

1 Rene L. Valladares
2 Federal Public Defender
3 Nevada State Bar No. 11479
4 *Jocelyn S. Murphy
5 Assistant Federal Public Defender
6 Nevada State Bar No. 15292
7 411 E. Bonneville Ave., Ste. 250
8 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
9 (702) 388-6577
10 Jocelyn_Murphy@fd.org
11

12 *Attorney for Petitioner Luis Antonio Molina Alberto

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

15 Luis Antonio Molina Alberto,

16 Petitioner,

17 v.

18 Ruben Leyva, *et al.*,

19 Respondents.

Case No. 2:26-cv-01216-RFB-NJK

**Traverse in Support of Petition for
Habeas Corpus (ECF No. 1-1)**

1 **I. Introduction**

2 In 2022, Petitioner Luis Antonio Molina Alberto¹ left El Salvador, and came
3 to the United States, seeking opportunities and resources to help his ailing parents.
4 Ex. 2 (Bond Tr. at 10:29–10:50). As an only child, Mr. Molina Alberto is solely
5 financially responsible for caring for his elderly and disabled parents. Ex. 1 at 19.
6 His mother suffers from a mental health condition and his 90-year-old father
7 struggles to maintain daily functioning and requires the help of a caregiver. Ex. 1 at
8 19; Ex. 2 (Bond Tr. at 10:29–10:50). Mr. Molina Alberto also sought escape from the
9 corrupt and gang riddled streets of El Salvador. ECF No. 1-1 at 9–12. For four
10 years, Mr. Molina Alberto has lived in St. George, Utah, with his fiancé who
11 anxiously awaits his release. *See* Ex. 2 (Bond Tr. at 5:59–6:24).

12 On February 13, 2026, two weeks before his wedding, Mr. Molina Alberto was
13 detained in St. George and transported to Las Vegas. ECF No. 1-1 at 2. On April 13,
14 2026, in a constitutionally inadequate proceeding, an immigration judge denied Mr.
15 Molina Alberto's bond request. Ex. 1 at 21. He has now been in civil immigration
16 custody for 89 days. ECF No. 1-1 at 2. Mr. Molina Alberto has no final removal
17 order and is currently seeking asylum. Ex. 1 at 5–16.

18 Respondents have conceded that Mr. Molina Alberto is a member of the
19 certified class in *Jacobo-Ramirez v. Mullin*, No. 2:25-cv-02136-RFB-MDC, and that
20 his detention is therefore governed by this Court's class-wide grant of partial
21 summary judgment. ECF No. 9 at 1. That concession resolves the merits. The writ
22 should issue, and the only remaining question is remedy.

23 This Court should grant the writ and order his immediate release. Mr.
24 Molina Alberto's request for immediate release rests on two grounds. First, this
25

26
27 ¹ Petitioner's legal name is Luis Antonio Molina Alberto. Some documents
erroneously refer to him by his alias Raul A. Garcia-Martinez.

1 Court's April 22, 2026, Order required Respondents to produce the I-200 Warrant
 2 for Arrest of Alien alongside their Response, but Respondents produced nothing.
 3 ECF No. 5 at 1; ECF No. 9 at 1. Second, detention without a lawful arrest and
 4 without individualized probable cause independently violates Mr. Molina Alberto's
 5 substantive due process rights under the Fifth Amendment. Alternatively, if release
 6 is not feasible, this Court should order Respondents to conduct a constitutionally
 7 adequate bond hearing for Mr. Molina Alberto.

8 **II. Procedural Background**

9 On April 13, 2026, Mr. Molina Alberto appeared before an immigration judge
 10 (IJ) for a custody redetermination hearing. His request for bond was denied based
 11 on a flight risk determination, to wit: he was stopped at the border several times,
 12 used a false name/nationality, did not have family in the United States, did not
 13 possess a permanent address, and had a suspicious date of birth. ECF No. 1-1 at 21.

14 On April 16, 2026, Mr. Molina Alberto filed two pro se habeas petitions² and
 15 requested appointment of counsel.³ ECF No. 1-1. On April 22, 2026, this Court

16
 17 ² A motion to dismiss the second case—Case No. 2:26-cv-01208-APG-EJY,
 18 based on similarity of issues, was filed on March 13, 2026, and is pending before the
 Honorable Andrew P. Gordon.

