ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney
ERIN M. DIMBLEBY
California Bar No. 323359
Assistant U.S. Attorneys
Office of the U.S. Attorney
880 Front Street, Room 6293
San Diego, CA 92101-8893
Telephone: (619) 546-6987
Facsimile: (619) 546-7751
Email: erin.dimbleby@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Respondents

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

| | |
|---|---|
| FRANYELIT STEFANY PONTE-GUANARE,<br><br>Petitioner,<br><br>v.<br><br>JOHN ARCHAMBEAULT; et al.,<br><br>Respondents. | Case No.: 25-cv-2081-TWR-KSC<br><br>**RESPONDENTS' RETURN TO HABEAS PETITION** |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

**PAGES**

**CASES**

**STATUTES**



**REGULATIONS**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner is detained in Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) custody and is subject to mandatory detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). She requests that this Court order that she be released or provided another bond hearing before an immigration judge (IJ). While Petitioner's claims are structured around allegations of unlawful detention authority, her claims attack a decision rendered by an IJ during an immigration bond hearing, however, such review is explicitly barred by statute. Through multiple provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1252, Congress has unambiguously stripped federal courts of jurisdiction over challenges to the commencement of removal proceedings, including the decision to detain during removal proceedings. Further, Petitioner has failed to exhaust her administrative remedies. And even apart from these preliminary issues, she fails on the merits of her claims because she seeks to circumvent the detention statute under which she is rightfully detained to secure a bond hearing to which she is not entitled. The Court should deny Petitioner's request for relief and dismiss the petition.

## II. STATUTORY BACKGROUND

### 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" aliens "initially determined to be inadmissible due to fraud, misrepresentation, or lack of valid documentation." *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287; 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i), (iii). 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. *Id.* § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii). An alien "with a credible fear of persecution" is "detained for further consideration of the application for asylum." *Id.* § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii). If the alien does not indicate an intent to apply for asylum, express a fear of persecution, or is "found not to have such a fear," they are detained until removed from the United States. *Id.* §§ 1225(b)(1)(A)(i), (B)(iii)(IV).

Section 1225(b)(2) 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 alien "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 Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216, 220 (BIA 2025) ("[A]liens who are present in the United States without admission are applicants for admission as defined under section 235(b)(2)(A) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), and must be detained for the duration of their removal proceedings."); *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). However, 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." *Id.* § 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 provides for arrest and detention "pending a decision on whether the alien is to be removed from the United States." 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). Under § 1226(a), the government may detain an alien during her removal proceedings, release her on bond, or release her on conditional parole. By regulation, immigration officers can release aliens upon demonstrating that the alien "would not pose a danger to property

or persons" and "is likely to appear for any future proceeding." 8 C.F.R. § 236.1(c)(8). But the Attorney General may, at any time, revoke such bond or parole, and rearrest and detain the alien. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(b); *see* 8 C.F.R § 236.1(c)(9) ("When an alien who, having been arrested and taken into custody, has been released, such release may be revoked at any time . . . in which event the alien may be taken into physical custody and detained."). These discretionary decisions under Section 1226 are not subject to judicial review. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(e) ("No court may set aside any action or decision by the Attorney General under this section regarding the detention or any alien or the revocation or denial of bond or parole."); *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, 295 (2018) (confirming that "§ 1226(e) precludes an alien from challenging a discretionary judgment by the Attorney General or a decision that the Attorney General has made regarding his detention or release" but "does not preclude challenges to the statutory framework that permits the alien's detention without bail.") (simplified).

An alien can also request a custody redetermination (i.e., a bond hearing) by an IJ at any time before a final order of removal is issued. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a); 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1(d)(1), 1236.1(d)(1), 1003.19. At a custody redetermination, the IJ may continue detention or release the alien on bond or conditional parole. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a); 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(d)(1). IJs have broad discretion in deciding whether to release an alien on bond. *In re Guerra*, 24 I. & N. Dec. 37, 39-40 (BIA 2006) (listing nine factors for IJs to consider). But regardless of the factors IJs consider, an alien "who presents a danger to persons or property should not be released during the pendency of removal proceedings." *Id.* at 38.

