UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA
Civil No. 0:25-cv-03051-ECT-DJF

JOSE JACOB OTERO ESCALANTE,

Petitioner,

v.

PAMELA BONDI, *et al.*

Respondents.

RESPONDENTS' RETURN TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Jose Jacob Otero Escalante ("Otero Escalante" or "Petitioner") is an applicant for admission from Honduras who was apprehended by officers of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") recently. Officials from Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") placed him in removal proceedings and in immigration detention pending the outcome of his removal proceedings. The removal proceedings are preceding apace. Petitioner conceded removability and filed for Cancellation of Removal and Adjustment of Status for Certain Nonpermanent Residents which application will be considered by the Immigration Court at a merits hearing on September 29, 2025. Meanwhile, the Immigration Court also determined that Petitioner shall remain in immigration detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) pending the outcome of his removal proceedings. Petitioner appealed that determination to the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) and that appeal remains pending.

Then, on July 29, 2025, Petitioner filed this habeas petition to challenge the Immigration Court's detention determination. Petitioner claims that placement in detention

under 1225(b)(2)(A) violated the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), the regulations promulgated thereunder, the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment to the U. S. Constitution, and the Administrative Procedures Act (APA). Specifically, while not challenging the removal proceedings or his concomitant detention *per se*, Petitioner essentially asserts the Immigration Court should have considered the detention question under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 under which he would have been eligible for a custody redetermination and release on bond and other conditions. Petitioner seeks immediate release or an order requiring the Immigration Court to conduct a bond hearing to determine his eligibility for release on bond.

Contrary to Petitioner's arguments, the Immigration Court considered the detention question under the applicable provision and correctly determined that Petitioner be detained pending the outcome of his pending removal proceedings. His continued detention complies with the applicable law and comports with due process. All of Petitioner's claims fail. This Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction to review these removal and detention procedures, and in any event, ICE's actions violate neither the statute nor due process. The court should dissolve the pending TRO and dismiss the habeas petition.

BACKGROUND

A. STATUTORY BACKGROUND

For more than a century, the immigration laws have authorized immigration officials to charge noncitizens as removable from the country, arrest noncitizens subject to removal, and detain noncitizens during their removal proceedings. *See Abel v. United States*, 362 U.S. 217, 232–37 (1960). In the INA, Congress enacted a multi-layered

statutory scheme for the civil detention of noncitizens pending a decision on removal, during the administrative and judicial review of removal orders, and in preparation for removal. *See generally* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225, 1226, 1231. "The rule has been clear for decades: "[d]etention during deportation proceedings [i]s ... constitutionally valid." *Banyee v. Garland*, 115 F.4th 928 (8th Cir. 2024), *rehearing by panel and en banc denied*, *Banyee v. Bondi*, No. 22-2252, 2025 WL 837914 (8th Cir. Mar. 18, 2025) (citing *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 523 (2003)); *see Demore*, 538 U.S. at 523 n.7 ("In fact, prior to 1907 there was no provision permitting bail for *any* aliens during the pendency of their deportation proceedings."); *Carlson v. Landon*, 342 U.S. 524, 538 (1952) ("Detention is necessarily a part of this deportation procedure."). Indeed, removal proceedings "'would be [in] vain if those accused could not be held in custody pending the inquiry into their true character.'" *Demore*, 538 U.S. at 523 (quoting *Wong Wing v. United States*, 163 U.S. 228, 235 (1896)).

a. Detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225

Section 1225 applies to "applicants for admission," who are defined as "alien[s] present in the United States who [have] not been admitted" or "who arrive[] in the United States." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1). Applicants 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" noncitizens "initially determined to be inadmissible due to fraud, misrepresentation, or lack of valid documentation." *Id.*; 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i), (iii). These noncitizens are generally subject to expedited removal proceedings. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i). But if the

individual "indicates an intention to apply for asylum . . . or a fear of persecution," immigration officers will refer the alien for a credible fear interview. *Id.* § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii). An individual "with a credible fear of persecution" is "detained for further consideration of the application for asylum." Id. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii). If the individual does not indicate an intent to apply for asylum, express a fear of persecution, or is "found not to have such a fear," he is detained until removed. *Id.* §§ 1225(b)(1)(A)(i), (B)(iii)(IV).

Section 1225(b)(2), under which Otero Escalante is detained, is "broader" and "serves as a catchall provision." *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287. It "applies to all applicants for admission not covered by § 1225(b)(1)." *Id.* Under § 1225(b)(2), an individual "who is an applicant for admission" shall be detained for a removal proceeding "if the examining immigration officer determines that [the] alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A); *see Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 66, 68 (BIA 2025) ("for aliens arriving in and seeking admission into the United States who are placed directly in full removal proceedings, section 235(b)(2)(A) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), mandates detention 'until removal proceedings have concluded.'") (citing *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 299). Still, the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") has the sole discretionary authority to temporarily release on parole "any alien applying for admission to the United States" on a "case-by-case basis for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit." 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A); *see Biden v. Texas*, 597 U.S. 785, 806 (2022).

b. Detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)

Section 1226 "generally governs the process of arresting and detaining . . . aliens pending their removal." *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 138 S. Ct. 830, 837 (2018). Section 1226(a) provides that "an alien may be arrested and detained pending a decision on whether the alien is to be removed from the United States." 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). The Attorney General and the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") thus have broad discretionary authority to detain a noncitizen during removal proceedings.[1] *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(1) (DHS "may continue to detain the arrested alien" during the pendency of removal proceedings); *Nielsen v. Preap*, 139 S. Ct. 954, 966 (2019) (highlighting that "subsection (a) creates authority for *anyone's* arrest or release under § 1226—and it gives the Secretary broad discretion as to both actions").

When a noncitizen is apprehended, a DHS officer makes an initial custody determination. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 236.1(c)(8). DHS "may continue to detain the arrested alien." 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(1). "To secure release, the alien must show that he does not pose a danger to the community and that he is likely to appear for future proceedings." *Johnson v. Guzman Chavez*, 141 S. Ct. 2271, 2280–81 (2021) (citing 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1(c)(8),

[1] Although the relevant statutory sections refer to the Attorney General, the Homeland Security Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-296, 116 Stat. 2135 (2002), transferred all immigration enforcement and administration functions vested in the Attorney General, with few exceptions, to the Secretary of Homeland Security. The Attorney General's authority—delegated to immigration judges, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(d)—to detain, or authorize bond for noncitizens under section 1226(a) is "one of the authorities he retains . . . although this authority is shared with [DHS] because officials of that department make the initial determination whether an alien will remain in custody during removal proceedings." *Matter of D-J-*, 23 I. & N. Dec. 572, 574 n.3 (A.G. 2003).

1236.1(c)(8); *Matter of Adeniji*, 22 I. & N. Dec. 1102, 1113 (BIA 1999)).

If DHS decides to release the noncitizen, it may set a bond or place other conditions on release. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2); 8 C.F.R. § 236.1(c)(8). If DHS determines that a noncitizen should remain detained during the pendency of his removal proceedings, the noncitizen may request a bond hearing before an immigration judge. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1(d)(1), 1003.19, 1236.1(d). The immigration judge then conducts a bond hearing and decides whether to release the noncitizen, based on a variety of factors that account for the noncitizen's ties to the United States and evaluate whether the noncitizen poses a flight risk or danger to the community. *See Guerra*, 24 I. & N. Dec. 37, 40 (BIA 2006);[2] *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(d) ("The determination of the Immigration Judge as to custody status or bond may be based upon any information that is available to the Immigration Judge or that is presented to him or her by the alien or [DHS].").