19 ³ In his first habeas petition, using what appears to be an unapproved
 20 template for a 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition from the *Jacobo-Ramirez* class
 21 action, Mr. Molina Alberto mistakenly indicated that the immigration court had not
 22 conducted a custody redetermination hearing by the time he filed his petition. ECF
 23 No. 1-1 at 3. Respondents appear to have prematurely distributed this template
 24 habeas petition to immigration detainees at the Nevada Southern Detention Center.
 25 This Court did not approve a template class member habeas petition for distribution
 26 until April 22, 2026—six days after Mr. Molina Alberto mailed his petition. *See*
 27 *Jacobo-Ramirez*, No. 25-cv-02136, ECF No. 127 (*Jacobo-Ramirez* approval order for
 distribution of class notice and habeas template); *see also* ECF No. 1-1 at 3 (listing
 April 16, 2026 as the date Mr. Molina Alberto mailed his petition). Yet Mr.
 Ramirez's petition is on a template petition attached to an earlier and vacated yet-
 to-be-approved notice from *Jacobo-Ramirez*. *See* ECF No. 1-1 at 1–5 (containing a
 docket heading from ECF No. 96 in *Jacobo-Ramirez*); *See Jacobo-Ramirez*, No. 25-
 cv-02136, ECF No. 99 (Minute order vacating notice from ECF 96). Given the

1 appointed the Federal Public Defender's office to represent Mr. Molina Alberto. ECF
2 No. 5 at 1. This Court also ordered Respondents to show cause why Mr. Molina
3 Alberto is not a member of the certified class in *Jacobo-Ramirez v. Mullin*, No. 25-
4 cv-02136-RFB-MDC (D. Nev.) and why the petition should not be granted. ECF No.
5 5 at 1. In *Jacobo-Ramirez*, this Court ordered that class members are "entitled to
6 consideration for release from detention on bond and/or conditions by immigration
7 officers and immigration judges." *Jacobo Ramirez v. Mullin*, 2026 WL 879799, at
8 *33 (D. Nev. Mar. 30, 2026). This Court noted class members are entitled to
9 "meaningful procedural protections to ensure [the government] has a
10 constitutionally legitimate interest in detaining them." *Id.* at *26. Consistent with
11 *Jacobo-Ramirez*, the Court's appointment order for Mr. Molina Alberto's case
12 directed Respondents to file immigration documents "relevant to the lawfulness of
13 [Mr. Molina Alberto's] detention," including transcripts or recordings of any custody
14 redetermination proceedings, with its response. ECF No. 5 at 2.

15 On April 27, 2026, Respondents responded to the show cause order. ECF No.
16 9. Respondents conceded Mr. Molina Alberto is a class member. ECF No. 9 at 1.
17 Respondents failed to provide Mr. Molina Alberto's immigration documents to the
18 Court as directed, instead contending: "[t]he documents noted in the Order to Show
19 Cause are not available to this office at this time. A request has been made with
20 OIL/ICE and this response will be supplemented as soon as they are received by
21
22

23 mistaken distribution of this template petition, it appears that Mr. Molina Alberto
24 thought he also needed to apply for relief through this unapproved template.
25 Notably in the unapproved template petition, the existence of an already conducted
26 bond hearing is not one of the checkboxes. ECF No. 1-1 at 2. Mr. Molina Alberto
27 appears to have only checked the applicable boxes and written out missing
information in the blanks. ECF No. 1-1 at 1–3. In addition, the unapproved 2241
habeas template is provided only in English, and as Mr. Molina Alberto speaks
Spanish, there was likely confusion due to language.

1 this office.” ECF No. 9 at 1. To date, Respondents have not supplemented their
2 response.

3 Mr. Molina Alberto now files this traverse, asking this Court to grant the
4 writ and order his immediate release or alternatively, a constitutionally adequate
5 bond hearing.

6 **III. Argument**

7 **A. Respondents’ Concession of Class Membership Established that** 8 **the Writ Should Issue**

9 Respondents’ Response does not contest Mr. Molina Alberto’s class
10 membership. (ECF No. 9 at 1 (“Petitioner is a Class Member”).) That concession is
11 dispositive on the merits. Under this Court’s class-wide partial summary judgment
12 in *Jacobo-Ramirez*, class members illegally detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §
13 1225(b)(2)(A) are entitled to habeas relief. Respondents’ Response concedes every
14 element necessary to that conclusion. The writ should issue, and the sole remaining
15 dispute is the form of relief.