**C. Review Before the Board of Immigration Appeals**

The Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) is an appellate body within the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) and possesses delegated authority from the Attorney General. 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.1(a)(1), (d)(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 is also directed to, "through precedent decisions, [] 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). Decisions rendered by the BIA are final, except for those reviewed by the Attorney General. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(d)(7).

## III. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner is a citizen and national of Venezuela. ECF No. 1 at ¶ 12. On or about September 6, 2023, she entered the United States between ports of entry, at or near El Paso, Texas, without being admitted, paroled, or inspected. ECF No. 1 at ¶ 12; Exhibit 1.[1] On that date, she was apprehended by Border Patrol agents who determined she was inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i), as an alien present in the United States who has not been admitted or paroled. She was then issued a Notice to Appear (NTA) and placed in removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. ECF No. 1 at ¶ 22; Exhibits 1, 2, 3. On September 10, 2023, Petitioner was released from immigration custody on her own recognizance. ECF No. 1 at ¶ 22; Exhibits 4, 5.

On August 29, 2024, after Petitioner did not appear for her scheduled immigration court hearing, the IJ ordered her removed *in-absentia*. ECF No. 1 at ¶ 23; Exhibit 6. On March 20, 2025, Petitioner was apprehended by DHS officers and taken into custody to execute her removal order. ECF No. 1 at ¶ 24; Exhibits 7, 8. Petitioner subsequently moved to reopen her removal proceedings. ECF No. 1 at ¶ 24. On June 23, 2025, an IJ granted Petitioner's request and reopened her removal proceedings. ECF No. 1 at ¶ 24; Exhibit 9. Her removal proceedings remain ongoing. ECF No. 1 at ¶ 24.

[1] The attached exhibits are true copies, with redactions of private information, of documents obtained from ICE counsel.

Petitioner is currently detained at the Otay Mesa Detention Facility pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). On July 25, 2025, an IJ denied Petitioner's request for bond, finding that she is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), pursuant to *Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 66, 68 (BIA 2025). ECF No. 1 at ¶ 25; Exhibit 10. She has not appealed the bond denial order to the BIA.

## IV. ARGUMENT

### A. Petitioner's Claims and Requests are Barred by 8 U.S.C. § 1252

Petitioner bears the burden of establishing that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over her claims. *See Ass'n of Am. Med. Coll. v. United States*, 217 F.3d 770, 778-79 (9th Cir. 2000); *Finley v. United States*, 490 U.S. 545, 547-48 (1989). As a threshold matter, Petitioner's claims are jurisdictionally barred under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) and 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9).

Courts lack jurisdiction over any claim or cause of action arising from any decision to commence or adjudicate removal proceedings or execute removal orders. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) ("[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.") (emphasis added); *Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 483 (1999) ("There was good reason for Congress to focus special attention upon, and make special provision for, judicial review of the Attorney General's discrete acts of "commenc[ing] proceedings, adjudicat[ing] cases, [and] execut[ing] removal orders"—which represent the initiation or prosecution of various stages in the deportation process."). In other words, § 1252(g) removes district court jurisdiction over "three discrete actions that the Attorney may take: [his] 'decision or action' to 'commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders.'" *Reno*, 525 U.S. at 482 (emphasis removed). Petitioners' claims necessarily arise "from the decision or action by the Attorney General to commence proceedings [and] adjudicate cases," over which Congress has explicitly foreclosed district court jurisdiction. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g).

Section 1252(g) also bars district courts from hearing challenges to the method by which the government chooses to commence removal proceedings, 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 bars review of "ICE's decision to take [plaintiff] into custody and to detain him during his removal proceedings").

Petitioner's claims stem from her detention during removal proceedings. However, that detention arises from the decision to commence such proceedings against her. *See, e.g.*, *Valecia-Meja v. United States*, No. 08-2943 CAS (PJWz), 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).

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. 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). *But see Vasquez Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02180-DMS-MMP, 2025 WL 2549431, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025).