Section 1226(a) does not provide a noncitizen with a right to release on bond. *See Matter of D-J-*, 23 I. & N. Dec. at 575 (citing *Carlson*, 342 U.S. at 534). Nor does Section 1226(a) explicitly address the burden of proof that should apply or any particular factor that must be considered in bond hearings. Rather, it grants DHS and the Attorney General

[2] The BIA has identified the following non-exhaustive list of factors the immigration judge may consider: "(1) whether the alien has a fixed address in the United States; (2) the alien's length of residence in the United States; (3) the alien's family ties in the United States, and whether they may entitle the alien to reside permanently in the United States in the future; (4) the alien's employment history; (5) the alien's record of appearance in court; (6) the alien's criminal record, including the extensiveness of criminal activity, the recency of such activity, and the seriousness of the offenses; (7) the alien's history of immigration violations; (8) any attempts by the alien to flee prosecution or otherwise escape from authorities; and (9) the alien's manner of entry to the United States." *Guerra*, 24 I. & N. Dec. at 40.

broad discretionary authority to determine whether to detain or release a noncitizen during his removal proceedings. *Id.* If, after the bond hearing, either party disagrees with the decision of the immigration judge, that party may appeal that decision to the BIA. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1(d)(3), 1003.19(f), 1003.38, 1236.1(d)(3).

Included within the Attorney General and DHS's discretionary authority are limitations on the delegation to the immigration court. Under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(h)(2)(i)(B), the immigration judge does not have authority to redetermine the conditions of custody imposed by DHS for any arriving alien. While not applicable in this case, the regulations also allow DHS to invoke an automatic stay of any decision by an immigration judge to release an individual on bond when DHS files an appeal of the custody redetermination. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(i)(2) ("The decision whether or not to file [an automatic stay] is subject to the discretion of the Secretary.").

c. Review of custody determinations at the Board of Immigration Appeals ("BIA")

The BIA is an appellate body within the Executive Office for Immigration Review ("EOIR"). *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(d)(1). Members of the BIA possess delegated authority from the Attorney General. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(a)(1). The BIA is "charged with the review of those administrative adjudications under the [INA] that the Attorney General may by regulation assign to it," including IJ custody determinations. 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.1(d)(1), 236.1; 1236.1. The BIA not only resolves particular disputes before it, but also "through precedent decisions, [it] shall provide clear and uniform guidance to DHS, the immigration judges, and the general public on the proper interpretation and

administration of the [INA] and its implementing regulations." *Id.* § 1003.1(d)(1). "The decision of the [BIA] shall be final except in those cases reviewed by the Attorney General." 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(d)(7).

B. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Otero Escalante is a citizen and national of Honduras. ECF No. 1, ¶ 32. Otero Escalante entered the United States without inspection on or about February 1, 2014, at or near McAllen, Texas. ECF No. 1, ¶ 32. Otero Escalante entered the United States without being inspected by an Immigration Officer. Otero Escalante entered the United States without admission or parole after inspection by an Immigration Officer. Declaration of William Robinson ("Robinson Declaration"), ¶ 4.

Otero Escalante was encountered on June 23, 2025, by agents from Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO), St Paul; special agents from Homeland Security Investigations (his); and agents from the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA). Robinson Declaration, ¶ 5.

On June 23, 2025, these agents were conducting fugitive operations near 1945 West 136th Street, in Burnsville, Minnesota. Otero Escalante was a passenger in a vehicle that was stopped by HSI. It was determined that Otero Escalante was present in the United States illegally. Otero Escalante was arrested and transported to the ICE ERO office at Fort Snelling, Minnesota. Robinson Declaration, ¶ 6. *See* ECF No. 1, ¶ 35.

At ICE ERO, after Otero Escalante voluntarily answered questions from immigration officers about his background, immigration officers served Otero Escalante a Notice to Appear (Form I-862)(NTA). Robinson Declaration, ¶ 7, Ex. A. He was charged under the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), § 212 (a)(6)(A)(i), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i), for being present in the United States without being admitted or paroled after inspection. Robinson Declaration, ¶ 7, Ex. A. *See* ECF No. 1, ¶ 36.

On June 23, 2025, ICE also issued a Warrant for Arrest of Alien to Otero Escalante. Robinson Declaration, ¶ 8, Ex. B. *See* ECF No. 1, ¶ 37.

On June 23, 2025, ICE determined that Otero Escalante would be detained by the Department of Homeland Security pending a final determination of his removal proceedings. ICE completed a Notice of Custody Determination. Robinson Declaration, ¶ 9, Ex. C. This was read to Otero Escalante in Spanish. Otero Escalante acknowledged receipt and requested that the Immigration Judge review this custody determination. *Id.*

On June 27, 2025, Otero Escalante, through counsel, filed a motion for a bond hearing. Robinson Declaration, ¶ 10, Ex. D. *See* ECF No. 1, ¶ 40. The hearing on the custody redetermination was scheduled for July 9, 2025. Robinson Declaration, ¶ 11, Ex. E.

On July 9, 2025, a bond hearing was held by Immigration Judge Monte Miller upon request by Sierra Paulsen, Esq., Otero Escalante's private counsel. Both Otero Escalante's counsel and counsel for the DHS presented arguments. The DHS argued that Otero Escalante's detention was governed under INA 235(b)(2)(a). The Immigration Judge issued a written order finding that Otero Escalante "[was] not eligible for bond because he's charged under INA 212 and he entered without inspection as such he's an 'applicant for admission' and pursuant to INA section 235(b)(2)(a) and Matter of Q. Li, 29 I&N Dec. 66 (BIA 2025)." Robinson Declaration, ¶ 12 and Ex. G. *See* ECF No. 1, ¶ 44.

On July 16, 2025, Otero Escalante, through counsel, filed an appeal to the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) of the Immigration Judge's July 9, 2025, decision in the bond proceedings. Robinson Declaration, ¶ 15 and Ex. J. The BIA acknowledged receipt of the appeal on July 22, 2025. Robinson Declaration, ¶ 16 and Ex. K. Petitioner's appeal to the BIA remains pending. *See* ECF No. 1, ¶¶ 46-47.

On July 23, 2025, a removal hearing was held by Immigration Judge Kalin Ivany. Pursuant to ICE and EOIR database records, Otero Escalante, again represented by private counsel, admitted to all four allegations and conceded the single charge of inadmissibility in the Notice to Appear. The fact that Otero Escalante entered the United States without being admitted or paroled after inspection by an Immigration Officer has never been in dispute. Robinson Declaration, ¶ 17.

On July 23, 2025, the Immigration Court scheduled as Master Calendar hearing for August 13, 2025. Robinson Declaration, ¶ 18 and Ex. L. Otero Escalante remains in removal proceedings. His counsel requested additional time to file an application for relief from removal at an upcoming hearing scheduled for August 13, 2025. Robinson Declaration, ¶ 19.

On August 8, 2025, because of the appeal on the bond proceedings, the Immigration Judge Monte Miller entered a supplemental order further describing his reasoning for his July 9, 2025, order on the bond redetermination issue currently pending before the BIA. Robinson Declaration, ¶ 18 and Ex. M.

The Immigration Court, Immigration Judge Kalin Ivany presiding, held a removal hearing on August 13, 2025. Pursuant to ICE and EOIR database records, Otero Escalante, again represented by private counsel, filed an application for relief from removal– EOIR 42B Application for Cancellation of Removal and Adjustment of Status for Certain Nonpermanent Residents. Immigration Judge Ivany set the matter for an individual merits hearing on September 29, 2025, at 10:30 a.m. Robinson Declaration, ¶ 18 and Ex. N.

