Spencer Judd Jr., Esq.
NV Bar# 14219
SJ Law
720 E Charleston Blvd., Ste. 165
Las Vegas, NV 89104
Phone: (702) 572-5939
immigration@SJLaw.vegas

Counsel for Petitioner

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Juan GARCIA DEHUMA,
Petitioner,

v.

Jason KNIGHT, Field Office Director, Salt Lake City Field Office, U.S. Immigration and Custom Enforcement, Enforcement and Removal Operations Division;

John MATTOS, Warden, Nevada Southern Detention Center;

Kristi NOEM, Secretary, United States Department of Homeland Security;

Pamela BONDI, Attorney General of the United States,
Respondents.

Case No.

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

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This petition challenges the unlawful detention of Petitioner, Juan Garcia Dehuma, a 43-year-old, from Mexico who has resided in the United States for nearly 24 years. Petitioner's only criminal conviction is a 2003 DUI which has since been sealed. Mr. Garcia Dehuma initially had a case pending before the immigration court beginning in November 2019. As a result of then-President Biden's administration's efforts to administer prosecutorial discretion, his case was dismissed in September 2022. As a result of the present administration's aggressive enforcement decisions, Mr. Garcia Dehuma was again arrested and detained on or about June 30, 2025. A bond hearing was held on July 14, 2025. There, Immigration Judge ("IJ") Nguyen of the Las Vegas Immigration Court granted bond in the amount of $3,000 with Alternatives to Detention ("ATD") at the discretion of Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE"). He was released soon after. However, the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") appealed that decision. The Board of Immigration Appeals ("BIA"), citing *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), overturned the bond order on February 2, 2026. Mr. Garcia Dehuma was arrested and detained again yesterday, February 18, 2026. This arrest was not as a result of him having committed any crime or caused any harm or damage. Mr. Garcia Dehuma is concerned with the possibility that he may be moved out of this Court's jurisdiction, away from his wife and 9 United States Citizen children, his community, and his job, where he provides for his large family. He is also concerned for his health. He was recently diagnosed with premature coronary artery disease and had a stent placed in his heart in 2024. His detention or removal to Mexico could seriously affect his health. His wife is also at risk, as she just found out she is pregnant. Her pregnancy is considered high-risk.

///

2. This detention is a substantial deprivation and burden that puts Petitioner and his family at risk without his parental, financial, and emotional support.

3. The Department of Homeland Security asserts that Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), because he entered the United States without inspection, 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.

4. Though many other similarly situated undocumented immigrants were able, for a time, to obtain a bond determination hearing based on the nationwide class action and final order in *Maldonado Bautista et. al. v. Ernesto Santacruz Jr. et. al.*, 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM (U.S. Dist. Ct. Cen. D. CAL., Dec. 18, 2025), which binds the Respondents, specifically Immigration Judges, to accept jurisdiction and determine bond for noncitizens who find themselves similarly situated to Mr. Garcia Dehuma, a nationwide memo has subsequently been circulated by the Chief Immigration Judge which orders all Immigration Judges to ignore this binding class action and deny jurisdiction subject to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). Just last night a further development in that case was brought to our attention. The District Court has now ordered vacated *Yajure Hurtado* as contrary to law under the APA. *See attached at* Exh. 16 at 132. However, given Respondents unwillingness to follow the previous orders of *Maldonado Bautista*, Mr. Garcia Dehuma is not willing to spend even more time in detention to see what comes of this most recent decision.

5. This court already found in *Maldonado Vazquez v. Feely*, Case No. 2:25-cv-01542-RFB-EJY, that §1225 subjects, "noncitizens who are present and who have resided in the U.S. for an extended period—to permissive detention." *Id.*, at 26. The Chief Immigration Judge's order, forcing Immigration Judges to adopt DHS's position in *Yajure Hurtado* would therefore deny Mr.

Garcia Dehuma access to any further bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226. If past is prologue, it seems likely that such a position would be maintained without action by this Court.

