ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney
CAMILLE SAVEDRA
California Bar No. 336490
Assistant U.S. Attorney
Office of the U.S. Attorney
880 Front Street, Room 6293
San Diego, CA 92101-8893
Telephone: (619) 546-5084
Email: camille.savedra@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Respondents

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SHATSKOV MAKSIM, Petitioner, v. CHRISTOPHER LAROSE; *et al.*, Respondents.	Case No. 26-cv-03199-RBM-JAC **RETURN TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS**

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner requests the Court to order that he be afforded an individualized bond hearing. This Court lacks jurisdiction because Petitioner's claims are barred by 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g). Moreover, as an arriving alien found to have a credible fear of persecution, Petitioner's detention is mandated by 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii) until the conclusion of his removal proceedings. As Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii), the Court should deny Petitioner's requests for relief.

II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner is a native and citizen of Russia. On October 6, 2025, he applied for admission to the United States at the Otay Mesa port of entry. *See* Exhibit 1 (Form I-213).[1] He did not then possess legal documentation to be in or enter the United States. *Id.* He was determined to be an arriving alien inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(7)(A)(i)(I), placed into expedited removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1), and taken into Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) custody pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B). *See* Exhibit 2 (Notice and Order of Expedited Removal). Petitioner was subsequently interviewed by an asylum officer, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B). After receiving a positive credible fear determination, Petitioner was issued a Notice to Appear (NTA). *See* Exhibit 3 (Notice to Appear). The filing of the NTA initiated removal proceedings, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a, against Petitioner, and those proceedings remain ongoing. Within his removal proceedings under § 1229a, Petitioner has the opportunity to apply for relief from removal before an immigration judge (IJ), including asylum under 8 U.S.C. § 1158, withholding of removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(3), and relief under the Convention Against Torture.

Petitioner's merits hearing took place on May 1, 2026. *See* Exhibit 4 (Order of the Immigration Judge). On that date, the immigration judge denied Petitioner's applications for relief and ordered him removed to Russia. *See id.* Several days later, Petitioner appealed the immigration judge's decision to the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). *See* ECF No. 6 at 2. Because Petitioner's appeal remains pending, there is no administratively final order of removal at this time. Petitioner remains mandatorily detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii).

/ / /

/ / /

[1] The attached exhibits are true copies, with redactions of private information, of documents obtained from Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) counsel.

III. STATUTORY BACKGROUND

Section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), codified at 8 U.S.C. § 1225, applies to an "applicant for admission," defined as an "alien present in the United States who has not been admitted" or "who arrives in the United States." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1). "[A]pplicants for admission fall into one of two categories, those covered by § 1225(b)(1) and those covered by § 1225(b)(2)." *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287 (2018).

Section 1225(b)(1) applies to arriving aliens and "certain other" aliens "initially determined to be inadmissible due to fraud, misrepresentation, or lack of valid document." *Id.* (citing 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i)). These aliens are generally subject to expedited removal proceedings. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i). But if "the alien indicates an intention to apply for asylum . . . or a fear of persecution," immigration officers will refer the alien for a credible fear interview. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii). "If the officer determines at the time of the interview that [the] alien has a credible fear of persecution . . . , the alien *shall be detained* for further consideration of the application for asylum." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii) (emphasis added). If the alien does not indicate an intent to apply for asylum, does not express a fear of persecution, or is "found not to have such a fear," they "shall be detained . . . until removed" from the United States. 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(1)(A)(i), (B)(iii)(IV).

IV. ARGUMENT

A. Petitioner's Claim is Barred Under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g).

Respondents contend that judicial review over Petitioner's claim is barred by 28 U.S.C. § 1252(g), which states that "[n]o court shall have jurisdiction to hear any cause or claim by or on behalf of any alien arising from the decision or action by the Attorney General to commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders."

Here, Petitioner's claims of unlawful detention necessarily arise from the Department of Homeland Security's[2] decision to commence removal proceedings against him because that decision unavoidably triggers mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii) until the conclusion of his removal proceedings. *See, e.g.*, *Wang v. United States*, No. CV 10-0389 SVW (RCx), 2010 WL 11463156, at *6 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 18, 2010) (finding section 1252(g) bars judicial review of false imprisonment claim because the plaintiff's detention arose from the decision to commence removal proceedings, and in turn, the "statute mandating detention during removal proceedings of a person charged as an 'arriving alien.'").