Otero Escalante remains in immigration detention under INA § 235, 8 U.S.C. § 1225 in Freeborn County Jail, Austin, Minnesota, in accordance with the Immigration Judge's oral decision on July 9, 2025, his written order of that date, and his supplemental

order dated August 8, 2025, pending the outcome of the petitioner's appeal to the BIA. Robinson Declaration, ¶ 20 and Ex's. G and M.

On July 29, 2025, Petitioner filed this petition for a writ of habeas corpus. ECF No. 1. Petitioner asserts the Immigration Court should have considered the detention question under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 under which he would have been eligible for a custody redetermination and release on bond and other conditions. Petitioner seeks immediate release or an order requiring the Immigration Court to conduct a bond hearing to determine his eligibility for release on bond.

ARGUMENT

A. Applicable Legal Standards

"The district courts of the United States . . . are courts of limited jurisdiction. They possess only that power authorized by Constitution and statute[.]" *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Allapattah Servs., Inc.*, 545 U.S. 546, 552 (2005) (internal quotations omitted). "[T]he scope of habeas has been tightly regulated by statute, from the Judiciary Act of 1789 to the present day[.]" *Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 125 n.20. To warrant a grant of habeas corpus, a petitioner must demonstrate that his custody violates the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3).

B. Petitioner Is Properly Detained Under Section 1225.

Petitioner is properly in removal proceedings. ICE served him with a Notice to Appear (NTA) alleging he is an alien present without admission or parole and inadmissible pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i). Pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1), an alien present

in the United States who has not been admitted is known as an "applicant for admission." Per Section 1225(a)(3), all applicants for admission are subject to inspection by immigration officers to determine if they are admissible to the United States. The term "admission" is defined by the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA") to mean "the lawful entry of the alien into the United States after inspection and authorization by an immigration officer." 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(13)(A); see also 8 C.F.R. § 1235.1 (setting forth inspection procedures). A person who has not been inspected, admitted, or paroled into the United States is subject to removal. Id. In this case, Otero Escalante admits he entered into the country without inspection in 2014 and has remained in the country since then.

Section 1225(b) provides for the inspection of aliens in the United States for admission. Section 1225(b)(1) pertains to inspection of "arriving aliens," contains the "expedited removal" provision for such aliens, and thus does not apply directly here.

Rather, this case involves the catch-all provision, Section § 1225(b)(2)(A), which provides for the inspection of all "other" applicants for admission and states that "in the case of an alien who is an applicant for admission, if the examining immigration officer determines that an alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, the alien ***shall be detained*** for a proceeding under section 240."[3] 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) (emphasis added).

Here, Petitioner had never been inspected by immigration officials before his apprehension on June 23, 2025. After his inspection, ICE officials determined that he was

[3] Section 240 of the INA, codified at 8 U.S.C. § 1229a, refers to the full removal proceedings that the Petitioner is currently subject to before the Immigration Court.

in the United States without inspection and without being admitted or paroled after inspection and they charged him appropriately. Robinson Declaration, ¶¶ 4, 7 and Exs. A and F. Otero Escalante does not claim that this removal charge was inappropriate and indeed he has admitted the charge of inadmissibility and requested cancellation of removal.

Then, ICE officials turned to the question of detention. Based on the information provided, they determined he should remain in custody. Using the form in use at the time, they issued and served him with a Warrant for Arrest of Alien and a Notice of Custody Determination. Robinson Declaration, ¶¶ 7, 8, 9 and Exs. B and C. Otero Escalante requested that an Immigration Judge review the custody determination. Robinson Declaration, ¶ 9 and Ex. C. Otero Escalante's counsel formally requested a bond hearing. Robinson Declaration, ¶ 10 and Ex. D.

The Immigration Court held a hearing on the bond issue on July 9, 2025, and heard arguments from both counsel. The Immigration Court concluded that Petitioner had entered without inspection, was an applicant for admission, and thus not eligible for bond under Section 1225(b)(2)(a) and Matter of Q. Li, 29 I & N Dec. 66 (BIA 2025). Robinson Declaration, ¶¶ 13, 20 and Exs. G and M. Otero Escalante appealed this determination to the BIA.

Otero Escalante has made this issue the heart and basis of his habeas petition. The Immigration Judge's decision was correct and based on the clear statutory language of the INA and in particular Section 1225(b)(2)(a). Congress wrote (or rewrote) Section 1225(b)(2)(a) in IIRIRA in 1996 and it has not changed materially since. The Immigration Judge applied it correctly to the undisputed facts of this case. To the extent that Section

1225(b)(2)(a) may leave persons who have not been inspected, admitted, or paroled in "exclusion" proceedings as opposed to persons who have been admitted but deportable and to whom 1226(a) would apply, that has been the case for many decades leading up to IIRIRA and does not implicate due process. In short, Otero Escalante's detention under Section 1225(b)(2)(a) comports with the facts, the INA, and due process. To the extent that any error may have occurred, that can be corrected on any appeal to the BIA, or the Court of Appeals should any such appeal become necessary. The Court should dismiss the habeas petition on the merits.

C. The Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction.

As noted, Petitioner's habeas petition proceeds upon a fundamental misunderstanding of the basis for his removal from the United States and his concomitant detention pending that removal. Petitioner is properly in removal proceedings and is detained properly under Section 1225. The court should dismiss the habeas petition on the merits. The Court also lacks subject matter jurisdiction to delve any further into this detention issue raised by the habeas petition for the following reasons.

1. Lack of Exhaustion.

Petitioner has not raised claims that constitute routine matters of statutory interpretation. Rather, he relies on Respondents' "longstanding practice of considering people like Petitioner as detained under § 1226(a)" to support his arguments. He filed an appeal of the bond denial decision to the BIA on July 16, 2025, before he filed his habeas petition. Robinson Declaration, ¶¶ 15,16, Exs. J and K. Yet, through this petition and emergency motion for temporary restraining order, he seeks to bypass the administrative

review process. Before addressing how an agency's "longstanding practice" affects the statutory analysis, the Court would likely benefit from the BIA's expertise. *See Puga v. Chertoff*, 488 F.3d 812, 815 (9th Cir. 2007); *see also Reiter v. Cooper*, 507 U.S. 258, 269 (1993) ("Where relief is available from an administrative agency, the plaintiff is ordinarily required to pursue that avenue of redress before proceeding to the courts; and until that recourse is exhausted, suit is premature and must be dismissed."); *Mathena v. United States*, 577 F.3d 943, 946 (8th Cir. 2009); *Arroyo v. Fikes*, No. 21-CV-2489 (KMM/BRT), 2022 WL 2820405, at *2 (D. Minn. May 5, 2022). While "[t]here is no statutory requirement that a habeas petitioner exhaust his administrative remedies before challenging his immigration detention [in federal court]," *Araujo- Cortes v. Shanahan*, 35 F. Supp. 3d 533, 538 (S.D.N.Y. 2014), exhaustion should be required as a prudential matter, *accord Paz Nativi v. Shanahan*, No. 16 Civ. 8496 (JPO), 2017 WL 281751, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 23, 2017) ("[B]efore immigration detention may be challenged in federal court. . . exhaustion is generally required as a prudential matter." (collecting cases)).

