UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

HAIQIANG YIN,

[redacted]

Petitioner,

v.

KEVIN RAYCRAFT, in his official capacity as Field Office Director of Enforcement and Removal Operations, Detroit Field Office, Immigration and Customs Enforcement; Kristi NOEM, in her official capacity as Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY; Pamela BONDI, in her official capacity as U.S. Attorney General; EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW,

Respondents.

Case No. 1:26-cv-00905

Hon.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

INTRODUCTION

1. This petition arises from the U.S. government's new policy—which contradicts both the plain language of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) and decades of agency practice—of erroneously interpreting the INA to mandate detention without the possibility of bond for noncitizens who entered the United States without inspection, even if they have been residing here for years.

2. This policy has led to the unlawful detention of countless noncitizens nationwide. Hundreds of habeas corpus petitions for their release have been filed in jurisdictions across the country, including many in the Eastern District of Michigan. Virtually every merits decision in those cases has found for the petitioners, either granting them a bond hearing or ordering their immediate release.

3. Petitioner Haiqiang Yin has been unlawfully detained without the possibility of bond in furtherance of this policy. Petitioner came to the United States approximately two years ago, arriving in June of 2024.

4. Upon information and belief, Petitioner was taken into immigration custody after local police near Detroit, MI, arrested him sitting near his car. Respondents placed Petitioner in civil immigration removal proceedings, alleging that he had entered the United States without inspection. 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i).

5. Petitioner is currently in the physical custody of Respondents at The North Lake Processing Center, located in Baldwin, MI, which falls under the

purview of the Detroit Field Office of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), which has responsibility for immigration detention centers in Michigan and Ohio.

6. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), which allows for release on conditional parole or bond, Petitioner is entitled to a bond determination. That statute expressly applies to people who, like Petitioner, are residing in the United States but are charged as inadmissible for having initially entered the United States without inspection. In accordance with 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and Executive Office of Immigration Review (EOIR) have for decades provided bond determinations and bond hearings to people like Petitioner who have been living in the United States but allegedly entered without inspection.

7. However, pursuant to a new governmental policy announced on July 8, 2025,[1] Petitioner is now being unlawfully detained without bond. The new policy instructs all ICE employees to no longer apply 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) to people charged with being inadmissible under § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i)—i.e., those who initially entered the United States without inspection. Instead, under the new policy, ICE employees are to subject people like Petitioner to mandatory detention without bond under §

[1] ICE Memo: Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission (Jul. 8, 2025), https://www.aila.org/library/ice-memo-interim-guidance-regarding-detention-authority-for-applications-for-admission [https://perma.cc/8SP7-TDDD].

1225(b)(2)(A)—a provision that has historically been applied only to recent arrivals at the U.S. border—no matter how long they have resided in the United States.

8. Detaining Petitioner without bond is plainly contrary to the statutory framework of the INA and contrary to both agency regulations and decades of consistent agency practice applying § 1226(a) to people like Petitioner. It also violates Petitioner's right to due process by depriving him of his liberty without any consideration of whether such a deprivation is warranted.

9. Accordingly, Petitioner seeks a writ of habeas corpus requiring that he be immediately released from custody unless Petitioner is provided with a bond hearing under § 1226(a) that meets constitutional and statutory requirements for due process within seven days.

10. Petitioner is not challenging any discretionary denial of bond; he is challenging the legal determination that he is not eligible for bond under § 1226(a) in the first place.

JURISDICTION

11. Petitioner Haiqiang Yin is in the physical custody of Respondents. Petitioner is detained at the North Lake Processing Center in Baldwin, MI.

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

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

VENUE

14. Venue is proper in the Western District of Michigan under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and 28 U.S.C. § 1391. Petitioner is detained in an immigration detention facility at the direction of, and is in the immediate custody of, Respondent Kevin Raycraft. *See Roman v. Ashcroft*, 340 F.3d 314, 320-21 (6th Cir. 2003).

15. 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 and relevant facts occurred in the Eastern District.

REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

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

17. Habeas corpus is "perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law . . . affording as it does a *swift* and imperative remedy in all cases

of illegal restraint or confinement." *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963) (emphasis added). "The application for the writ usurps the attention and displaces the calendar of the judge or justice who entertains it and receives prompt action from him within the four corners of the application." *Yong v. I.N.S.*, 208 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted).