6. Petitioner has applied for Cancellation of Removal and Adjustment of Status for Certain Nonpermanent Residents under 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(b) with the Immigration Court. Cancellation of Removal under § 1229b(b) requires: physical presence in the U.S. for a continuous period of not less than ten (10) years from issuance of the Notice to Appear (NTA); good moral character during that period as defined in section 101(f) of the INA; no convictions of disqualifying offenses under the INA; and that removal would result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to the U.S. citizen spouse, parent, or child. Mr. Garcia Dehuma has been residing in the U.S. for more than 10 years from the issuance of his NTA. He has no criminal convictions. His qualifying relatives are his 9 minor U.S. citizen children. His wife is also pregnant with a high-risk pregnancy. Accordingly, he believes he could make a good showing for relief from removal at immigration court.

7. Mr. Garcia Dehuma asks this Court to hold that his continued detention under *Yajure Hurtado* is unlawful as a matter of statutory interpretation and due process. *Yajure Hurtado* contradicts the Immigration and Nationality Act's (INA) text, the canon against surplusage, longstanding administrative practice, and Due Process. Respondents cannot thus justify Mr. Garcia Dehuma s present detention and hold him in contravention of law.

8. Petitioner respectfully asks this Court to grant his petition and issue a writ of habeas corpus or, in the alternative, to order Respondents to show cause *within three days*, providing their reasons, if any, as to why his detention is lawful. 28 U.S.C. § 2243. Because Respondents cannot justify Petitioner's ongoing detention, he urges this Court to grant his petition and order

Respondents to immediately release him under the same bond requirements as he had previously been successfully operating.

II. JURISDICTION

9. Respondents currently detain Mr. Garcia Dehuma in civil immigration custody with Immigration and Customs Enforcement. He was transferred late in the evening to the Nevada Southern Detention Center in Paharump, Nevada.

10. This action arises under the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 8 U.S.C. § 1101 et seq., the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) 5 U.S.C. § 702, 706, and the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

11. This Court has jurisdiction under Art. I, § 9, cl. 2 of the United States Constitution (the Suspension Clause); 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (general grant of habeas authority to district courts); 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question jurisdiction); and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202 (Declaratory Judgment Act), and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

12. The federal habeas statute establishes this Court's power to decide the legality of Mr. Garcia Dehuma's detention and directs courts to "hear and determine the facts" of a habeas petition and to "dispose of the matter as law and justice require." 28 U.S.C. § 2243; *see also Hilton v. Braunskill*, 481 U.S. 775 (1987) (explaining that as far back as the nineteenth century, "the Court interpreted the predecessor of [the habeas statute] as vesting a federal court with the largest power to control and direct the form of judgment to be entered in cases brought up before it on habeas corpus") (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

13. The Supreme Court, moreover, has held that the federal habeas statute codifies the common law writ of habeas corpus as it existed in 1789. *See I.N.S. v. St. Cyr*, 533 U.S. 289, 301

(2001) ("[A]t its historical core, the writ of habeas corpus has served as a means of reviewing the legality of Executive detention, and it is in that context that its protections have been strongest."). The Court has reiterated federal court jurisdiction over habeas claims brought by petitioners in immigration custody. *See Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 138 S. Ct. 830, 839–41 (2018).

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

III. VENUE

15. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because Respondents detain Mr. Garcia Dehuma in civil immigration custody Pahrump, Nevada, within the jurisdiction of this Court. *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493–500 (1973); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d).

16. Venue is also proper 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 District of Nevada.

IV. REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243, WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS ISSUANCE, RETURN, HEARING, AND DECISION

17. The Court must grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus or order Respondents to show cause "forthwith," unless Mr. Garcia Dehuma is not entitled to relief. 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If an order to show cause is issued, Respondents must file a return "within three days." *Id.* "[F]or good cause[,] additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is allowed." *Id.*

18. 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. INS*, 208 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted). Due to the nature of this proceeding, Petitioner asks this Court to expedite proceedings in this case as necessary and practicable for justice.