Further, Petitioner's assertion in his Petition that an administrative appeal is "futile" because it "will take several months to complete" rings hollow for several reasons. First, the BIA is well-positioned to assess how agency expertise affects the interplay between 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225, 1226. *See Delgado v. Sessions*, No. C17-1031-RSL-JPD, 2017 WL 4776340, at *2 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 15, 2017) (finding denial of bond to an immigration detainee was "a question well suited for agency expertise"); *Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 66, 68 (BIA 2025) (addressing the interplay of §§ 1225(b)(1) and 1226); *Matter of M-S-*, 27 I&N Dec. 509, 515-18 (2019). Second, waiving exhaustion will "encourage other

detainees to bypass the BIA and directly appeal their no-bond determinations from the IJ to federal district court." *Aden v. Nielsen*, No. C18-1441RSL, 2019 WL 5802013, at *2 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 7, 2019). Put another way, judicial intervention may stop the flow from immigration courts to the BIA and redirect it—prematurely, as here—to the federal courts. *See id.* The Court should deny the habeas petition for lack of exhaustion.

2. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g).

Section 1252(g) specifically deprives courts of jurisdiction, including habeas corpus jurisdiction, to review "any cause or claim by or on behalf of an alien arising from the decision or action by the Attorney General to [1] *commence proceedings*, [2] adjudicate cases, or [3] execute removal orders against any alien under this chapter." 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) (emphasis added). Section 1252(g) eliminates jurisdiction "[e]xcept as provided in this section and notwithstanding any other provision of law (statutory or nonstatutory), including section 2241 of title 28, United States Code, or any other habeas corpus provision, and sections 1361 and 1651 of such title."[4] Except as provided in § 1252, courts "cannot entertain challenges to the enumerated executive branch decisions or actions." *E.F.L. v. Prim*, 986 F.3d 959, 964–65 (7th Cir. 2021).

Section 1252(g) also bars district courts from hearing challenges to the *method* by which the Secretary of Homeland Security chooses to commence removal proceedings,

[4] Congress initially passed § 1252(g) in the IIRIRA, Pub. L. 104-208, 110 Stat. 3009. In 2005, Congress amended § 1252(g) by adding "(statutory or nonstatutory), including section 2241 of title 28, United States Code, or any other habeas corpus provision, and sections 1361 and 1651 of such title" after "notwithstanding any other provision of law." REAL ID Act of 2005, Pub. L. 109-13, § 106(a), 119 Stat. 231, 311.

including the decision to detain an alien pending removal. *See Alvarez v. ICE*, 818 F.3d 1194, 1203 (11th Cir. 2016) ("By its plain terms, [§ 1252(g)] bars us from questioning ICE's discretionary decisions to commence removal" and also to review "ICE's decision to take [plaintiff] into custody and to detain him during removal proceedings").

Petitioner's claim stems from his detention during removal proceedings. That detention arises from the decision to commence such proceedings against him. *See, e.g.*, *Valencia-Mejia v. United States*, No. CV 08–2943 CAS (PJWx), 2008 WL 4286979, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2008) ("The decision to detain plaintiff until his hearing before the Immigration Judge arose from this decision to commence proceedings[.]"); *Wang v. United States*, No. CV 10-0389 SVW (RCx), 2010 WL 11463156, at *6 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 18, 2010); *Tazu v. Att'y Gen. U.S.*, 975 F.3d 292, 298–99 (3d Cir. 2020) (holding that 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) and (b)(9) deprive district court of jurisdiction to review action to execute removal order).

As other courts have held, "[f]or the purposes of § 1252, the Attorney General commences proceedings against an alien when 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). "The Attorney General may arrest the alien against whom proceedings are commenced and detain that individual until the conclusion of those proceedings." *Id.* at *3. "Thus, an alien's detention throughout this process arises from the Attorney General's decision to commence proceedings" and review of claims arising from such detention is barred under § 1252(g). *Id.* (citing *Sissoko v. Rocha*, 509 F.3d 947, 949 (9th Cir. 2007)); *Wang*, 2010 WL 11463156, at *6; 8 U.S.C. §

1252(g). As such, judicial review of the claim that she is entitled to bond is barred by § 1252(g). The Court should dismiss for lack of jurisdiction.

3. § 1252(a)(5) and § 1252(b)(9).

Under § 1252(b)(9), "judicial review of all questions of law . . . including interpretation and application of statutory provisions . . . arising from any action taken . . . to remove an alien from the United States" is only proper before the appropriate federal court of appeals in the form of a petition for review of a final removal order. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9); *Reno v. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 483 (1999). Section 1252(b)(9) is an "unmistakable 'zipper' clause" that "channels judicial review of all [claims arising from deportation proceedings]" to a court of appeals in the first instance. *Id.*; *see Lopez v. Barr*, No. CV 20-1330 (JRT/BRT), 2021 WL 195523, at *2 (D. Minn. Jan. 20, 2021) (citing *Nasrallah v. Barr*, 590 U.S. 573, 579–80 (2020)).

Moreover, § 1252(a)(5) provides that a petition for review is the exclusive means for judicial review of immigration proceedings:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of law (statutory or nonstatutory), . . . a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals in accordance with this section shall be the sole and exclusive means for judicial review of an order of removal entered or issued under any provision of this chapter, except as provided in subsection (e) [concerning aliens not admitted to the United States].

8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(5). "Taken together, § 1252(a)(5) and § 1252(b)(9) mean that *any* issue—whether legal or factual—arising from *any* removal-related activity can be reviewed *only* through the [petition-for-review] process." *J.E.F.M. v. Lynch*, 837 F.3d 1026, 1031 (9th Cir. 2016) (emphasis in original); *see id.* at 1035 ("§§ 1252(a)(5) and

[(b)(9)] channel review of all claims, including policies-and-practices challenges . . . whenever they 'arise from' removal proceedings"); *accord Ruiz v. Mukasey*, 552 F.3d 269, 274 n.3 (2d Cir. 2009) (only when the action is "unrelated to any removal action or proceeding" is it within the district court's jurisdiction); *cf. Xiao Ji Chen v. U.S. Dep't of Justice*, 434 F.3d 144, 151 n.3 (2d Cir. 2006) (a "primary effect" of the REAL ID Act is to "limit all aliens to one bite of the apple" (internal quotation marks omitted)).

Critically, "[§] 1252(b)(9) is a judicial channeling provision, not a claim-barring one." *Aguilar v. ICE*, 510 F.3d 1, 11 (1st Cir. 2007). Indeed, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(D) provides that "[n]othing . . . in any other provision of this chapter . . . shall be construed as precluding review of constitutional claims or questions of law raised upon a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals in accordance with this section." *See also Ajlani v. Chertoff*, 545 F.3d 229, 235 (2d Cir. 2008) ("[J]urisdiction to review such claims is vested exclusively in the courts of appeals[.]"). The petition-for-review process before the court of appeals ensures that aliens have a proper forum for claims arising from their immigration proceedings and "receive their day in court." *J.E.F.M.*, 837 F.3d at 1031–32 (internal quotations omitted); *see also Rosario v. Holder*, 627 F.3d 58, 61 (2d Cir. 2010) ("The REAL ID Act of 2005 amended the [INA] to obviate . . . Suspension Clause concerns" by permitting judicial review of "nondiscretionary" BIA determinations and "all constitutional claims or questions of law.").