16 **B. This Court should order Respondents to release Mr. Molina** 17 **Alberto**

18 **1. The egregiousness of the due process violation here** 19 **warrants release, consistent with his Court’s approach in** 20 ***Niebla Perez*.**

21 In exercising its broad equitable authority to fashion a remedy as law and
22 justice require, this Court has recognized that the nature and extent of the
23 government’s due process violations bear directly on whether release is the
24 appropriate remedy. *Niebla Perez*, 2026 WL 1031231, at *3–4. There, this Court
25 granted the writ and ordered immediate release—not a bond hearing—based on the
26 severity and extensiveness of the constitutional violations the government had
27 caused the petitioner, including active government misconduct in attempting to
remove him mid-litigation. *Id.*

1 The violations here are equally egregious and warrant the same result. Mr.
 2 Molina Alberto has been held in ICE custody since approximately February 13,
 3 2026, for almost 3 months, without a constitutionally adequate bond hearing or any
 4 neutral review of the probable cause basis for his detention. For nearly 90 days, Mr.
 5 Molina Alberto has been separated from his fiancé and unable to provide financially
 6 for his disabled mother and father. Respondents failed to produce the I-200 arrest
 7 warrant this Court expressly ordered them to file, raising a substantial inference
 8 that no valid warrant ever existed. Taken together, the unlawful arrest, the absence
 9 of a constitutionally adequate process for nearly 3 months, and Respondents'
 10 continued noncompliance with this Court's orders present precisely the kind of
 11 extensive due process violations that warrant release rather than another bond
 12 hearing as the appropriate equitable remedy.

13 **2. Respondents' failure to produce the I-200 independently**
 14 **supports release because the absent warrant raises a**
 15 **substantial inference that the arrest was unlawful.**

16 This Court's April 22, 2026, Order required Respondents to file alongside
 17 their Response "(1) I-200 Warrant for Arrest of Alien" or, in the alternative, to
 18 "CERTIFY that any of the listed documents are not in their possession, custody, or
 19 control." ECF No. 4 at 2–3. Respondents filed their Response on April 27, 2026, with
 20 no supporting exhibits. ECF No. 9. Petitioner independently obtained copies of the
 21 following documents from immigration court via e-mail: copies of the I-213, NTA (I-
 22 862), Application for Asylum and for Withholding of Removal, motion to request a
 23 bond hearing, and an immigration court order dated April 13, 2026. Redacted copies
 24 of the documents provided by the immigration court are attached hereto as Exhibit
 25 1. Respondents also obtained an audio recording of Petitioner's custody
 26 redetermination proceeding, which was manually filed as Exhibit 2. However,
 27 Respondents did not file or provide undersigned counsel with the remaining
 documents as required by this Court's order. Undersigned counsel is still not in

1 possession of an: I-200 form, I-286 form, and a transcription of the custody
2 redetermination hearing. Thus, Respondents have failed to produce an I-200 or
3 supplement their response in violation of this Court's order.

4 That is noncompliance with a direct court order. The Court should find that
5 Respondents' failure to produce the I-200 is a concession that no such record exists.

6 The absent I-200 is fatal to the lawfulness of Mr. Molina Alberto's arrest and
7 detention. This Court addressed this precise question in *Djiwaje*, 2026 WL 926753.
8 There, the government produced an I-200 that was unsigned. This Court held that
9 an unsigned I-200 fails to confer arrest authority under § 1226(a) and 8 C.F.R. §
10 236.1(b)(1), because the signature is the sole indication that an authorized official
11 has made the requisite probable cause determination. *Id.* at *3 (adopting and
12 incorporating the holdings of *N.S. v. Dixon*, 141 F.4th 279, 282–83 (D.C. Cir. 2025);
13 *Sergio P. v. Bondi*, 2026 WL 497290, at *2 (D. Minn. Feb. 23, 2026)). "Absent a
14 signature, the Court finds that the I-200 does not supply immigration authorities
15 the power to arrest or detain noncitizens." *Id.* Here, Respondents have not produced
16 any I-200, signed or otherwise, in direct contravention of this Court's April 22
17 Order. ECF No. 4 at 2–3. The inference that no valid warrant exists is even stronger
18 than in *Djiwaje*, where at least a deficient warrant was produced.