Moreover, under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9), "[j]udicial review of all questions of law and fact . . . *arising from any action taken or proceeding brought to remove an alien*

*from the United States* under this subchapter shall be available only in judicial review of a final order under this section." Further, judicial review of a final order is available only through "a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals." 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(5). The Supreme Court has made clear that § 1252(b)(9) is "the unmistakable 'zipper' clause," channeling "judicial review of all" "decisions and actions leading up to or consequent upon final orders of deportation," including "non-final order[s]," into proceedings before a court of appeals. *Reno*, 525 U.S. at 483, 485; *see J.E.F.M. v. Lynch*, 837 F.3d 1026, 1031 (9th Cir. 2016) (noting § 1252(b)(9) is "breathtaking in scope and vise-like in grip and therefore swallows up virtually all claims that are tied to removal proceedings"). "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] PFR process." *J.E.F.M.*, 837 F.3d at 1031 ("[W]hile these sections limit *how* immigrants can challenge their removal proceedings, they are not jurisdiction-stripping statutes that, by their terms, foreclose *all* judicial review of agency actions. Instead, the provisions channel judicial review over final orders of removal to the courts of appeal.") (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").

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 noncitizens 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."). These 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").

In evaluating the reach of subsections (a)(5) and (b)(9), the Second Circuit has 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 her, which arises from DHS's decision to commence removal proceedings, and is thus an "action taken . . . to remove [her] 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"). *But see Vasquez Garcia*, 2025 WL 2549431, at *3-4. 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* 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 her in the first place. Though Petitioner attempts to frame her challenge as one relating to detention authority, such creative framing does not evade the preclusive effect of § 1252(b)(9). Indeed, that Petitioner is challenging the basis upon which she 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). As such, Petitioner's claims would be more appropriately presented before the appropriate federal court of appeals because they challenge the government's decision or action to detain her which must be raised before a court of appeals, not this Court. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9).

The Court should dismiss this matter for lack of jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252.

**B. Petitioner Has Failed to Exhaust Administrative Remedies**

"Exhaustion can be either statutorily or judicially required." *Acevedo–Carranza v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 539, 541 (9th Cir. 2004). "If exhaustion is statutory, it may be a mandatory requirement that is jurisdictional." *Id.* (citing *El Rescate Legal Servs., Inc. v. Exec. Off. of Immigr. Rev.*, 959 F.2d 742, 747 (9th Cir. 1991)). "If, however, exhaustion is a prudential requirement, a court has discretion to waive the requirement." *Id.* (citing *Stratman v. Watt*, 656 F.2d 1321, 1325–26 (9th Cir. 1981)). Here, Petitioner is attempting to bypass the administrative scheme by not appealing her underlying bond denial to the BIA.

"District Courts are authorized by 28 U.S.C § 2241 to consider petitions for habeas corpus." *Castro–Cortez v. INS*, 239 F.3d 1037, 1047 (9th Cir. 2001). "That section does not specifically require petitioners to exhaust direct appeals before filing petitions for habeas corpus." *Id.* That said, the Ninth Circuit "require[s], as a prudential

matter, that habeas petitioners exhaust available judicial and administrative remedies before seeking relief under § 2241." *Id.* Specifically, "courts may require prudential exhaustion if (1) agency expertise makes agency consideration necessary to generate a proper record and reach a proper decision; (2) relaxation of the requirement would encourage the deliberate bypass of the administrative scheme; and (3) administrative review is likely to allow the agency to correct its own mistakes and to preclude the need for judicial review." *Puga v. Chertoff*, 488 F.3d 812, 815 (9th Cir. 2007) (internal quotation marks omitted).

"When a petitioner does not exhaust administrative remedies, a district court ordinarily should either dismiss the petition without prejudice or stay the proceedings until the petitioner has exhausted remedies, unless exhaustion is excused." *Leonardo v. Crawford*, 646 F.3d 1157, 1160 (9th Cir. 2011); *see also Alvarado v. Holder*, 759 F.3d 1121, 1127 n.5 (9th Cir. 2014) (issue exhaustion is a jurisdictional requirement); *Tijani v. Holder*, 628 F.3d 1071, 1080 (9th Cir. 2010) (no jurisdiction to review legal claims not presented in the petitioner's administrative proceedings before the BIA). Moreover, a "petitioner cannot obtain review of procedural errors in the administrative process that were not raised before the agency merely by alleging that every such error violates due process." *Vargas v. INS*, 831 F.3d 906, 908 (9th Cir. 1987); *see also Sola v. Holder*, 720 F.3d 1134, 1135-36 (9th Cir. 2013) (declining to address a due process argument that was not raised below because it could have been addressed by the agency).

