ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney
JACOB T. METZGER
Special Assistant U.S. Attorney
Ohio State Bar No. 104783
Office of the U.S. Attorney
880 Front Street, Room 6293
San Diego, CA 92101-8893
Telephone: (619) 546-8693
Mobile: (619) 885-2119
Facsimile: (619) 546-7751
Email: jacob.metzger@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Respondents

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GERARDO JOSE NUNEZ-RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

v.

SIXTO MARRERO, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Case No.: 26-cv-03276-LL-GC

RETURN TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner has filed a habeas petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The government has carefully reviewed this petition and determined that the legal issues presented concern the statutory authority for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement's (ICE) detention of Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(2)(A) or 1226(a). While reserving all rights, including the right to appeal, the government respectfully submits this abbreviated response to preserve the legal issues, to conserve judicial and party resources, and to expedite the Court's consideration of this matter.

Notably, Petitioner's brief alleges that Petitioner is entitled to a bond hearing under *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, 813 F. Supp. 3d 1084 (C.D. Cal. 2025). Petitioner is not defined as the bond eligible class which requires a noncitizen to have (1) entered the United States without inspection, (2) not have been apprehended at arrival, and (3) not be detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1126(c), 8 U.S.C. § 1125(b)(1) or 8 U.S.C. § 1231 at the time the Department of Homeland Security made its initial custody determination. Here, Petitioner was apprehended at the border on August 31, 2021, and Petitioner admitted to crossing border illegally less than 24 hours before the apprehension. *See* Exhibit 1 (2021 I-213). Thus, Petitioner was apprehended at arrival and is not defined within the bond eligible class pursuant to *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, 813 F. Supp. 3d 1084 (C.D. Cal. 2025).

Further, it is the government's position that Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2). However, the government acknowledges that this Court, and Courts in this District, have repeatedly reached the opposite conclusion under the same and/or similar facts. *See, e.g.*, *Arias Torres v. Bondi*, No. 25-cv-2457-BAS-MSB, 2025 WL 3214773 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 18, 2025); *Martinez Lopez v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-2717-JES-AHG, 2025 WL 3030457 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2025); *Beltran v. Noem*, No. 25cv2650-LL-DEB, 2025 WL 3078837 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2025); *Garcia v. Noem*, 803 F. Supp. 3d 1064 (S.D. Cal. 2025); *Esquivel-Ipina v. LaRose*, No. 25-CV-2672 JLS (BLM), 2025 WL 2998361 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2025); *Lucas-Miguel v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3022-RSH-JLB, 2025 WL 3251580 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2025); *Vasquez-Diaz v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3038-TWR-JLB,

ECF No. 6 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2025); *Cardoso v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3043-BJC-VET, ECF No. 7 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 12, 2025); *Maceda-Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-2968-JO-JLB, ECF No. 9 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2025); *A.S. v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-2876-RBM-VET, ECF No. 9 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 225); *Prieto-Cordova v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-2824-CAB-DDL, 2025 WL 3228953 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2025); *Lagarda-Vega v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-2970-GPC-DDL, 2025 WL 3558931 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2025); *Nayyer v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3111-AGS-DDL, ECF No. 7 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 12, 2025); *Amaya v. Noem*, No. 25cv2892-BTM-DEB, 2025 WL 3182998 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2025).

The government acknowledges that this Court's prior decisions will control the result here if the Court adheres to its prior decisions, as the facts are not materially distinguishable for purposes of the Court's decision, and on that basis the government does not oppose the petition and defers to the Court on the appropriate relief.[1]

DATED: June 8, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney

s/ Jacob T. Metzger
JACOB T. METZGER
Special Assistant U.S. Attorney
Attorney for Respondents

[1] To the extent the Court issues an order directing a bond hearing under 1226(a), considering heavy caseloads and staffing levels, Respondents respectfully request that such order provide the government 14 days from issuance to hold such bond hearing. Respondents also respectfully note that the Ninth Circuit has confirmed that at a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), the burden is on the detainee to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that he is not a flight risk or danger to the community. *See Rodriguez Diaz v. Garland*, 53 F.4th 1189, 1197 (9th Cir. 2022); *see also Dos Santos v. Becerra*, No. 26-cv-01423-GPC-VET, 2026 WL 800201 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 23, 2026).