V. PARTIES

19. Petitioner Garcia Dehuma is a citizen of Mexico who entered the United States nearly 24 years ago and has resided in the United States since then. ICE detained him and placed him in removal proceedings in June of 2025, released him, and again detained him today, February 18, 2026. ICE currently detains him at the for processing in Las Vegas, Nevada.

20. Respondent Jason Knight is sued in his official capacity as the Field Office Director, Salt Lake City Field Office, U.S. Immigration and Custom Enforcement, Enforcement and Removal Operations Division (ERO) for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Respondent Knight oversees the ICE Nevada Field Office and is responsible for Petitioner's detention and removal.

21. Respondent John Mattos is sued in his official capacity as warden of the Nevada Southern Detention Center. He is an employee of CoreCivic, which contracts with ICE to hold noncitizens in its custody at Nevada Southern. He has immediate physical custody of Petitioner.

22. Respondent Kristi Noem is sued in her official capacity as the Secretary of DHS. 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.

23. Respondent Pamela Bondi is sued in her official capacity as the Attorney General of the United States. She is responsible for the Department of Justice (DOJ) and oversees the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) and the immigration court system.

VI. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

24. Petitioner is a 43-year-old man from Mexico. *See* Exh. 4 at 2.

25. Petitioner was detained on February 18, 2026, as a result of a ICE administrative stop. He has committed no crimes during his time in the United States. As far as we know, he remains in ICE custody in Las Vegas, NV

26. ICE holds Petitioner without bond, asserting he is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).

27. On November 25, 2025, the United States District Court for the Central District of California certified a nationwide class and extended declaratory judgment to the certified class in *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).

28. Since on the class certification in *Maldonado Bautista*, some undocumented immigrants have been able to obtain bond. In a patchwork and inconsistent manner, some, but not

all IJs agreed to accept jurisdiction. This has been further complicated as a recent email from the Chief Immigration Judge, Teresa L. Riley, has instructed IJs to not accept jurisdiction and follow *Yajure Hurtado*. *See* Exh ** Leaked January 13, 2026, Email from Chief Immigration Judge Teresa L. Riley.

29. For nearly three decades, DHS and EOIR treated individuals arrested in the interior and present without admission as detained under § 1226(a), subject to IJ bond hearings unless § 1225(b)(1), § 1226(c), or §1231 applied.

30. Petitioner's detention and then today's re-detention has inflicted severe hardship on his family. His girlfriend especially struggles in her day-to-day time without him. His family depends on his income financially.

31. Petitioner's ongoing detention impedes his ability to properly defend against removal, including gathering evidence and coordinating with counsel and witnesses. Petitioner has applied for Cancellation of Removal and Adjustment of Status for Certain Nonpermanent Residents with the immigration court in his removal proceedings. He is currently awaiting a final hearing date from the Las Vegas Immigration Court.

32. Finally, Mr. Garcia Dehuma's detention is a severe detriment to his health. He has already been diagnosed with premature coronary artery disease, and this will further stress and damage his health.

33. Petitioner remains detained solely because DHS misclassified his custody under §1225(b) rather than § 1226(a), contrary to statutory text, constitutional principles, and historical practice.

///

///

VII. LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Due Process Clause

34. The Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause applies to "all persons" within the U.S., including noncitizens. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001). "Freedom from imprisonment – from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint – lies at the heart of liberty that the Clause protects." *Id.* at 690. In the immigration context, detention is constitutionally justified only to prevent flight or protect the community. *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 528 (2003).

Statutory Framework for Detention

35. Generally, removable noncitizens are subject to detention under one of the three statutory provisions under the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), depending on the context in which they are arrested and deemed removable.

36. First, Section 235(b) 8 U.S.C. § 1225 "applies primarily to [noncitizens] seeking entry into the United States" (applicants for admission) and "mandate[s] detention" of these noncitizens "until certain proceedings have concluded." *Jennings*, 583 U.S. 281 at 297. As the Supreme Court has clarified, this provision applies "at the Nation's borders and points of entry." *Id.* at 287.