PARTIES

18. Petitioner Haiqiang Yin is a citizen of China who has resided in the United States since June of 2024. He was recently detained by DHS and has been in immigration detention since approximately mid-February 2026. He is currently located at North Lake Processing Center, in Baldwin, MI. After taking custody of Petitioner, ICE did not set bond. It is unclear whether the Petitioner sought a bond hearing before the Detroit Immigration Court.

19. Respondent Kevin Raycraft is the Director of the Detroit Field Office of ICE's Enforcement and Removal Operations division. As such, Director Raycraft is Petitioner's immediate custodian and is responsible for Petitioner's detention and removal. He is named in his official capacity.

20. The North Lake facility holds immigration detainees pursuant to a contract with ICE.

21. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. She is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of

the INA and oversees ICE, which is responsible for Petitioner's detention. Ms. Noem has ultimate custodial authority over Petitioner and is sued in her official capacity.

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

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

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

FACTS

25. Petitioner has resided in the United States since June of 2024 and lives in California. Petitioner is 51 years old.

26. Petitioner is a refugee from the People's Republic of China. He comes from Heibei province, which surrounds the massive city of Beijing, the Chinese capital and seat of power. His wife and children continue to reside there.

27. Upon information and belief, the Petitioner was detained and threatened with physical violence by government officials in China for objecting to the

government's demolition scheme for his neighborhood. In response to his opposition, the government initiated a scheme of persecution and intimidation. The government threatened Haiqiang and his family's access to water and electricity, and he was ultimately terminated from his employment. As is unfortunately common in modern China, he was subjected to total social ostracization and pariah status simply for voicing an opinion about the oppressive and unjust way in which the government was implementing its policies.

28. The Petitioner fled China in 2024, fearful for his life and freedom. He entered the U.S. without inspection at the Mexican border on June 26th, 2024. The Petitioner claimed a fear of return and was permitted to enter the U.S. to apply for asylum relief. He subsequently did so, and he was approved for work authorization, valid during the pendency of his asylum case.

29. Upon arrival on U.S. territory in 2024, the Petitioner was detained for less than 24 hours before being released to the interior.

30. Regarding the circumstances giving rise to his recent detention in February of 2026, it appears the Petitioner was initially detained by local law enforcement near Detroit, MI on suspicion of consuming alcohol and driving, or drinking in public. The specific allegations are unclear, as no charges appear to have been brought, and no police report appears to exist. The Petitioner drives long

distances for a living professionally, hence his presence in Michigan, far from California.

31. The Petitioner was parked at a 7-Eleven convenience store when local law enforcement apprehended him. Upon information and belief, he was not charged with any crime. After detaining the Petitioner, local law enforcement reached out directly to the Department of Homeland Security, who took custody of him the day after his initial apprehension. He was transferred to the North Lake facility, where he is now detained.

32. DHS placed Petitioner in removal proceedings before the Detroit Immigration Court pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. ICE has charged Petitioner with being inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) as someone who entered the United States without inspection.

33. Following the initiation of removal proceedings, ICE either did not conduct a custody determination or chose to continue detaining Petitioner without providing an opportunity to post bond or be released under other conditions.

34. It is unclear whether the Petitioner initially requested a custody redetermination hearing before the Detroit Immigration Court.

35. Petitioner is clearly neither a flight risk nor a danger to the community, as demonstrated by the following:

- Petitioner has no criminal history.

- Although the Petitioner was arrested in a parking lot on suspicion of drinking in public, or drinking while driving (unclear), he has been charged with no crime. Local authorities immediately transferred him to DHS custody, which would be an unusual step, if the initial arrest were predicated on an intention to charge Petitioner with a crime.
- The Petitioner has complied with all the conditions of his detention release, since his arrival in the United States in 2024.
- The Petitioner has a bona-fide application for asylum relief currently pending before EOIR, which was timely submitted.
- The Petitioner has never worked unlawfully in the United States, having waited to begin his current employment until after he was issued work authorization by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services ("USCIS").
- Petitioner's entire future, as well as the future of his wife and children who remain in China, depend on his continuing to cooperate, as he has done until now, with the conditions of his detention release.

36. Petitioner is working with an immigration attorney and has strong claims for asylum relief.

37. Without relief from this court, Petitioner faces the prospect of months—or even years—in immigration custody, separated from family and community.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

38. The INA prescribes three basic forms of detention for the vast majority of noncitizens in removal proceedings.

39. First, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 authorizes the detention of noncitizens who are in removal proceedings. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. *See also Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 289 (2018) (explaining that § 1226(a) applies to those who are "already in the country" and are detained "pending the outcome of removal proceedings"). Under § 1226(a), individuals who are taken into immigration custody pending a decision on whether they are to be removed can be detained but are generally entitled to seek release on bond.[2] The bond may be set by ICE itself as part of an initial custody determination, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(c)(8), and/or the individual may seek a bond hearing in immigration court at the outset of their detention, *see* 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19(a), 1236.1(d). Section 1226(a) is the statute that, for decades, has been applied to people like Petitioner who have been living in the United States and are charged with inadmissibility under § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i).