Here, exhaustion is warranted because agency expertise is required. "[T]he BIA is the subject-matter expert in immigration bond decisions." *Aden v. Nielsen*, No. C18-1441RSL, 2019 WL 5802013, at *2 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 7, 2019). The BIA is well-positioned to assess how agency practice affects the interplay between 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225 and 1226. *See Delgado v. Sessions*, No. C17-1031-RSL-JPD, 2017 WL 4776340, at *2 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 15, 2017) (noting a denial of bond to an immigration detainee was "a question well suited for agency expertise"); *Matter of M-S-*, 27 I&N Dec. 509, 515-18 (2019) (addressing interplay of §§ 1225(b)(1) and 1226). *But see Vasguez-Rodriguez*

*v. Garland*, 7 F.4th 888, 896-97 (9th Cir. 2021); *Vasquez Garcia*, 2025 WL 2549431, at *4-5.

Waiving exhaustion would also "encourage other detainees to bypass the BIA and directly appeal their no-bond determinations from the IJ to federal district court." *Aden*, 2019 WL 5802013, at *2. Individuals, like Petitioner, would have little incentive to seek relief before the BIA if this Court permits review here. And allowing a skip-the-BIA-and-go-straight-to-federal-court strategy would needlessly increase the burden on district courts. *See Bd. of Tr. of Constr. Laborers' Pension Trust for S. Calif. v. M.M. Sundt Constr. Co.*, 37 F.3d 1419, 1420 (9th Cir. 1994) ("Judicial economy is an important purpose of exhaustion requirements."); *see also Santos-Zacaria v. Garland*, 598 U.S. 411, 418 (2023) (noting "exhaustion promotes efficiency"). If the IJ erred as Petitioner alleges, this Court should allow the administrative process to correct itself. *See id.*

Moreover, detention alone is not an irreparable injury. Discretion to waive exhaustion "is not unfettered." *Laing v. Ashcroft*, 370 F.3d 994, 998 (9th Cir. 2004). Petitioners bear the burden to show that an exception to the exhaustion requirement applies. *Leonardo*, 646 F.3d at 1161; *Aden*, 2019 WL 5802013, at *3. "[C]ivil detention after the denial of a bond hearing [does not] constitute[] irreparable harm such that prudential exhaustion should be waived." *Reyes v. Wolf*, No. C20-0377JLR, 2021 WL 662659, at *3 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 19, 2021), *aff'd sub nom. Diaz Reyes v. Mayorkas*, No. 21-35142, 2021 WL 3082403 (9th Cir. July 21, 2021).

Because Petitioner has not exhausted her administrative remedies, this matter should be dismissed or stayed.

**C. Petitioner is Subject to Mandatory Detention**

The Court should reject Petitioners' argument that § 1226(a) governs her detention instead of § 1225. *See* ECF No. 1 at 21. 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). Section

1226(a) applies to those "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).

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 Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 218-19 (for "those aliens who are seeking admission and who an immigration officer has determined are 'not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted' . . . the INA explicitly requires that this third 'catchall' category of applicants for admission be mandatorily detained for the duration of their immigration proceedings"); *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) therefore applies because Petitioner is present in the United States without being admitted. *See Matter of Lemus-Losa*, 25 I&N Dec. 734, 743 (BIA 2012) ("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 Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 221 (noting "no

legal authority for the proposition that after some undefined period of time residing in the interior of the United States without lawful status, the INA provides that an applicant for admission is no longer 'seeking admission,' and has somehow converted to a status that renders him or her eligible for a bond hearing under section 236(a) of the INA"). On September 5, 2025, after the IJ denied Petitioner bond, the BIA decided *Matter of Yahure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). This decision, which is binding on IJs, clearly directs: "Based on the plain language of section 235(b)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) (2018), Immigration Judges lack authority to hear bond requests or to grant bond to aliens who are present in the United States without admission."