37. Second, Section 236 (a) 8 U.S.C. § 1226 "applies to [noncitizens] already present in the United States." *Id.* at 303. § 1226(a) "creates a default rule" permitting detention of removable noncitizens. *Id.* Noncitizens detained under § 1226(a) qualify for release on bond. *Id.* § 1226(c) operates as an exception to § 1226(a)'s general rule in that it mandates detention of noncitizens who "fall[] into one of the enumerated categories involving criminal offenses and

terrorist activities." *Id.* Noncitizens who fall under this mandatory detention provision do not qualify for bond.

38. Third, Section 241(b) 8 U.S.C. § 1231 governs detention procedures for individuals with administratively final removal orders. *Maldonado Vazquez*, 2025 WL 2676082, at *4.

Recent Agency Interpretation of Statutory Detention Provisions

39. In July 2025, the BIA issued a decision holding that "an applicant for admission who is arrested and detained without a warrant while arriving in the United States" is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1), regardless of whether the noncitizen was arrested at the border or shortly after crossing into the United States. *Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 66, 69 (BIA 2025).

40. In doing so, the BIA acknowledged the Supreme Court's characterization of § 1225 as applying to noncitizens "'seeking entry into the United States" and arrested "without a warrant at the border.'" *Id.* at 70 (quoting *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 303). In *Q. Li*, the BIA acknowledged that § 1226 "'applies to [noncitizens] already present in the United States and arrested on a warrant.'" *Id.* (quoting *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 302-03).

41. On September 5, 2025, the BIA issued another decision further broadening the classes of noncitizens subject to mandatory detention than the narrower interpretation it had reached two months prior. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. at 228.

42. In *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, the BIA reversed decades of well-settled law and procedure, holding that any noncitizen who was not formally admitted into the United States—such as noncitizens who entered without inspection or arriving noncitizens who were arrested at the border and released on parole—are applicants for admission subject to mandatory detention

under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) regardless of how long they have resided in the United States. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. at 228.

VIII. EXHAUSTION

43. Exhaustion is not required as a prudential matter. Prudential exhaustion may be required if "(1) agency expertise makes agency consideration necessary to generate a proper record and reach a proper decision; (2) relaxation of the requirement would encourage the deliberate bypass of the administrative scheme; and (3) administrative review is likely to allow the agency to correct its own mistakes and to preclude the need for judicial review." *Puga v. Chertoff*, 488 F.3d 812, 815 (9th Cir. 2007). None of these factors weigh in favor of requiring exhaustion.

44. Here, Mr. Garcia Dehuma has exhausted his legal remedies as he has already been determined eligible for bond by the Immigration Judge and then had that bond overturned by the Board of Immigration Appeals, reversing decades of statutory interpretation and practice. *Maldonado Vazquez*, 2025 WL 2676082, at *10. Moreover, the agency has reaffirmed its dedication to *Yajure Hurtado*, in spite of a class action that has ruled against it. *See* Exh ** Leaked January 13, 2026, Email.

45. To the extent that he should again be forced to seek bond before the immigration court given last night's decision in *Maldonado Bautista* would be an absurdity an a gross violation of his due process rights. He was already released on bond, had not violated any of the terms of his bond, and but for the BIA's determination he was not eligible for bond, he was diligently working on his case and providing for his family.

///

///

IX. ARGUMENT

A. Mr. Garcia Dehuma's detention based on the BIA's erroneous interpretation of § 1225(b)(2) is facially unlawful.

46. As the Supreme Court held, "[w]hen the meaning of a statute [is] at issue, the judicial role [is] to interpret the act of Congress, in order to ascertain the rights of the parties." *Loper Bright Enters. v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369, 385 (2024) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Accordingly, "[a] district court may grant a writ of habeas corpus to any person who demonstrates he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States." *Maldonado Vazquez*, 2025 WL 2676082, at *4 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3)). Because the BIA's sweeping interpretation of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) is legally erroneous, this Court must order Mr. Garcia Dehuma released.