[2] Section § 1226 contains an exception for noncitizens who have been arrested, charged with, or convicted of certain crimes, who are subject to mandatory detention without bond. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c). That exception does not apply to Petitioner here.

40. Second, the INA provides for mandatory detention of certain recently arrived noncitizens, namely those subject to expedited removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1), and other recent arrivals seeking admission under § 1225(b)(2). *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287, 289 (explaining that § 1225(b)(2)'s mandatory detention scheme applies "at the Nation's borders and ports of entry" to noncitizens "seeking admission into the United States."). Section 1225(b)(2) is the statute that Respondents have suddenly decided is applicable to people like Petitioner.

41. Third, the INA also provides for detention of noncitizens who have already been ordered removed, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1231. Section 1231 is not relevant here.

42. This case challenges Respondents' erroneous decision that Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention without bond under §1225(b)(2), rather than being bond-eligible under § 1226(a).

43. The detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) 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, 582–583, 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).

44. Following the 1996 enactment of the IIRIRA, EOIR drafted new regulations explaining that, in general, people who entered the country without

inspection were not detained under § 1225 and that they were instead detained under § 1226(a). *See* Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum Procedures, 62 Fed. Reg. 10,312, 10,323 (Mar. 6, 1997) (explaining that "[d]espite being applicants for admission, [noncitizens] 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.").

45. Thus, in the three decades that followed, people who entered without inspection and were subsequently placed in removal proceedings received bond hearings if ICE chose to detain them, unless their criminal history rendered them ineligible. That practice was consistent with many more decades of prior practice, in which noncitizens who were not deemed "arriving" were entitled to a custody hearing before an IJ or other hearing officer. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a) (1994); *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 229 (1996) (noting that § 1226(a) simply "restates" the detention authority previously found at § 1252(a)).

46. However, on July 8, 2025, ICE, "in coordination with" the Department of Justice, suddenly announced a new governmental policy that rejected the well-established understanding of the statutory framework and reversed decades of agency practice.

47. The new policy, entitled "Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission," claims that all persons who entered the United States without inspection are subject to mandatory detention without bond under § 1225(b)(2)(A). The policy applies regardless of when a person is apprehended and affects those who have resided in the United States for months, years, and even for decades or since infancy.

48. In decision after decision, federal courts—both nationwide and here in the Eastern District of Michigan—have rejected Respondents' sudden reinterpretation of the statutory scheme, and have instead held that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to noncitizens who are not apprehended upon arrival to the United States. *See, e.g.*, *Demirel v. Fed. Det. Ctr. Phila.*, 25-cv-5488, 2025 WL 3218243, at *5-13 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 18, 2025) (cataloging ***288 cases*** granting habeas relief as of November 18, 2025); *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 25-cv-01873, 2025 WL 3713987, at *32 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025) (granting relief to a nationwide class that includes the Petitioner here).

49. This list is undoubtedly incomplete. As the media has reported, "[f]ederal judges are increasingly exasperated by the Trump administration's effort to lock up nearly everyone facing deportation proceedings . . . . The legal rejections are so frequent that one judge compared the Trump administration's effort to Sisyphus rolling a rock uphill." Kyle Cheney, *Hundreds of Judges Reject Trump's*

Mandatory Detention Policy, With No End in Sight, Politico (Jan. 5, 2026, at 5:55 AM ET), https://www.politico.com/news/2026/01/05/trump-administration-immigrants-mandatory-detention-00709494 (noting that more than 300 judges across over 1,600 cases have granted habeas petitions).