In evaluating the reach of subsections (a)(5) and (b)(9), the Second Circuit explained that jurisdiction turns on the substance of the relief sought. *Delgado v. Quarantillo*, 643 F.3d 52, 55 (2d Cir. 2011). Those provisions divest district courts of jurisdiction to review

both direct and indirect challenges to removal orders, including decisions to detain for purposes of removal or for proceedings. *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 294–95 (section 1252(b)(9) includes challenges to the "decision to detain [an alien] in the first place or to seek removal[.]"). Here, Petitioner challenges the government's decision and action to detain him, which arises from DHS's decision to commence removal proceedings against him as an arriving alien and is thus an "action taken . . . to remove [them] from the United States." *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9); *see also, e.g.*, *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 294–95; *Velasco Lopez v. Decker*, 978 F.3d 842, 850 (2d Cir. 2020) (finding that 8 U.S.C. § 1226(e) did not bar review in that case because the petitioner did not challenge "his initial detention"); *Saadulloev v. Garland*, No. 3:23-CV-00106, 2024 WL 1076106, at *3 (W.D. Pa. Mar. 12, 2024) (recognizing that there is no judicial review of the threshold detention decision, which flows from the government's decision to "commence proceedings"). As such, the Court lacks jurisdiction over this action.

The reasoning in *Jennings* outlines why Petitioner's claims are unreviewable here. While holding that it was unnecessary to comprehensively address the scope of § 1252(b)(9), the Supreme Court in *Jennings* also provided guidance on the types of challenges that may fall within the scope of § 1252(b)(9). *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 293–94. The Court found that "§1252(b)(9) [did] not present a jurisdictional bar" in situations where "respondents . . . [were] not challenging the decision to detain them in the first place." *Id.* at 294–95. In this case, Petitioner *does* challenge the government's decision to detain him in the first place. (ECF No. 5 at 23-28.) Though Petitioner may attempt to frame his challenge as one relating to detention authority, rather than a challenge to DHS's

decision to detain him pending his removal proceedings in the first instance, such creative framing does not evade the preclusive effect of § 1252(b)(9).

Indeed, the fact that Petitioner is challenging the basis upon which he is detained is enough to trigger § 1252(b)(9) because "detention *is* an 'action taken . . . to remove' an alien." *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. 318, 319 (Thomas, J., concurring); 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9). The Court should dismiss Petition for lack of jurisdiction under § 1252(b)(9). Petitioner must present his claims before the appropriate federal court of appeals because they challenge the government's decision or action to detain him, which must be raised before a court of appeals, not this Court. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9).

D. The habeas petition should be denied on the merits.

As argued above, the court should dismiss the habeas petition on the merits, because under the plain text of Section 1225, Otero Escalante must be detained pending the outcome of his removal proceedings. The Immigration Court properly denied the bond hearing under the plain reading of Section 1225 and prevailing precedent.

1. <u>The plain reading of Section 1225 and basic statutory construction</u>.

The Court should reject Petitioner's argument that § 1226(a) governs his detention instead of § 1225. When there is "an irreconcilable conflict in two legal provisions," then "the specific governs over the general." *Karczewski v. DCH Mission Valley LLC*, 862 F.3d 1006, 1015 (9th Cir. 2017); *Hickman v. Cliff Peck Chevrolet, Inc.*, 566 F.2d 44, 48 (8th Cir. 1977); *In re Bender*, 338 B.R. 62, 69 (Bankr. W.D. Mo. 2006). Section 1226(a) "applies to aliens "arrested and detained pending a decision" on removal. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). In contrast, § 1225 is narrower. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225. It applies only to "applicants

for admission"; that is, as relevant here, aliens present in the United States who have not be admitted. *See id.; see also Florida v. United States,* 660 F. Supp. 3d 1239, 1275 (N.D. Fla. 2023). Because Petitioner falls within that category, the specific detention authority under § 1225 governs over the general authority found at § 1226(a).

Applying this reasoning, the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts recently confirmed in a habeas action that an unlawfully present alien, who had been unlawfully present in the country for approximately 20 years, was nonetheless an "applicant for admission" upon the straightforward application of the statute. *See Webert Alvarenga Pena, Petitioner, v. Patricia Hyde, et al., Respondents.*, No. CV 25-11983-NMG, 2025 WL 2108913 (D. Mass. July 28, 2025). The court explained this resulted in the "continued detention" of an alien during removal proceedings as commanded by statute. *Id.*

Petitioner's argument that 1226(a) applies rests on a factual error. Petitioner states in his petition that ICE must put him in proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a, and he argues that his detention is unlawful because the "discretionary detention framework at 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2)(A)" applies regardless because 8 U.S.C. § 1229 governs. That is incorrect.

Otero Escalante is in 1229a proceedings. DHS charged him initially as removable under 212(a)(6)(A)(i) of the INA, as someone who is present in the United States without inspection and without being admitted or paroled. Robinson Declaration, ¶ 7, Ex. A.) The NTA clearly states at the top that he is in removal proceedings "under Section 240 of the Immigration and Nationality Act." Petitioner is not in proceedings under 1225. He is, however, detained during his 1229a removal proceedings under section 1225(b)(2), which

is mandatory.

Under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a), an "applicant for admission" is defined as an "alien present in the United States who has not been admitted or who arrives in the United States." Applicants for admission "fall into one of two categories, those covered by § 1225(b)(1) and those covered by § 1225(b)(2)." *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287. Section 1225(b)(2)—the provision relevant here—is the "broader" of the two. *Id.* It "serves as a catchall provision that applies to all applicants for admission not covered by § 1225(b)(1) (with specific exceptions not relevant here)." *Id.* And § 1225(b)(2) mandates detention. *Id.* at 297; *see also* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2); *Matter of Q. Li,* 29 I & N. Dec. at 69 ("[A]n applicant for admission who is arrested and detained without a warrant while arriving in the United States, whether or not at a port of entry, and subsequently placed in removal proceedings is detained under section 235(b) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), and is ineligible for any subsequent release on bond under section 236(a) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)."). Section 1225(b) applies because Petitioner is present in the United States without being admitted. Indeed, Otero Escalante does not dispute that he was not inspected and that he was not admitted.

Petitioner's argument that he should be treated differently because he has been in the interior of the United States is unpersuasive. The BIA has long recognized that "many people who are not *actually* requesting permission to enter the United States in the ordinary sense are nevertheless deemed to be 'seeking admission' under the immigration laws." *Matter of Lemus-Losa*, 25 I. & N. Dec. 734, 743 (BIA 2012). Statutory language "is known by the company it keeps." *Marquez-Reyes v. Garland*, 36 F.4th 1195, 1202 (9th Cir. 2022)

(quoting *McDonnell v. United States*, 579 U.S. 550, 569 (2016)). The phrase "seeking admission" in § 1225(b)(2)(A) must be read in the context of the definition of "applicant for admission" in § 1225(a)(1). Applicants for admission are both those individuals present without admission and those who arrive in the United States. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1). Both are understood to be "seeking admission" under §1225(a)(1). *See Lemus-Losa*, 25 I. & N. Dec. at 743. Congress made that clear in § 1225(a)(3), which requires all aliens "who are applicants for admission or otherwise seeking admission" to be inspected by immigration officers. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3). The word "or" here "introduce[s] an appositive–a word or phrase that is synonymous with what precedes it ('Vienna or Wien,' 'Batman or the Caped Crusader')." *United States v. Woods*, 571 U.S. 31, 45 (2013).

Petitioner's interpretation also reads "applicant for admission" out of § 1225(b)(2)(A). One of the most basic interpretative canons instructs that a "statute should be construed so that effect is given to all its provisions." *See Corley v. United States*, 556 U.S. 303, 314 (2009) (cleaned up). Petitioner's interpretation fails that test. It renders the phase "applicant for admission" in § 1225(b)(2)(A) "inoperative or superfluous, void or insignificant." *See id.* If Congress did not want § 1225(b)(2)(A) to apply to "applicants for admission," then it would not have included that phrase in the subsection. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A); *see also Corley*, 556 U.S. at 314.