19 The only remaining basis for the arrest is the warrantless arrest exception
20 under 8 U.S.C. § 1357(a)(2), which requires a showing that Petitioner was "likely to
21 escape before a warrant could be obtained." *Djiwaje*, 2026 WL 926753, at *4.
22 Respondents' Response makes no such showing — the warrantless arrest exception
23 is not mentioned. *Id.* (rejecting government's defense of ICE arrest where
24 Respondents "do not even mention the warrantless arrest exception in their
25 briefing."). Accordingly, no lawful basis for the arrest exists, and the detention has
26 been unlawful from its inception.

C. Mr. Molina Alberto's Detention Without a Lawful Arrest Independently Violates the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution

Even if the Court were to find a statutory basis for Mr. Molina Alberto's continued detention, that detention independently violates Petitioner's substantive due process rights under the Fifth Amendment. This Court held in *Djiwaje* that detention without a lawful arrest and without individualized probable cause "clearly violates substantive due process, because the government has asserted no special justification that outweighs Petitioner's constitutionally protected liberty interest." *Djiwaje*, 2026 WL 926753, at *4 (citing *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001)). The Due Process Clause protects all persons within the United States — including noncitizens — from arbitrary confinement, and the government's detention authority is "always constrained by the requirements of due process." *Hernandez v. Sessions*, 872 F.3d 976, 981 (9th Cir. 2017). Freedom from physical restraint "lies at the heart of the liberty [the Due Process Clause] protects." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690.

Here, as in *Djiwaje*, Respondents have articulated no interest, let alone a compelling interest, that would justify Mr. Molina Alberto's continued detention absent a lawful arrest warrant. The constitutional injury is ongoing. Release is the appropriate remedy for that injury, as this Court has held. *Djiwaje*, 2026 WL 926753, at *8.

D. Alternatively, Mr. Molina Alberto is Entitled to a Constitutionally Adequate Bond Hearing

Alternatively, if this Court finds release is not available to Mr. Molina Alberto, he is entitled to a second bond hearing that is constitutionally adequate. Here, Mr. Molina Alberto's bond hearing did not meet constitutional muster for two reasons, the IJ: based its denial on factual inaccuracies and failed to consider

1 alternatives to detention after finding Mr. Molina Alberto was not a danger to the
2 community only a flight risk.

3 Under the authority of 8 U.S.C. §1226(a), ICE may arrest and detain
4 noncitizens during their removal proceedings. Such noncitizens are entitled to a
5 bond hearing in immigration court, absent certain circumstances implicating
6 mandatory detention statutes, none of which apply here. *See Obregon v. Sessions*,
7 No. 17-CV-01463-WHO, 2017 WL 1407889, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 20, 2017) (“[t]he
8 Attorney General has discretion to continue to detain such individuals or release
9 them on bond or conditional parole and has delegated this authority to the IJs.”)
10 citing 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19, 1236.1 (2006). The precedential BIA decision *Matter of*
11 *Guerra*, 24 I&N Dec. 37 (BIA 2006), sets out the 9 factors to be considered in
12 assessing an individual’s request for release on bond. Those factors are:

13 (1) whether the [noncitizen] has a fixed address in the
14 United States; (2) the [noncitizen]'s length of residence in
15 the United States; (3) the [noncitizen]'s family ties in the
16 United States, and whether they may entitled the
17 [noncitizen] to reside permanently in the United States in
18 the future; (4) the [noncitizen]'s employment history; (5)
19 the [noncitizen]'s record of appearance in court; (6) the
20 [noncitizen]'s criminal record, including the extensiveness
21 of criminal activity, the recency of such activity, and the
22 seriousness of the offenses; (7) the [noncitizen]'s history of
23 immigration violations; (8) any attempts by the
24 [noncitizen] to flee prosecution or otherwise escape from
25 authorities; and (9) the [noncitizen]'s manner of entry to
26 the United States.

27 *Id.* at 40.

a. **Respondents denied bond based on factual inaccuracies not supported by the evidence**

Here, in assessing Mr. Molina Alberto's request for release on bond, the IJ was obligated to consider the factors outlined by the BIA in *Matter of Guerra*. Those factors are listed above. Because of those factors, the evidence simply does not support denying Mr. Molina Alberto's request for bond based on flight risk. Applying the *Guerra* factors to the facts of Mr. Molina Alberto's case, the IJ's finding of flight risk was simply not supported by evidence and was legally erroneous. The following facts should have been considered under *Guerra*.