As explained by another district court, removal proceedings are commenced when, as occurred here, "the alien is issued a Notice to Appear before an immigration court." *Herrera-Correra v. United States*, No. CV 08–2941 DSF (JCx), 2008 WL 11336833, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2008); *see also* Exhibit 3. The government "may arrest the alien against whom proceedings are commenced and detain that individual until the conclusion of those proceedings." *Herrera-Correra*, 2008 WL 11336833, at *3. "Thus, an alien's detention throughout this process arises from the [government's] decision to commence proceedings" and review of claims arising from such detention is barred under section 1252(g). *Id.* (citing *Sissoko v. Rocha*, 509 F.3d 947, 949 (9th Cir. 2007)); *see also Wang*, 2010 WL 11463156, at *6.

Because this habeas petition brings a claim "arising from the decision or action by the [government] to commence proceedings," review of Petitioner's claim is barred under 8 U.S.C § 1252(g). Thus, the Court must dismiss the petition.

///

///

///

[2] "In 2002, Congress transferred the Attorney General's immigration enforcement responsibilities to the Secretary of Homeland Security." *Ibarra-Perez v. United States*, 154 F.4th 989, 995 n.2 (9th Cir. 2025).

B. Petitioner is Lawfully Detained Under the INA and the Constitution.

Even if the Court assumed jurisdiction to review Petitioner's claim, the Court must deny his habeas petition because Petitioner's detention is statutorily mandated under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii) and it has not been unconstitutionally prolonged.

1. Petitioner is mandatorily detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1).

Petitioner is an arriving alien. *See* ECF No. 6 at 2 (admitting that Petitioner "presented himself" at the Otay Mesa port of entry). As discussed above, arriving aliens are applicants for admission who are subject to expedited removal proceedings, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i), unless—as occurred here—an asylum officer has determined that they have a credible fear of persecution, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii). In such cases, the INA mandates that "the alien *shall be detained* for further consideration of the application for asylum." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii) (emphasis added); *see also Matter of M-S*, 27 I. & N. Dec. 509, 519 (AG 2019) ("all aliens transferred from expedited to full [removal] proceedings after establishing a credible fear are ineligible for bond"). Because Petitioner is an arriving alien found to have a credible fear of persecution and placed in full removal proceedings, his detention is mandated by section 1225(b) until the conclusion of his removal proceedings. *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 302 ("§§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2) mandate detention of aliens throughout the completion of applicable proceedings").

Petitioner requests that the Court order Respondents to provide him with an individualized bond hearing. *See* ECF No. 6 at 9. But the Supreme Court has rejected such contention, explaining: "[r]ead most naturally, §§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2) thus mandate detention of applicants for admission until certain proceedings have concluded. . . . Nothing in the statutory text imposes any limit on the length of detention. And neither § 1225(b)(1) nor § 1225(b)(2) says anything whatsoever about bond hearings." *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 297. Except for temporary parole granted at the discretion of the Attorney General "for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit" under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5), "there are no *other* circumstances under

which aliens detained under § 1225(b) may be released." *Id.* at 300 (emphasis in original).

As Petitioner's removal proceedings are pending, and he has not been granted temporary parole, section 1225(b)(1)(B) mandates his detention until the proceedings have concluded. *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 297 ("Once those proceedings end, detention under § 1225(b) must end as well."). Because Petitioner is lawfully detained under section 1225(b)(1)(B) and the statute does not entitle him to release at this time, his petition must be denied. *See, e.g.*, *Zelaya-Gonzalez v. Matuszewski*, No. 23-CV-151 JLS-KSC, 2023 WL 3103811, at *3 (S.D. Cal. April 25, 2023) (applying *Jennings* to find that the petitioner had no right to release or a bond hearing).

2. Petitioner's detention is not unconstitutionally prolonged.

In *Jennings*, the Supreme Court evaluated the proper interpretation of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). The Supreme Court stated that, "[r]ead most naturally, [8 U.S.C.] §§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2) . . . mandate detention of applicants for admission until certain proceedings have concluded." *Id.* at 297. In other words, neither 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) nor § 1225(b)(2) "impose[] any limit on the length of detention" and "neither § 1225(b)(1) nor § 1225(b)(2) say[] anything whatsoever about bond hearings." *Id.* The Supreme Court added that the sole means of release for noncitizens detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(1) or (b)(2) prior to removal from the United States is temporary parole at the discretion of the Attorney General under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5). *Id.* at 300 ("That express exception to detention implies that there are no *other* circumstances under which aliens detained under [8 U.S.C.] § 1225(b) may be released.") (emphasis in original). "In sum, [8 U.S.C.] §§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2) mandate detention of aliens throughout the completion of applicable proceedings[.]" *Id.* at 302.