The court's decision in *Florida v. United States,* 660 F.Supp.3d 1239 (N.D. Fla. 2023) is instructive here. The district court held that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) mandates detention of applicants for admission throughout removal proceedings, rejecting the assertion that DHS has discretion to choose to detain an applicant for admission under either section

1225(b) or 1226(a). 660 F. Supp. 3d at 1275. The court held that such discretion "would render mandatory detention under § 1225(b) meaningless. Indeed, the 1996 expansion of § 1225(b) to include illegal border crossers would make little sense if DHS retained discretion to apply § 1225(a) and release illegal border crossers whenever the agency saw fit." *Id.* The court pointed to *Demore v. Kim,* 538 U.S. 510, 518 (2003), in which the Supreme Court explained that "wholesale failure" by the federal government motivated the 1996 amendments to the INA. *Florida*, 660 F. Supp. 3d at 1275. The court also relied on, *Matter of M-S-,* 27 I&N Dec. 509, 516 (A.G. 2019), in which the Attorney General explained "section [1225] (under which detention is mandatory) and section [1226(a)] (under which detention is permissive) can be reconciled only if they apply to different classes of aliens." *Florida*, 660 F. Supp. 3d at 1275.

2. Congress did not intend to treat individuals who enter unlawfully better than those who appear at a port of entry.

When the plain text of a statute is clear, that meaning is controlling and courts "need not examine legislative history." *Doe v. Dep't of Veterans Affs. of U.S.*, 519 F.3d 456, 461 (8th Cir. 2008). But to the extent legislative history is relevant here, nothing "refutes the plain language" of § 1225. *Suzlon Energy Ltd. v. Microsoft Corp.*, 671 F.3d 726, 730 (9th Cir. 2011). Congress passed IIRIRA to correct "an anomaly whereby immigrants who were attempting to lawfully enter the United States were in a worse position than persons who had crossed the border unlawfully." *Torres v. Barr*, 976 F.3d 918, 928 (9th Cir. 2020) (en banc), *declined to extend by, United States v. Gambino-Ruiz*, 91 F.4th 981 (9th Cir. 2024). It "intended to replace certain aspects of the [then] current 'entry doctrine,' under which

illegal aliens who have entered the United States without inspection gain equities and privileges in immigration proceedings that are not available to aliens who present themselves for inspection at a port of entry." *Id.* (quoting H.R. Rep. 104-469, pt. 1, at 225). The Court should reject the Petitioner's interpretation because it would put aliens who "crossed the border unlawfully" in a better position than those "who present themselves for inspection at a port of entry." *Id.* Aliens who presented at port of entry would be subject to mandatory detention under § 1225, but those who crossed illegally would be eligible for a bond under § 1226(a).

Nothing in the Laken Riley Act ("LRA") changes the analysis.[5] Redundancies in statutory drafting are "common . . . sometimes in a congressional effort to be doubly sure." *Barton v. Barr*, 590 U.S. 222, 239 (2020). The LRA arose after an inadmissible alien "was paroled into this country through a shocking abuse of that power." 171 Cong. Rec. H278 (daily ed. Jan. 22, 2025) (statement of Rep. McClintock). Congress passed it out of concern that the executive branch "ignore[d] its fundamental duty under the Constitution to defend its citizens." *Id.* at H269 (statement of Rep. Roy). One member even expressed frustration that "every illegal alien is currently required to be detained by current law throughout the pendency of their asylum claims." *Id.* at H278 (statement of Rep. McClintock). The LRA reflects a "congressional effort to be doubly sure" that such unlawful aliens are detained. *Barton*, 590 U.S. at 239.

[5] The cases Petitioner cites make this argument. *See Rodriguez v. Bostock*, No. 3:25-CV-05240-TMC, 2025 WL 1193850, at *13–14 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 24, 2025).

3. Prior agency practices are not entitled to deference under *Loper Bright*.

Prior agency practice carries little, if any, weight under *Loper Bright*. The weight given to agency interpretations "must always 'depend upon their thoroughness, the validity of their reasoning, the consistency with earlier and later pronouncements, and all those factors which give them power to persuade.'" *Loper Bright Enters. v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369, 432–33 (2024) (quoting *Skidmore v. Swift & Co.*, 323 U.S. 134, 140 (1944) (cleaned up)). And here, the agency provided no analysis to support its reasoning. *See* 62 Fed. Reg. at 10323; *see also Maldonado v. Bostock*, No. 2:23-cv-00760-LK-BAT, 2023 WL 5804021, at *3, 4 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 8, 2023) (noting the agency provided "no authority" to support its reading of the statute).

To be sure, "when the best reading of the statute is that it delegates discretionary authority to an agency," the Court must "independently interpret the statute and effectuate the will of Congress." *Loper Bright*, 603 U.S. at 395 (cleaned up). But "read most naturally, §§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2) mandate detention for applicants for admission until certain proceedings have concluded." *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 297 (cleaned up). The court should dismiss the habeas petition.

4. Petitioner's detention is for the purpose of conducting his removal proceedings.

Petitioner claims that his current temporary detention pending removal is unlawful and violates prior precedent. Congress, the Eighth Circuit, and the Supreme Court disagree.

As mentioned above, Congress broadly crafted "applicants for admission" to include undocumented aliens present within the United States like Petitioner. *See* 8 U.S.C.

§ 1225(a)(1). And, Congress directed aliens like the Petitioner to be detained during removal proceedings. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A); *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 297 ("Read most naturally, §§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2) thus mandate detention of applicants for admission until certain proceedings have concluded."). In so doing, Congress made a legislative judgment to detain undocumented aliens during removal proceedings, as they—by definition—have crossed borders and traveled in violation of United States law. As explained above, that is the prerogative of the legislative branch serving the interest of the government and the United States.

The Supreme Court has recognized this profound interest. See *Shaughnessy v. United States*, 345 U.S. 206, 210 (1953) ("Courts have long recognized the power to expel or exclude aliens as a fundamental sovereign attribute exercised by the Government's political departments largely immune from judicial control."). With this power to remove aliens, the Supreme Court has recognized the United States's longtime Constitutional ability to detain those in removal proceedings. *Carlson v. Landon*, 342 U.S. 524, 538 (1952) ("Detention is necessarily a part of this deportation procedure."); *Wong Wing v. United States*, 163 U.S. 228, 235 (1896) ("Proceedings to exclude or expel would be vain if those accused could not be held in custody pending the inquiry into their true character, and while arrangements were being made for their deportation."); *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 531 (2003) ("Detention during removal proceedings is a constitutionally permissible part of that process."); *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 286 (2018) ("Congress has authorized immigration officials to detain some classes of aliens during the course of certain immigration proceedings. Detention during those proceedings gives immigration

officials time to determine an alien's status without running the risk of the alien's either absconding or engaging in criminal activity before a final decision can be made.").

In light of Congress's interest in dealing with illegal immigration by keeping specified aliens in detention pending the removal period, the Supreme Court dispensed of any Due Process concerns without engaging in the *Mathews v. Eldridge* test. *See generally Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690-91.

5. Any claim related to Petitioner's arrest should be dismissed.

Petitioner has not asserted his initial apprehension and booking were invalid; however, in the event he were to make such a claim, the Court should reject it as not cognizable in habeas. "The 'body' or identity of a defendant or respondent in a criminal or civil proceeding is never itself suppressible as a fruit of an unlawful arrest, even if it is conceded that an unlawful arrest . . . occurred." *I.N.S. v. Lopez-Mendoza*, 468 U.S. 1032, 1039 (1984). One court recently addressing this in a similar context explained, "Thus, even if Petitioner's initial arrest was unlawful, her detention pending removal may stand." *Rodrigues De Oliveira v. Joyce*, No. 2:25-CV-00291-LEW, 2025 WL 1826118, at *5 (D. Me. July 2, 2025). Should Petitioner raise this issue, the Court should reject it.