First, contrary to the IJ's determination, Mr. Molina Alberto does have a fixed address in the United States to return to. *See* Ex. 1 at 21. During the hearing, he informed the IJ he was from St. George, Utah and his fiancé, who is a US citizen, still lives there. *See* Ex. 2 (Bond Tr. at 3:45–4:52). Before his arrest, Mr. Molina Alberto and his fiancé had intentions of moving to Las Vegas for a new work opportunity. *See* Ex. 2 (Bond Tr. at 3:45–4:52). His new employer would also provide housing in Las Vegas, however, during the hearing Mr. Molina Alberto could not recall the address. *See* Ex. 2 (Bond Tr. at 11:20–11:53) Undersigned counsel has since confirmed the Las Vegas address with Mr. Molina Alberto. Notably, Mr. Molina Alberto offered to give the IJ his current fixed address in Utah, but the IJ ignored his question and moved on. Ex. 2 (Bond Tr. at 11:50–12:16). Mr. Molina Alberto and his fiancé maintain their residence in St. George and as he stated during the bond hearing he can still reside there. Ex. 2 (Bond Tr. at 11:50–12:16). Undersigned counsel spoke with Petitioner's fiancé and confirmed that she still resides in St. George at a fixed address that Mr. Molina Alberto can return to. Mr. Molina Alberto has lived in St. George, Utah, where he was arrested, for 4 years, since he came to the United States. This is a significant amount of time which cuts against flight risk.

1 Second, the IJ's finding that Mr. Molina Alberto has no immediate family in
2 the United States is belied by the record. *See* Ex. 1 at 21. In response to a question
3 about his family, Mr. Molina Alberto told the IJ that his cousins and their children
4 are US citizens and live in Utah. *See* Ex. 2 (Bond Tr. at 5:09–5:59). He lived with
5 them when he first came to the US. *See* Ex. 2 (Bond Tr. at 5:59–6:24). And
6 eventually he moved in with another immediate family member, his now fiancé. *See*
7 Ex. 2 (Bond Tr. at 5:59–6:24). Mr. Molina Alberto's fiancée is a US citizen. *See* Ex. 2
8 (Bond Tr. at 5:59–6:24). And because Mr. Molina Alberto is due to be wed soon, this
9 factor supports release as his family ties may entitle him to reside permanently in
10 the country in the future.

11 Third, the IJ relied on Mr. Molina Alberto's admission to using a false
12 identification to enter the country as evidence of flight risk. *See* Ex. 2 (Bond Tr. at
13 12:30–13:10). But this evidence was stale as Mr. Molina Alberto used the false ID 4
14 years prior to enter the country and only under duress and threats from the person
15 who assisted him in entering. *See* Ex. 2 (Bond Tr. at 12:30–13:10, 14:25–18:00).
16 When filing both his motion for bond hearing, and his habeas petition, he used his
17 real name. Ex. 1 at 19–20; ECF No. 1-1; Ex. 2 (Bond Tr. at 13:10–14:25). While
18 there are some documents that list and are signed as Mr. Molina Alberto's alias—
19 Raul Martinez Garcia—that is because ICE and other entities have Mr. Molina
20 Alberto's A# associated with his alias, not his birth name, causing confusion as to
21 which name Mr. Molina Alberto needed to file documents under.

22 Next, the IJ denied bond based on a “questionable/suspect” DOB. Ex. 1 at 21.
23 But this basis was erroneous and cumulative of the false identification
24 determination. In 2022, Mr. Molina Alberto used a false identification to enter the
25 US. *See* Ex. 2 (Bond Tr. at 19:00–20:19). However, in applying for a bond hearing
26 and during the bond hearing Mr. Molina Alberto used his real name and date of
27 birth—. *See* Ex. 2 (Bond Tr. at 19:00–20:19). Several times during the

1 bond hearing, the IJ questioned Mr. Molina Alberto regarding his date of birth and
2 each time he corrected the error and gave his true birth date and age. *See* Ex. 2
3 (Bond Tr. at 2:40–2:51, 3:15–3:22, 19:00–20:19). Moreover, separately listing this
4 factor as an additional reason to deny bond was also impermissible because it is
5 cumulative of the false identification determination.