In *Shaughnessy v. United States ex rel. Mezei*, 345 U.S. 206, 207–09 (1953), a noncitizen in exclusion proceedings filed a habeas petition claiming that his prolonged detention without a hearing violated his constitutional rights. The Supreme Court rejected the petition, concluding that the noncitizen's continued detention did not

deprive him of any due process rights, stating: "[A]n alien on the threshold of initial entry stands on a different footing: 'Whatever the procedure authorized by Congress is, it is due process as far as an alien denied entry is concerned.'" *Id.* at 212 (citation omitted).

In *Department of Homeland Security v. Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 138–40 (2020), the Supreme Court once again addressed the due process rights of individuals like Petitioner—inadmissible arriving noncitizens seeking initial entry into the United States. The Supreme Court stated that such individuals have no due process rights "other than those afforded by statute." *Id.* at 107; *see also id.* at 140 ("[A]n alien in respondent's position has only those rights regarding admission that Congress has provided by statute."). The Supreme Court noted that its determination was supported by "more than a century of precedent." *Id.* at 138 (citing *Nishimura Ekiu v. United States*, 142 U.S. 651, 660 (1892); *U.S. ex rel. Knauff v. Shaughnessy*, 338 U.S. 537, 544 (1950); *Mezei*, 345 U.S. at 212; *Landon v. Plasencia*, 459 U.S. 21, 32 (1982)). Because the only process due Petitioner is that afforded under section 1225(b), the Court must reject his claim that his detention violates the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause and deny his requested relief. *See Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 138–40; *Mendoza-Linares*, 51 F.4th at 1167; *Rodriguez Diaz v. Garland*, 53 F.4th 1189, 1206 (9th Cir. 2022) ("The recognized liberty interests of U.S. citizens and aliens are not coextensive: the Supreme Court has 'firmly and repeatedly endorsed the proposition that Congress may make rules as to aliens that would be unacceptable if applied to citizens.'") (quoting *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 522 (2003)); *Zelaya-Gonzalez*, 2023 WL 3103811, at *4 ("Binding Ninth Circuit and Supreme Court precedents are clear that Petitioner lacks any rights beyond those conferred by statute, and no statute entitles Petitioner to a bond hearing.").

Since the Supreme Court's decision in *Thuraissigiam*, numerous published decisions have acknowledged *Thuraissigiam*'s impact on the precise Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause that Petitioner might have raised in this petition: Does an alien

detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) have a due process right to release or a bond hearing after being detained for a certain period of time? The answer is no. *See Mendoza-Linares v. Garland*, No. 21-cv-1169-BEN (AHG), 2024 WL 3316306, *2 (S.D. Cal. June 10, 2024) ("[T]he Court finds that Petitioner has no Fifth Amendment right to a bond hearing pending his removal proceedings."); *Zelaya-Gonzalez*, 2023 WL 3103811. *3 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 25, 2023) (same); *Rodriguez Figueroa v. Garland*, 535 F. Supp. 3d 122, 126–27 (W.D.N.Y. 2021); *Gonzales Garcia v. Rosen*, 513 F. Supp. 3d 329, 336 (W.D.N.Y. 2021); *St. Charles v. Barr*, 514 F. Supp. 3d 570, 579 (W.D.N.Y. 2021); *Petgrave v. Aleman*, 529 F. Supp. 3d 665, 667 (S.D. Tex. 2021).

Even if the Court infers a constitutional right against prolonged mandatory detention, Petitioner's claim still fails. "In general, as detention continues past a year, courts become extremely wary of permitting continued custody absent a bond hearing." *Sibomana v. LaRose*, No. 22-cv-933-LL-NLS, 2023 WL 3028093, at *4 (S.D. Cal. April 20, 2023) (citation omitted); *see also Durand v. Allen*, No. 3:23-cv-00279-RBM-BGS, 2024 WL 711607, at *5 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 21, 2024) (detained over two-and-a-half years); *Sanchez-Rivera v. Matuszewski*, No. 22-cv-1357-MMA (JLB), 2023 WL 139801, at *6 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2023) (three years); *Yagao v. Figueroa*, No. 17-cv-2224-AJB-MDD, 2019 WL 1429582, at *2 (S.D. Cal. March 29, 2019) (two years). Petitioner's detention falls significantly short of the length courts have found to raise due process concerns.