E. The due process claim lacks merit.

Petitioner claims that his current detention is "without cause" and "in violation of his constitutional rights to due process of law." Doc. 1 ¶ 15. This argument fails. The cause of his detention is that the Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), as set forth above.

To the extent Petitioner intends to argue that he expects to remain released on his own recognizance during the pendency of his removal proceedings, this argument is unavailing. An "expectation of receiving process is not, without more, a liberty interest protected by the Due Process Clause." *Olim v. Wakinekona*, 461 U.S. 238, 250 n. 12 (1983). And the Supreme Court has held that applicants for admission such as Petitioner are only entitled to the protections set forth by statute and that "the Due Process Clause provides nothing more." *Department of Homeland Sec. v. Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 140 (2020).

The Supreme Court has long recognized that Congress exercises "plenary power to make rules for the admission of foreign nationals and to exclude those who possess those characteristics which Congress has forbidden." *Kleindienst v. Mandel*, 408 U.S. 753, 766 (1972). Pursuant to that longstanding doctrine, "an alien seeking initial admission to the United States requests a privilege and has no constitutional rights regarding his application, for the power to admit or exclude aliens is a sovereign prerogative." *Landon v. Plasencia*, 459 U.S. 21, 32 (1982). The broad scope of the political branches' authority over immigration is "at its zenith at the international border." *United States v. Flores-Montano*, 541 U.S. 149, 152–53 (2004). Accordingly, "certain constitutional protections available to persons inside the United States are unavailable to aliens outside of our geographical borders." *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001).

The Supreme Court has explained that applicants for admission lack any constitutional due process rights with respect to admission aside from the rights provided by statute: "[w]hatever the procedure authorized by Congress is, it is due process as far as

an alien denied entry is concerned," *Mezei*, 345 U.S. at 212, and "it is not within the province of any court, unless expressly authorized by law, to review [that] determination". *United States ex rel. Knauff v. Shaughnessy*, 338 U.S. 537, 543 (1950). The Supreme Court reaffirmed "[its] century-old rule regarding the due process rights of an alien seeking initial entry" in *Thuraissigiam*, explaining that an individual who illegally crosses the border—like Petitioner—is an applicant for admission and "has only those rights regarding admission that Congress has provided by statute." 591 U.S. at 139-40.

As explained by the Supreme Court, "[w]hen an alien arrives at a port of entry—for example, an international airport—the alien is on U.S. soil, but the alien is not considered to have entered the country …". *Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 139. Stated further, "aliens who arrive at ports of entry—even those paroled elsewhere in the country for years pending removal—are 'treated' for due process purposes 'as if stopped at the border.'" *Id.* (quoting *Mezei*, 345 U.S. at 215). The Court held that this same "threshold" rule applies to individuals, like Petitioner, who are apprehended after trying "to enter the country illegally" since by statute, such individuals are also defined as applicants for admission. *Id.* at 139-40. Treating such an individual in a more favorable manner than an individual arriving at a port of entry would "create a perverse incentive to enter at an unlawful rather than a lawful location" and therefore the Supreme Court rejected the argument that an individual who "succeeded in making it 25 yards into U.S. territory before he was caught" should be entitled to additional constitutional protections. *Id.* at 140.

Instead, applying the "century-old rule regarding the due process rights of an alien seeking initial entry[,]" the Court explained that aliens arrested after crossing the border

illegally, such as Petitioner, have "only those rights regarding admission that Congress has provided by statute." *Id.* at 140. The Court was clear: "the Due Process Clause provides nothing more" than the procedural protections set forth in 8 U.S.C. § 1225 that allow an individual to seek protection from removal if he fears return to his home country and also seek parole from the agency. *Id.* The Supreme Court's decision in *Thuraissigiam* is instructive. In relevant part, *Thuraissigiam* concerned a due process challenge raised by an alien apprehended 25 yards from the border, which he crossed illegally. 591 U.S. at 139. DHS detained and processed him for expedited removal because he lacked valid entry documents. *Id.* at 114. An asylum officer then determined that Mr. Thuraissigiam lacked a credible fear of persecution. *Id.* Mr. Thuraissigiam petitioned for a writ of habeas corpus, asserting a fear of persecution and requesting another opportunity to apply for asylum. *Id.*

In its decision, the Supreme Court delineated the boundaries of due process claims that can be made by applicants for admission. Specifically, the Court held that for such aliens stopped at the border, "the decisions of executive or administrative officers, acting within powers expressly conferred by Congress, are due process of law." *Id.* at 131 (citing *Nishimura Ekiu v. United States*, 142 U.S. 651, 660 (1892)); *see also Guerrier v. Garland*, 18 F.4th 304, 313 (9th Cir. 2021) ("In concluding that Thuraissigiam's due process rights were not violated, the Supreme Court emphasized that the due process rights of noncitizens who have not 'effected an entry' into the country are coextensive with the statutory rights Congress provides.").

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit also held that detention of an alien seeking admission to the United States does not violate due process in *Amanullah v. Nelson*, 811 F.2d 1, 9 (1st Cir. 1987). In that case, the Court explained that "the detention of the appellants is entirely incident to their attempted entry into the United States and their apparent failure to meet the criteria for admission—and so, entirely within the powers expressly conferred by Congress." *Id.* The appellants were detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) and the Court found no due process violation in the denial of their parole applications "pending the ultimate (seasonable) resolution of the exclusion/asylum proceedings" as there was "no suggestion of unwarranted governmental footdragging in these cases" and because "prompt attention appears to have been paid to the administrative aspects of exclusion and asylum." *Id.*

This Court should apply the "century-old rule" reaffirmed in *Thuraissigiam* and conclude that Petitioner's due process rights are coextensive with the rights provided him under statute. Here, the law provides that "in the case of an alien who is an applicant for admission, if the examining immigration officer determines that an alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, the alien shall be detained for a proceeding under section 240." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). For the reasons set forth above, the Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under this statute.

Moreover, mandatory detention is warranted under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a whether the Petitioner remains in ongoing removal proceedings or is later processed for expedited removal. *See Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. 66, 67 ("'in the case of an alien who is an applicant for admission, if the examining immigration officer determines that an alien

seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, the alien *shall be detained* for a proceeding under section 240."' (emphasis added) (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1235(b)(2)(A)). ICE's decision to place an alien arriving in the United States in either expedited removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1), or full removal proceedings 8 U.S.C. § 1229a, is discretionary. However, ICE's decision to detain or release aliens deemed applicants for admission is not. "For those placed in expedited removal proceedings who are referred to an Immigration Judge for consideration of their asylum application. . . 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii), requires detention until the final adjudication of the asylum application." *Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. at 68 (citing *Matter of M-S-*, 27 I&N Dec. 509, 516 (A.G. 2019)). "Likewise, for aliens arriving in and seeking admission into the United States who are placed directly in full removal proceedings, section . . . 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), mandates detention 'until removal proceedings have concluded.'" *Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. at 68 (quoting *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 299). Thus, even if the Court was not barred from reviewing Petitioner's claim under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(A), his claim that his current detention is "without cause" and "in violation of his constitutional rights to due process of law" is without merit and should be dismissed.

For all these reasons, Petitioner's due process claim should be denied.

