ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney
DOUGLAS D. NELSON
Assistant U.S. Attorney
California Bar No. 177643
Office of the U.S. Attorney
880 Front Street, Room 6293
San Diego, CA 92101-8893
Telephone: (619) 546-8909
Facsimile: (619) 546-7751
Email: Douglas.Nelson@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Respondents

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

YURBIN OTONIEL PEREZ-GOMEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

MARKWAYNE MULLIN, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security; TODD BLANCHE, Acting Attorney General of the United States; DAVID J. VENTURELLA, Acting Director, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; JESUS ROCHA, Acting Director, San Diego ICE Field Office; and JEREMY CASEY, Warden Imperial Regional Detention Facility,

Respondents.

Case No.: 26cv4057 BAS SBC

RESPONSE TO PETITION

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.

Petitioner was previously released from immigration custody on conditional parole issued under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). 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,[1] and on that basis the government

[1] Petitioner also challenges his detention citing violations of Due Process. Should the Court grant the petition, it should decline to address these additional arguments. *INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976) ("As a general rule courts and agencies are not required to make findings on issues the decision of which is unnecessary to the results they reach.").

does not oppose the petition and defers to the Court on the appropriate relief.[2]

DATED: July 22, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney

s/ Douglas D. Nelson
DOUGLAS D. NELSON
Assistant United States Attorney
Attorneys for Respondents

[2] 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).