47. The BIA's decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado,* which holds that all noncitizens who have not been formally admitted into the United States ("applicants for admission") are subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) regardless of how long they have lived in the United States. 29 I. & N. Dec. at 228. This holding contradicts the clear language of the statute, judicial precedent, legislative history, and longstanding agency practice demonstrate. The BIA's erroneous interpretation of § 1225(b)(2) cannot support Mr. Garcia Dehuma's continued detention.

48. As the Supreme Court has explained, immigration screening and enforcement can be separated into two broad categories: border-related enforcement and interior enforcement. *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287-89.

49. Immigration enforcement "generally begins at the Nation's borders and points of entry." *Id.* at 287. § 1225 governs enforcement actions at the border, where the government

determines whether to admit noncitizens who are arriving into the United States or are present but have not been admitted (applicants for admission). *See id.* (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1)). Noncitizens subject to § 1225 must be detained without the opportunity for a bond hearing for the duration of their proceedings. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b).

50. There are two broad classes of noncitizens subject to § 1225 mandatory detention. First, § 1225(b)(1), the expedited removal provision, pertains to "arriving" noncitizens and noncitizens who have not been admitted and cannot demonstrate that they have been present in the United States for at least two years. Unless they raise a fear of return to their home country, these noncitizens can be administratively removed without being placed in removal proceedings. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1). § 1225(b)(2) on the other hand pertains to "applicant[s] for admission" who are "not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).

51. Conversely, § 1226 "applies to [noncitizens] already present in the United States." *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 303. § 1226(a) "creates a default rule" permitting detention of removable noncitizens. *Id.* Noncitizens detained under § 1226(a) qualify for release on bond. *Id.* § 1226(c) operates as an exception to 1226(a)'s general rule in that it mandates detention of noncitizens who "fall[] into one of the enumerated categories involving criminal offenses and terrorist activities." *Id.* Noncitizens who fall under this mandatory detention provision do not qualify for bond.

52. Notably, § 1226(c) mandates detention for noncitizens based on crime-based inadmissibility grounds, which apply to noncitizens who have not been formally admitted into the United States, as well as deportability grounds, which apply to noncitizens who have been previously admitted but are nonetheless removable. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1). In fact, Congress recently enacted a new ground for mandatory detention under § 1226(c) under the Laken Riley Act, which mandates detention for noncitizens who are *inter alia* present in the United States

without being admitted or paroled, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A), and who have been charged, arrested, convicted or who admit to having committed certain enumerated crimes. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E).

53. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, however, holds that § 1226 applies only to deportable noncitizens—i.e. those who have been admitted— and that § 1225(b)(2)(A) applies to all noncitizens who have not been properly admitted, regardless of how long they have lived in the United States. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. at 220-21. The plain language of the statute makes it clear that the BIA's sweeping interpretation of § 1225(b)(2) is erroneous.

54. First, the references to inadmissibility grounds, which *only* apply to noncitizens who have not been admitted—"applicants for admission" as the BIA describes them—in § 1226(c) necessarily mean that noncitizens who are present in the United States without admission and have no disqualifying criminal history are subject to discretionary detention under § 1226(a).

55. The BIA's interpretation in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, focuses on the term "applicant for admission" in § 1225 as the only term that could possibly be used to describe a person who has not been admitted and, in doing so, ignoring the full language of the statute. The BIA justified its sweeping interpretation of Section 1225(b) by reasoning that interpreting § 1226 as pertaining to noncitizens residing in the United States who have not been formally admitted would "leave unanswered which applicants for admission would be covered by § [1225](b)(2)(A)" and create an improbable third category of noncitizens who are neither applicant's for admission nor admitted. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. at 221.

56. However, this reasoning demonstrates the BIA's inaccurate assessment of the statute. By focusing too narrowly on the applicant for admission language, the BIA fails to contend with the narrowing clause in § 1225(b)(2), which clarifies that it pertains to applicants for admission who are "not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted." 8 U.S.C. §

1225(b)(2)(A). Justice Breyer provides a reasonable interpretation that dissipates this purported tension, explaining that § 1225(b)(2):

> [C]onsists of persons who are neither (1) clearly eligible for admission, nor (2) clearly ineligible. A clearly eligible person is, of course, immediately admitted. A clearly ineligible person—someone who lacks the required documents, or provides fraudulent ones—is "removed ... without further hearing or review." But where the matter is not clear, i.e., where the immigration officer determines that an alien "is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted," he is detained for a removal proceeding. *Jennings*, 583 U.S. 281 at 353 (Breyer, J. dissenting) (internal citations omitted).