F. The APA claim lacks merit.

Petitioner makes various arguments under the APA. But, a habeas petition is no place to raise APA claims. If Petitioner has any APA claims, he must raise them in a complaint filed in a civil action and properly serve and file that complaint. Moreover, there is no final agency action for the Court to review at this juncture. 5 U.S.C. § 704. Even if there

were a final agency action, there is no APA claim here to review. Detention is fundamentally within the discretion of the Executive Branch and discretionary decisions, like commencing removal proceedings and detaining a noncitizen pending those removal proceedings, are fundamentally not subject to judicial review under the APA. 5 U.S.C. § 701. See Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S.C. 821 (1985). For these and other reasons, the APA claims are not cognizable.

G. The Court should dissolve the TRO.

To the extent the motion for preliminary injunction has not been dispensed with full, it should be denied and the habeas petition dismissed. As a threshold matter, the Court dismiss the motion for preliminary injunction because of Petitioner's cannot prevail on the merits of his habeas petition. *See Devisme v. City of Duluth*, No. 21-CV-1195 (WMW/LIB), 2022 WL 507391, at *4 (D. Minn. Feb. 18, 2022) ("Because Devisme has not demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits, the Court need not address the remaining *Dataphase* factors."). Additionally, Petitioner has not and cannot show irreparable harm, and the public interest and balance of the equities favor the United States's position.

To obtain any injunctive relief, a plaintiff must show "that irreparable injury is likely in the absence of an injunction." *Singh v. Carter*, 185 F. Supp. 3d 11, 20 (D.D.C. 2016). To be considered "irreparable," a plaintiff must show that absent granting the preliminary relief, the injury will be "'both certain and great,' 'actual and not theoretical,' 'beyond remediation,' and 'of such imminence that there is a clear and present need for equitable relief to prevent irreparable harm.'" *Mexichem Specialty Resins, Inc. v. EPA*, 787 F.3d

544, 555 (D.C. Cir. 2015) (quoting *Chaplaincy of Full Gospel Churches v. England*, 454 F.3d 290, 297 (D.C. Cir. 2006)). The significance of the alleged harm is also relevant to a court's determination of whether to grant injunctive relief. *Weinberger v. Romero-Barcelo*, 456 U.S. 305, 313 (1982) ("[A] federal judge sitting as chancellor is not mechanically obligated to grant an injunction for every violation of law."); *E.B. v. Dep't of State*, 422 F. Supp. 3d 81, 88 (D.D.C. 2019) ("While 'there is some appeal to the proposition that any damage, however slight, which cannot be made whole at a later time, should justify injunctive relief,' the Court cannot ignore that 'some concept of magnitude of injury is implicit in the [preliminary injunction] standards.'") (quoting *Gulf Oil Corp. v. Dep't of Energy*, 514 F. Supp. 1019, 1026 (D.D.C. 1981)).

Petitioner cites the potential negative consequences of not being able to communicate with counsel as a basis for irreparable harm. Because ICE has, subject to a 72-hour reservation of rights, agreed not to move Petitioner out of the District of Minnesota until after September 5, 2025, or the resolution of the pending habeas matter, any claim for emergency relief are moot. As such, Petitioner cannot meet his burden to establish irreparable harm.

The two remaining *Dataphase* factors—the public interest and the balance of harms—also weigh against injunctive relief. "For practical purposes, these factors 'merge' when a plaintiff seeks injunctive relief against the government." *Let Them Play MN v. Walz*, 517 F. Supp. 3d 870, 888 (D. Minn. 2021).

Under the balance of harms factor, "[t]he goal is to assess the harm the movant would suffer absent an injunction, as well as the harm other interested parties and the public

would experience if the injunction issued." *Katch, LLC v. Sweetser*, 143 F. Supp. 3d 854, 875 (D. Minn. 2015) (citing *Pottgen v. Missouri State High Sch. Activities Ass'n*, 40 F.3d 926, 928 (8th Cir. 1994)). When balancing the harms, courts will also consider whether a proposed injunction would alter the status quo, finding that such proposals weigh against injunctive relief. *See, e.g., Katch, LLC*, 143 F. Supp. 3d at 875; *Amigo Gift Ass'n v. Exec. Props., Ltd.*, 588 F. Supp. 654, 660 (W.D. Mo. 1984) ("[B]ecause Amigo is not seeking the mere preservation of the status quo but rather is asking the Court to drastically alter the status quo pending a resolution of the merits, the Court finds that the balance of the equities tips decidedly in favor of Executive Properties.").

Importantly, the Court must take into consideration the public consequences of injunctive relief against the government. *See Winter v. NRDC, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 24 (2008) (cautioning that the Court "should pay particular regard for the public consequences" of injunctive relief). The government has a compelling interest in the steady enforcement of its immigration laws. *See Miranda v. Garland*, 34 F.4th 338, 365–66 (4th Cir. 2022) (vacating an injunction that required a "broad change" in immigration bond procedure); *Ubiquity Press Inc. v. Baran*, No 8:20-cv-01809-JLS-DFM, 2020 WL 8172983, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 20, 2020) ("the public interest in the United States' enforcement of its immigration laws is high"); *United States v. Arango*, CV 09-178 TUC DCB, 2015 WL 11120855, at 2 (D. Ariz. Jan. 7, 2015) ("the Government's interest in enforcing immigration laws is enormous.").

Judicial intervention would only disrupt the status quo. *See, e.g., Slaughter v. White*, No. C16-1067-RSM-JPD, 2017 WL 7360411, at * 2 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 2, 2017) ("[T]he

purpose of a preliminary injunction is to preserve the status quo pending a determination on the merits."). The Court should avoid a path that "inject[s] a degree of uncertainty" in the process. *USA Farm Labor, Inc. v. Su*, 694 F. Supp. 3d 693, 714 (W.D.N.C. 2023). The BIA exists to resolve disputes like the one regarding Petitioner's detention. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(d)(1). By regulation it must "provide clear and uniform guidance" "through precedent decisions" to "DHS [and] immigration judges." *Id.* Respondents respectfully ask that the Court allow the established process to continue without disruption.

The BIA also has an "institutional interest" to protect its "administrative agency authority." *See McCarthy v. Madigan*, 503 U.S. 140, 145, 146 (1992) *superseded by statute as recognized in Porter v. Nussle*, 534 U.S. 516 (2002). "Exhaustion is generally required as a matter of preventing premature interference with agency processes, so that the agency may function efficiently and so that it may have an opportunity to correct its own errors, to afford the parties and the courts the benefit of its experience and expertise, and to compile a record which is adequate for judicial review." *Global Rescue Jets, LLC v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.*, 30 F.4th 905, 913 (9th Cir. 2022) (quoting *Weinberger v. Salfi*, 422 U.S. 749, 765 (1975)). Indeed, "agencies, not the courts, ought to have primary responsibility for the programs that Congress has charged them to administer." *McCarthy*, 503 U.S. at 145. The Court should allow the BIA the opportunity to weigh in on these issues raised in DHS's appeal—which are the same issues raised in this action. *See id.* The Court should deny the motion.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Respondents respectfully request that the Court dissolve the existing injunction and dismiss or deny Petitioner's habeas petition.

Dated: August 15, 2025

JOSEPH H. THOMPSON
Acting United States Attorney

s/ Friedrich A. P. Siekert

BY: FRIEDRICH A. P. SIEKERT
Assistant U.S. Attorney
Attorney ID Number 142013
600 United States Courthouse
300 South Fourth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415
Telephone: 612-664-5600
Email: Fred.Siekert@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Respondents