50. In recent months, the Eastern District of Michigan has repeatedly rejected Respondents' interpretation of the INA and granted writs of habeas corpus to detained noncitizens to whom Respondents denied a bond hearing. On August 29, 2025, Judge Brandy McMillion granted a writ of habeas corpus to an identically situated petitioner, concluding that "There can be no genuine dispute that Section 1226(a), and not Section 1225(b)(2)(A), applies to a noncitizen who has resided in this country for . . . years and was already within the United States when apprehended and arrested during a traffic stop, and not upon arrival at the border." *Lopez-Campos*, 797 F. Supp. 3d at 784. And on September 9, 2025, Judge Robert White issued the same relief to another identically situated petitioner, reasoning that "the legislative history and agency guidance . . . in conjunction with the statutory interpretation" clearly entitles the petitioner to a bond hearing under § 1226(a). *Pizarro Reyes*, No. 25-cv-12546, 2025 WL 2609425, at *8. More recent decisions holding the same include: *Contreras-Cervantes v. Raycraft*, No. 25-cv-13073, 2025 WL 2952796 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 17, 2025); *Romero Garcia v. Raycraft*, No. 25-cv-13407, 2025 WL 3252286 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 21, 2025); *Hurado-Medlina v. Raycraft*,

No. 25-cv-13248, 2025 WL 3268896 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 24, 2025); *Ali Kadagan v. Raycraft*, No. 25-cv-13602, No. 2025 WL 3268895 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 24, 2025); *Zambrano Paz v. Raycraft*, No. 25-cv-13563, 2025 WL 3473361 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 3, 2025); *Brito Hidalgo v. Raycraft*, No. 25-cv-13588, 2025 WL 3473360 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 3, 2025); *Lopez Herrera v. Raycraft*, No. 25-cv-13627, 2025 WL 3473358 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 3, 2025); *Torres-Vasquez v. Raycraft*, No. 25-cv-13571, 2025 WL 3473359 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 3, 2025); *Alvarez-Lopez v. US Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, No. 25-cv-13098, 2025 WL 3525956 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 9, 2025); *Amaya v. Raycraft*, 25-cv-13539, 2025 WL 3530273 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 9, 2025); *Morales Rodriguez v. Raycraft*, No. 25-cv-13560, 2025 WL 3543614 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 10, 2025); *Morales Rodriguez v. Raycraft*, No. 25-cv-13560, 2025 WL 3543614 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 10, 2025) *Cervantes Morales v. Raycraft*, No. 25-cv-13434, 2025 WL 3543611 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 10, 2025).

51. On September 5, 2025, the BIA issued a precedential decision that rejected the overwhelming consensus of the federal courts. *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). That decision held that all noncitizens who entered the United States without admission or parole are ineligible for bond hearings before an IJ.

52. The *Yajure Hurtado* decision—like the government policy it seeks to uphold—defies the INA. As Judge Robert White wrote—after noting that federal

district courts are not bound by agency interpretations of statutes—the BIA's reasoning is unpersuasive and "at odds with every District Court that has been confronted with the same question of statutory interpretation." *Pizarro Reyes*, 2025 WL 2609425, at *7.

53. As court after court has explained, the plain text of the statutory provisions demonstrates that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to people like Petitioner.

54. Section 1226(a) applies by default to all persons "pending a decision on whether the [noncitizen] is to be removed from the United States." These removal hearings are held under § 1229a to "decid[e] the inadmissibility or deportability of a[] [noncitizen]."

55. The text of § 1226 also explicitly applies to people charged as being inadmissible, including those who entered without inspection. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E). Subparagraph (E)'s reference to such people makes clear that, by default, such people are afforded a bond hearing under subsection (a). As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court explained, "[w]hen Congress creates 'specific exceptions' to a statute's applicability, it 'proves' that absent those exceptions, the statute generally applies." *Rodriguez*, 779 F. Supp. 3d at 1256-57 (citing *Shady Grove Orthopedic Assocs., P.A. v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 559 U.S. 393, 400 (2010)).

56. Section 1226 therefore leaves no doubt that it applies to people who face charges of being inadmissible to the United States, including those who are present without admission or parole.

57. By contrast, § 1225(b) applies to people arriving at U.S. ports of entry or who recently entered the United States. The statute's entire framework is premised on inspections at the border of people who are "seeking admission" to the United States. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287 (explaining that this mandatory detention scheme applies "at the Nation's borders and ports of entry, where the Government must determine whether a[] [noncitizen] seeking to enter the country is admissible.").

58. Accordingly, the mandatory detention provision of § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to people who have already entered and were long residing in the United States at the time they were apprehended by immigration authorities and detained. Because § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), is the applicable statute, Petitioner's detention without eligibility for bond is unlawful.