Unlike the Board's lack of explanation in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, this interpretation contends with the full text of § 1225(b)(2).

57. Accordingly, accepting the BIA's sweeping interpretation of § 1225(b)(2) as pertaining to all noncitizens who have not been admitted into the United States would violate "one of the most basic interpretive canons, that a statute should be construed so that effect is given to all its provisions, so that no part will be inoperative or superfluous, void or insignificant." *Corley v. United States*, 556 U.S. 303, 314 (2009) (internal quotations omitted). As the District of Minnesota reasoned on this issue,

> Here, the presumption against superfluity is at its strongest because the Court is interpreting two parts of the same statutory scheme, and Congress even amended the statutory scheme this year when it passed the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No. 119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025), adding Sub§ (c)(1)(E) to § 1226. The Government's novel interpretation of § 1225(b)(2) runs headlong into that new addition. If § 1225(b)(2) already mandated detention of any alien who has not been admitted, regardless of how long they have been here, then adding § 1226(c)(1)(E) to the statutory scheme was pointless.

Aguilar Maldonado, 2025 WL 2374411, at *12.

58. The legislative history further supports a narrow interpretation of § 1225 as inapplicable to noncitizens who reside in the United States but are present without admission.

59. Before the enactment of IIRIRA, "immigration law provided for two types of removal proceedings: deportation hearings and exclusion hearings. A deportation hearing was the

"usual means of proceeding against an alien already physically in the United States," while an exclusion hearing was the "usual means of proceeding against an alien outside the United States seeking admission." *Hose v. INS,* 180 F.3d 992, 994 (9th Cir. 1999) (internal citations omitted). Like § 1226(a), the pre-IIRIRA statute allowed for "discretionary release on bond." *Rodriguez v. Boystock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239, 1260 (W.D. Wash. 2025) (citing 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(1) (1994)).

60. In enacting IIRIRA, Congress was explicit in its intent to "restate" the prior statute's provisions regarding arrest, detention, and discretionary release on bond for unlawfully present noncitizens. *Id.* (quoting H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 229). As such, Congress sought to preserve the longstanding practice of providing removable noncitizens residing in the United States with discretionary bond hearings.

61. Lastly, it is important to note that the longstanding practice of the government until the last September 2025 had been to treat "noncitizens arrested while living in the United States, including those who entered without inspection, as detained under § 1226(a)." *Id.* at 1260. This "longstanding practice of the government . . . can inform [a court's] determination of what the law is." *Loper Bright*, 603 U.S. at 386.

B. Mr. Garcia Dehuma's continued detention violates his procedural due process rights.

62. "[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." *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 695 (2001).

63. As this Court has recognized, DHS's classification under § 1225 is erroneous and that §1226 governs noncitizens "already in the country." *See Escobar Salgado v. Mattos*, 2:25-

CV-01872-RFB-EJY, 2025 WL 3205356, at *22 (D Nev. Nov. 17, 2025) (finding that "the text and canons of statutory interpretation, legislative history, and long history of consistent agency practice, demonstrate . . . that the government's new interpretation and policy under [§ 1225(b)(2)(A)], is unlawful"). Mr. Garcia Dehuma challenges the application of this policy that deprives him of the bond that was already determined in his favor and under which he has been complying since his release.

64. To determine whether detention violates procedural due process, courts apply *Mathews*'s three-prong test. *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 335 (1976). Under *Mathews,* the court weighs the following three factors: (1) "the private interest that will be affected by the official action"; (2) "the risk of an erroneous deprivation of such interest through the procedures used, and the probable value, if any, of additional or substitute procedural safeguards"; and (3) "the Government's interest, including the function involved and the fiscal and administrative burdens that the additional or substitute procedural requirement would entail." *Id.* Each of these factors weighs in favor of Mr. Garcia Dehuma.

