the need for an individualized assessment of flight risk and danger.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner Yoni Sibrian respectfully requests that this Honorable Court:

A. Assume Jurisdiction over this Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. B. Order Respondents to justify the legality of Petitioner's continued mandatory detention within three days. C. Issue a Writ ordering Respondents to hold a bond hearing for the Petitioner before an Immigration Judge, where he can demonstrate that he is neither a danger to the community nor a flight risk, in accordance with the procedures in effect prior to the September 5, 2025 *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* decision. D. In the alternative, order Petitioner's immediate release from custody under a \$5,000 bond, based on his twelve years of U.S residence, lack of a criminal record, and marriage to a U.S. citizen. E. Grant such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: January 28, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Robert Sheldon, Esq.
Law Office of Robert Sheldon
3134 Coral Way
Miami, FL 33145
(786) 436-1714
rsheldon1@hotmail.com
FL Bar #83409

Counsel for Petitioner