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 Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 221; *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). If Congress did not want § 1225(b)(2)(A) to apply to "applicants for admission," then it would not have included the phrase "applicants for admission" in the subsection. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A); *see also Corley v. United States*, 556 U.S. 303, 314 (2009).

The district court's decision in *Florida v. United States* is instructive here. There, the 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 § 1226(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.

When the plain text of a statute is clear, "that meaning is controlling" and courts "need not examine legislative history." *Washington v. Chimei Innolux Corp.*, 659 F.3d 842, 848 (9th Cir. 2011). Indeed, "in interpreting a statute a court should always turn first to one, cardinal canon before all others." *Conn. Nat'l Bank v. Germain*, 503 U.S. 249, 253-54 (1992). The Supreme Court has "stated time and again that courts must presume that a legislature says in a statute what it means and means in a statute what it says there." *Id.* (citations omitted). Thus, "[w]hen the words of a statute are unambiguous, then, this first canon is also the last: 'judicial inquiry is complete.'" *Id.* (citing *Rubin v. United States*, 449 U.S. 424, 430 (1981)).

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); *see Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 223-34 (citing H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 225 (1996)). 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." *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 234 (quoting H.R. Rep. 104-469, pt. 1, at 225). Petitioner's position requires an interpretation that 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.* Such interpretation would allow aliens who presented at a port of entry to be subject to mandatory detention under § 1225, but those who crossed illegally would be eligible for a bond under § 1226(a). *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 225 ("The House Judiciary Committee Report makes clear that Congress intended to eliminate the prior statutory scheme that provided aliens who entered the United States without inspection more procedural and substantive rights that those who presented themselves to authorities for inspection.").

Because Petitioner is properly detained under § 1225, she cannot show entitlement to relief.

**D. Conditions of Confinement Allegations are Not Proper Habeas Claims**

To the extent Petitioner asserts claims regarding conditions of her confinement, ECF No. 1 at ¶¶ 29-31, the Court lacks jurisdiction over such claims because they do not challenge the lawfulness of her custody. An individual may seek habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 if she is "in custody" under federal authority "in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c). But habeas relief is available to challenge only the legality or duration of confinement. *Pinson v. Carvajal*, 69 F.4th 1059, 1067 (9th Cir. 2023); *Crawford v. Bell*, 599 F.2d 890, 891 (9th Cir. 1979); *Dep't of Homeland Security v. Thraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 117 (2020) (The writ of habeas corpus historically "provide[s] a means of contesting the lawfulness of restraint and securing release."). The Ninth Circuit squarely explained how to decide

whether a claim sounds in habeas jurisdiction: "[O]ur review of the history and purpose of habeas leads us to conclude the relevant question is whether, based on the allegations in the petition, release is *legally required* irrespective of the relief requested." *Pinson*, 69 F.4th at 1072 (emphasis in original); *see also Nettles v. Grounds*, 830 F.3d 922, 934 (9th Cir. 2016) (The key inquiry is whether success on the petitioner's claim would "necessarily lead to immediate or speedier release."). Here, Petitioner's claims regarding the conditions of her confinement do not arise under § 2241. *See Nettles*, 830 F.3d at 933 ("We have long held that prisoners may not challenge mere conditions of confinement in habeas corpus."); *Giron Rodas v. Lyons*, No. 25cv1912-LL-AHG, 2025 WL 2300781, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2025) ("Like in *Pinson*, the Court lacks jurisdiction over Petitioner's § 2241 habeas petition since it cannot be fairly read as attacking 'the legality or duration of confinement.'") (quoting *Pinson*, 69 F.4th at 1065); *Guselnikov v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-1971-BTM-KSC, 2025 WL 2300873, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 8, 2025) (finding petitioners' claims did not arise under § 2241 because they were not arguing they were unlawfully in custody and receiving the requested relief would not entitle them to release). Thus, Petitioner's claims do not arise under § 2241 and the petition should be dismissed.

## V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Respondents respectfully request that the Court dismiss this action.

DATED: September 17, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney

*s/ Erin Dimbleby*
ERIN M. DIMBLEBY
Assistant United States Attorney
Attorneys for Respondents