65. ***Private Interest.*** First, Mr. Garcia Dehuma's private interest in "freedom from prolonged detention is unquestionably substantial." *Rodriguez Diaz v. Garland*, 53 F.4th 1189, 1207 (9th Cir. 2022) (internal quotations omitted). Mr. Garcia Dehuma's substantial freedom interest is bolstered by the conditions of his detention. *Id.* Mr. Garcia Dehuma's health is also put in jeopardy as a result of this unlawful and unnecessary detention.

66. Moreover, Mr. Garcia Dehuma has lived in the United States for over 24 years. *See* Exhibits 5 and 9. His 9 U.S. Citizen children and wife need him and miss him. *See* Exhibit 7. His wife is pregnant with a high risk pregnancy. Mr. Garcia Dehuma's physical and mental health is

being adversely impacted by yet another arrest for no lawful reason. As such, the first *Mathews* prong weighs heavily in Mr. Garcia Dehuma's favor.

67. ***Risk of Erroneous Deprivation.*** Similarly, the erroneous deprivation factor substantially weighs in Mr. Garcia Dehuma's favor due to DHS's categorical no-bond stance. There are no existing procedures for Petitioner to challenge his detention pending the conclusion of his removal proceedings without the opportunity for release on bond under the government's policy. The existing procedures set out under § 1226 substantially mitigate the risk of erroneous deprivation of Petitioner's liberty, because they require the government to establish that he presents a flight risk or danger to the community to continue his detention for the pendency of removal proceedings. This procedure was not accorded to him as his request for bond would be denied on jurisdictional grounds due to the limitations in *Yajure Hurtado*. The government's application of §1225 in his case elevates the risk of erroneous deprivation to an extraordinarily high level as this application gives ICE and DHS agency officials sole, unguided, and unreviewable discretion to detain Petitioner without any individualized showing of why his detention is warranted. As such, the second *Mathews* factor also weighs heavily in favor of granting Petitioner recognition of his procedural protections under §1226(a).

68. ***Government's Interest.*** Lastly, the government's interest and burden resulting from additional process also weighs in favor of Mr. Garcia Dehuma. While the government may have an interest in detaining dangerous noncitizens or securing a noncitizen's removal, Mr. Garcia Dehuma falls under neither of these categories. The government's interests are broadly safeguarded by the statutory mandatory detention scheme and the IJs authority to make discretionary bond determinations based on a review of the circumstances of the case against sound legal principles. *Maldonado Vazquez*, 2025 WL 2676082, at *21.

C. Mr. Garcia Dehuma's continued detention violates his substantive due process rights.

69. Substantive due process protects individuals from government action that unduly interferes with their fundamental rights. *Regino v. Staley*, 133 F.4th 951, 960 (9th Cir. 2025). When a fundamental right is at risk, due process requires the government to have a compelling state interest and to tailor its actions narrowly to serve that interest. *Id.*

70. It is well-established that "[f]reedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that Clause protects." *Zadvydas,* 533 U.S. 678 at 690. As such, freedom is the norm and the government must justify a noncitizen's detention by a compelling interest and narrowly tailored means.

71. Generally, the government justifies its detention of noncitizens based on its interest in preventing danger to the community and minimizing flight risk of removable noncitizens. *See id.* Those government interests are adequately protected by the INA's mandatory detention provisions and individualized bond adjudications by IJs. Here, Mr. Garcia Dehuma's detention, especially where the government has already evaluated him for risk of danger to the community or flight risk, have resulted in a failure to satisfy the compelling interest and narrowly tailored requirements under *Regino*. As such, Mr. Garcia Dehuma's detention violates his substantive due process right.

X. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

Count I

Violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)

Unlawful Detention Pursuant to Agency's Erroneous Interpretation

72. Mr. Garcia Dehuma re-alleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

73. The mandatory detention provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to noncitizens residing in the United Stated who are charged as inadmissible because they entered the United States without inspection. Absent disqualifying criminal convictions, those noncitizens are detained under Section 1226(a) and thus eligible for bond hearings.