59. Furthermore, Petitioner is part of a nationwide class of noncitizens that has obtained declaratory relief rejecting the government's reading of the INA and the BIA's reasoning in *Yajure Hurtado*. *See Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 25-cv-01873, 2025 WL 3713987, at *12 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025) . The court granted declaratory relief to "[a]ll noncitizens . . . who (1) have entered or will enter

the United States without inspection; (2) were not or will not be apprehended upon arrival; and (3) are not or will not be subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231 at the time the Department of Homeland Security makes an initial custody determination." *Id.* at *32. The court also vacated the July 8 policy under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). *Id.* at *22. Because the court in *Maldonado Bautista* entered final judgement as to these conclusions, *id.* at *32, Respondents are bound by them.

60. Petitioner seeks relief from this Court because any months-long appeal to the BIA of an IJ's decision denying bond would be futile. A new request for a bond hearing is likewise futile. First, the agency's position is clear: both IJs and future panels of the BIA must follow the *Yajure Hurtado* decision. Further, the new governmental policy was issued "in coordination with DOJ," which oversees the immigration courts, including the BIA—up to and including the ability of the Attorney General to modify or overrule decisions of the BIA, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(h). It is therefore unsurprising that the BIA has (erroneously) held that persons like Petitioner are subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A), rather than being bond-eligible under § 1226(a). Moreover, in the numerous identical habeas corpus petitions that have been filed nationwide, EOIR and the Attorney General are often respondents and have consistently affirmed via briefing and oral argument that individuals like Petitioner are applicants for admission and subject to

detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). *See, e.g.,* Resp. to Pet., *Lopez Campos v. Raycraft*, No. 25-cv-12546 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 9, 2025), Dkt. 9; Resp. to Pet., *Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft*, No. 25-cv-12546 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 27, 2025), Dkt. 4.

61. Second, by the time the BIA could even issue an appeal—a process that typically takes at least six months, *Rodriguez*, 779 F. Supp. 3d at 1245, and in many cases roughly a year, *id.*—the harm of Petitioner's unlawful detention will be impossible to remediate. Nor will the downstream effects of continued detention be remediable: Petitioner's family and community will be left without a caretaker and contributor for months.

62. Third, neither IJs nor the BIA have the authority to decide constitutional claims. *See Sterkaj v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 273, 279 (6th Cir. 2006). Here, Petitioner claims not only that Respondents are unlawfully detaining him without bond hearings under an inapplicable statute, but also that such detention violates Petitioner's constitutional right to due process if the government seeks to deprive him of his liberty.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I

Violation of the INA

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

64. Respondents are unlawfully detaining Petitioner without bond pursuant to the mandatory detention provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).

65. Section 1225(b)(2) does not apply to Petitioner, who previously entered the country and has long been residing in the United States prior to being apprehended and placed in removal proceedings by Respondents.

66. Instead, Petitioner should be subject to the detention provisions of § 1226(a) and are therefore entitled to a custody determination by ICE, and if custody is continued, to a custody redetermination (i.e., a bond hearing) by an immigration judge.

67. Respondents' application of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner results in Petitioner's unlawful detention without the opportunity for a bond hearing and violates the INA.

COUNT II

Violation of Due Process

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

69. The government may not deprive a person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. U.S. Const. amend. V. "Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the

heart of the liberty that the Clause protects." *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).

70. Regardless of whether the INA provides Petitioner with a bond hearing, Petitioner has a fundamental interest in liberty and being free from official restraint.

71. The government's detention of Petitioner without an opportunity for a custody determination or bond hearing to decide whether he is a flight risk or danger violates Petitioner's right to due process.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;

b. Issue a writ of habeas corpus requiring the Petitioner's immediate release; or alternatively, issue a writ of habeas corpus requiring that Respondents release Petitioner from custody unless, within 5 days, Petitioner is provided with a bond hearing pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) that meets constitutional and statutory requirements for due process;

c. Enjoin Respondents from transferring Petitioner from the jurisdiction of this District pending these proceedings;

d. Declare that 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)—and not 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) — is the appropriate statutory provision that governs Petitioner's detention

and eligibility for bond because Petitioner is not a recent arrival "seeking admission" to the United States, and instead was already residing in the United States when apprehended and charged as inadmissible for having allegedly entered the United States without inspection;

e. Award Petitioner fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA"), as amended, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and on any other basis justified under law; and

f. Grant any other and further relief that this Court deems necessary and proper in the circumstances.

Dated: 19 March 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ *Joshua J. Mikrut*

Joshua J. Mikrut, Esq. (P74897)
NEW LIBERTY LAW, PLC
2900 28th St. SW
Grandville, MI 49418
Ph. (616) 730-3197
Fax (616) 588-6320

Counsel for Petitioner