6 Finally, several other BIA factors, not discussed in the IJ's order, weigh
7 heavily in Mr. Molina Alberto's favor such as, his stable employment history as a
8 landscaper, his lack of criminal record, and lack of any attempts to escape from
9 authorities. *See* Ex. 2 (Bond Tr. at 7:30–9:02).

10 In total, these facts strongly undermine the IJ's determination that Mr.
11 Molina Alberto posed a flight risk based on the *Guerra* factors.

12 **b. Respondents failed to consider other alternatives**
13 **to detention even though Mr. Molina Alberto was**
14 **not a danger to the community.**

15 At a bond hearing, the immigration judge must consider alternative
16 conditions of release, and a petitioner's ability to pay a bond, to be consistent with
17 due process. *Cabrera Galdamez*, 2023 WL 1777310, at *9. "A bond determination
18 that does not include a consideration of financial circumstances and alternative
19 release conditions is unlikely to result in a bond amount that is reasonably related
20 to the government's legitimate interests." *Id.* And while immigration courts do not
21 have to consider alternative conditions to release when a noncitizen is a danger to
22 the community, the same reasoning does not stand for a noncitizen who merely
23 poses a potential flight risk. *See Martinez v. Clark*, 124 F.4th 775, 786 (9th Cir.
24 2025) (rejecting claim that agency is legally required to consider alternatives to
25 detention, such as GPS monitoring, drug testing, or counseling, before denying bond
26 on dangerousness).

27 Here, because the sole basis for denying Mr. Molina Alberto bond was based
on risk of flight, it was legally erroneous for the IJ to not consider non-monetary

1 alternative release conditions. *See* Ex. 1 at 21. Rather than explaining why any non-
2 custodial conditions were not feasible, the IJ issued a cursory denial stating “no
3 amount of bond is sufficient to ensure your presence in immigration court.” *See* Ex.
4 2 (4/13/26 Bond Tr. at 21:39-21:45). This was inadequate. Non-custodial conditions
5 could have been fashioned to mitigate any concerns regarding his risk of flight, such
6 as GPS monitoring, phone check-ins, or supervision, and if not the IJ should have
7 explained why these means were not feasible.

8 **IV. Conclusion**

9 Mr. Molina Alberto respectfully requests this Court grant the writ of habeas
10 corpus and order his immediate release from ICE custody on his own recognizance.
11 The equities overwhelmingly support that result: Petitioner has lived in the United
12 States since 2022. He resides with his fiancée in St. George, Utah and has
13 maintained employment throughout his residency. He has now been in civil custody
14 for almost 90 days without constitutional due process.

15 The government has conceded class membership under *Jacobo-Ramirez*;
16 thus, the merits are not in dispute. And this Court has ordered release, not a bond
17 hearing, as the appropriate remedy in similar cases. *See, e.g., Melendez Paz*, 2026
18 WL 1194944; *Niebla Perez*, 2026 WL 1031231, and *Djiwaje*, 2026 WL 926753.
19 Respondents cannot avoid by invoking a bond hearing framework that §
20 1225(b)(2)(A) does not authorize. Mr. Molina Alberto’s entitlement to release is
21 independently established by Respondents’ failure to produce a valid I-200, which
22 this Court held in *Djiwaje* renders the arrest unlawful from inception, and by the
23 ongoing violation of Mr. Molina Alberto’s substantive due process rights arising
24 from detention without a lawful arrest or individualized probable cause. *Djiwaje*,
25 2026 WL 926753 at *3–5; *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690. This Court should grant the
26 writ, order immediate release, and enter a permanent injunction against further
27 detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

1 Alternatively, this Court should order another bond hearing that meets
2 constitutionally adequate standards as the *Guerra* factors weigh in Mr. Molina
3 Alberto's favor. The immigration judge based his decision on factual inaccuracies
4 and failed to consider alternatives to detention after finding Mr. Molina Alberto was
5 not a danger to the community.

6
7 Dated May 13, 2026.

8 Respectfully submitted,

9
10 Rene L. Valladares
11 Federal Public Defender

12 /s/ Jocelyn S. Murphy
13 Jocelyn S. Murphy
14 Assistant Federal Public Defender
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27