74. Petitioner was arrested in the interior and after a lengthy residence in the U.S. Accordingly, Mr. Garcia Dehuma's detention based on the BIA's unlawful interpretation of Section 1225(b)(2) in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* is unlawful. Mr. Garcia Dehuma thus must be immediately released. He has already been afforded a bond hearing, paid said bond, and has been complying with all the conditions of the bond.

Count II

Unlawful Detention Pursuant to Violation of Due Process under Fifth Amendment of U.S. Constitution

75. Mr. Garcia Dehuma re-alleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

76. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment forbids the government from depriving any "person" of liberty "without due process of law." U.S. Const. amend. V.

77. Mr. Garcia Dehuma's detention violates his right to substantive and procedural due process guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

78. Respondents have deprived Mr. Garcia Dehuma of his liberty interest by the Fifth Amendment by detaining without cause.

79. Mr. Mr. Garcia Dehuma's detention is improper because he has complied with all of the conditions given to him by the bond hearing afforded to him in July 2025. A bond hearing is, if anything, a right to be heard, and here the immigration judge considered him eligible for bond. 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).

80. The government's actions in detaining Mr. Garcia Dehuma without any legal justification violates the Fifth Amendment.

81. Respondent's detention of Petitioner 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.

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

Count III

Violation of Administrative Procedures Act

83. Mr. Garcia Dehuma re-alleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

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

85. As set forth in Count Two, federal regulations and case law provide the procedure for a respondent in removal proceedings like him to seek a bond redetermination by an IJ.

86. Mr. Garcia Dehuma's re-dentention without cause, the denial of the his 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 evidence, deprives him 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. The respondents have already given Mr. Garcia Dehuma a bond hearing, determined he is eligible for bond, then detained him without cause, and now he faces removal proceedings during such time while Petitioner remains in custody.

87. Respondents' actions improperly alter the substantive rules concerning mandatory custody status without the required notice-and-comment period and are 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 government's actions exceed the authority granted ICE by Congress at 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). For these reasons, this Honorable Court should hold that Petitioner is detained under § 1226, not § 1225, and order his immediate release. Any contrary reliance on *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* would unlawfully misapply the statute and deprive Petitioner of his rights under the INA, the APA, and the Due Process Clause.

XI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Mr. Garcia Dehuma respectfully requests that this Court:

a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;

b. Issue an order direction Respondents to show cause why the writ should not be granted;

c. Enjoin ICE from transferring Mr. Garcia Dehuma outside of the State of Nevada while this matter is pending;

d. Grant a writ of habeas corpus and order Respondents to immediately release Mr. Garcia Dehuma under the bond order for which he was previously released which correctly applies the statutes and no longer mis-classifies him as subject to mandatory detention; and

e. Grant any other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

XII. PRAYER FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2243, Petitioner respectfully requests expedited consideration. There is real concern that Mr. Garcia Dehuma will be transferred out of the state. Moreover, each day of unlawful detention inflicts irreparable harm on Petitioner's health. His U.S. citizen children are also being deprived of their father's care, stability, and support. Prompt judicial intervention is necessary to protect Petitioner's constitutional rights and his family's well-being.

DATED this 19th day of February 2026.

/s/Spencer Judd Jr., Esq.
NV Bar# 14219
SJ Law
720 E Charleston Blvd., Ste. 165
Las Vegas, NV 89104
Phone: (702) 572-5939
immigration@SJLaw.vegas

Counsel for Petitioner

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

I represent Petitioner, Juan Garcia Dehuma, and submit this verification on his behalf. I hereby verify that the factual statements made in the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

DATED this 19th day of February 2026.

/s/Spencer Judd Jr., Esq.
NV Bar# 14219
SJ Law
720 E Charleston Blvd., Ste. 165
Las Vegas, NV 89104
Phone: (702) 572-5939
immigration@SJLaw.vegas

Counsel for Petitioner