In similar cases, courts in this district have applies the test in *Banda v. McAleenan*, 385 F. Sup. 3d 1099, 1106 (W.D. Wash. 2019), first adopted by Judge Battaglia in *Kydyrali v. Wolf*, 499 F. Supp. 3d 768 (S.D. Cal. 2020). Under *Banda*, to determine whether continued mandatory detention has become unreasonable, courts look at (1) total length of detention to date; (2) likely duration of future detention; (3) conditions of detention; (4) delays in the removal proceedings caused by the detainee; (5) delays in the removal proceedings caused by the government; and (6) the likelihood

that the removal proceedings will result in a final order of removal. *Banda*, 385 F. Sup. 3d at 1106.

First, Petitioner's approximate 8-month detention should not favor granting his release. The length of detention in *Kydyrali* was 27 months, three times as long as Petitioner's detention. *See Kydyrali*, 499 F. Supp. 3d at 773. This relatively short duration does not justify habeas relief. *See Prieto-Romero v. Clark*, 534 F.3d 1053, 1065 (9th Cir. 2008) (finding no constitutional violation in detention of more than three years under § 1226(a)); *see also Durand v. Allen*, No. 3:23-cv-00279-RBM-BGS, 2024 WL 711607 at *5 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 21, 2024) (32 months); *Sibomana*, 2023 WL 3028093, at *4 (19 months); *Sanchez-Rivera*, 2023 WL 139801 at *6 (three years); *Yagao v. Figueroa*, No. 17-CV-2224-AJB-MDD, 2019 WL 1429582, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 29, 2019) (42 months).

Notably, "the length of detention . . . is the most important factor." *Banda*, 385 F. Supp. 3d at 1118. In short, the period of Petitioner's detention is reasonable. Moreover, the length of Petitioner's detention, by itself, does not favor granting habeas relief. *See Sadeqi v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-2587-RSH-BJW, 2025 WL 3154520, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2025) ("The Court agrees with Respondents that the length of Petitioner's detention to date—almost 12 months—does not by itself, without more, establish prolonged detention in violation of due process.").

Second, the likely duration of future detention weighs against Petitioner. Petitioner's individual merits hearing recently concluded on May 1, 2026, resulting in a removal order to Russia. *See* Exhibit 4. Any length of detention after that point is purely speculative. The third facter is arguably neutral as Petitioner has not presented any evidence to show his detention at Respondents' detention facility "resemble[s] penal confinement[.]" *Banda*, 385 F. Supp. 3d at 1119. As to the fourth and fifth factors (delays in the removal proceedings caused by Petitioner and the government), Respondents agree with Petitioner that they are neutral (*see* ECF No. 6 at 8), as the record does not evidence any delays in removal proceedings. The sixth and final factor

weighs in favor of Respondents because an immigration judge has entered a removal order against Petitioner, which Petitioner has appealed to the BIA

Balancing the above factors, the record does not support a finding that "detention has become so unreasonable as to require an initial bond hearing," *Sanchez-Rivera*, 2023 WL 139801, at *6, or an order requiring Petitioner's release.

Petitioner was lawfully detained when she applied for admission to the United States. As a result, Petitioner is rightly considered an applicant for admission, and his mandatory detention does not violate due process. *See Markov v. LaRose*, No. 25-CV-3811 JLS (SBC), 2026 WL 92069 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 13, 2026) ("Petitioner's length of detention, without more, does not render his detention unreasonable."); *Duran Romero v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3567-AGS-VET, ECF No. 7 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 14, 2026); *Shahin v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-2496-AGS-KSC, ECF No. 12 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 23, 2025); *Cordova Cordova*, No. 25-cv-2426-BAS-DDL, ECF No. 9 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 14, 2025); *Mendez Ramirez*, 612 F. Supp. 3d at 221; *Gonzalez Aguilar v. Wolf*, 448 F. Supp. 3d at 1212; *de la Rosa Espinoza*, 2020 WL 3452967, at *6-8.

V. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein, Respondents respectfully request that the Court dismiss this petition for lack of jurisdiction or deny it on the merits.

Dated: June 18, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney

s/Camille Savedra
CAMILLE SAVEDRA
Assistant United States Attorney
Attorneys for Respondents