

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA
Civil No. 25-3432 (JRT/LIB)

Pedro Rodrigo Rodas Rodas,

Plaintiff,

v.

Pamela Bondi, et. al.,

Defendants.

**COMBINED BRIEF IN
OPPOSITION TO MOTION
FOR TEMPORARY
RESTRAINING ORDER AND
IN RESPONSE TO PETITION
FOR WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS**

The Respondents Pamela Bondi, Attorney General, Kristi Noem, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Department of Homeland Security, Todd Lyons, Acting Director of Immigrations and Customs Enforcement, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”), Sirce Owen, Acting Director for Executive Office for Immigration Review, Fort Snelling Immigration Court, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Samuel Olson, Director of the St. Paul Field Office of ICE hereby submit this Memorandum in Opposition to Petitioner’s Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order (ECF No. 3). Respondents respectfully request that this Court deny Petitioner Pedro Rodrigo Rodas Rodas’s (“Rodas”) motion.

First, numerous provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1252 deprive this Court of jurisdiction to review the Petitioner’s claims and preclude this Court from granting the relief he seeks. Congress has unambiguously stripped federal courts of jurisdiction over challenges to the commencement of removal proceedings, including detention pending removal

proceedings. Congress further directed that any challenges arising from any removal-related activity—including detention pending removal proceedings—must be brought before the appropriate federal court of appeals, not a district court.

Second, Petitioner’s motion should be denied because he is not likely to succeed on the merits of his Petition. Rodas’s detention is lawful under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) because he is an applicant for admission who is not “clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted” to the United States. Petitioner himself does not claim that he has lawful status to remain in the United States. (*See generally* ECF No. 1.) Under these circumstances, Petitioner “shall be detained for a proceeding under section 1229a of this title.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Additionally, subject to conditions, Respondents have agreed not to move Petitioner outside the District of Minnesota in the short term. Because Petitioner’s detention is fully supported by statute, regulation, and the Constitution, the request for a temporary restraining order should be denied.

BACKGROUND

I. Relevant Facts

Rodas is a citizen and national of Guatemala. (Declaration of Xiong Lee (“Lee Decl.”) ¶ 4.) On December 14, 2018, United States Border Patrol (USBP) in Hidalgo, Texas, encountered Rodas at or near Hidalgo, Texas. (*Id.* ¶ 5.) Rodas was interviewed by USBP and it was determined that Rodas was illegally present in the United States. (*Id.*) USBP identified Rodas as an unaccompanied minor child (UAC). (*Id.*) On the same date, USBP issued RODAS a Notice to Appear (Form I-862), charging him under 212(a)(6)(A)(i) of the INA, as amended for being an alien present in the United States

without being admitted or paroled, or who arrived in the United States as any time or place other than as designated by the Attorney General. (*Id.* ¶ 6, Ex. A.) Rodas was reunited with his non-primary caregiver and released on an order of recognizance approximately three months later on March 1, 2019. (*Id.* ¶ 7.)

On February 20, 2022, Rodas was charged with Bribery in violation of Nebraska State Law Section 28-201(1)(b), a class I Misdemeanor, no Operator's License, in violation of Section 60-484(1), a class III Misdemeanor and Speeding, in violation of Section 60-6, 186(1)(f), an infraction. (Lee Decl. ¶ 8, Ex. B.) On May 10, 2022, Rodas plead guilty to all counts was fined and given a jail sentence of one day with credit for one day served. (*Id.*)

On July 10, 2025, ICE agents were conducting surveillance on a private residence in Blaine, Minnesota. RODAS was present at that residence and taken into custody due to his criminal history. (Lee Decl. ¶ 9, Ex. C.) On the same date, Rodas was transported to the ICE office in Fort Snelling, Minnesota, for processing. (*Id.* ¶ 10, Ex. D.) ICE also issued a Warrant for Arrest of Alien (I-200) and arrested Rodas after being released from the custody of Freeborn County Jail. (*Id.* ¶ 11, Ex. E.)

On July 29, 2025, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) issued a "Notice of Forwarding of Form I-589 to EOIR," notifying Rodas that his I-589 application for asylum will be heard in Immigration Court. (Lee Decl. ¶ 12.) USCIS had previously issued an undated letter to Rodas notifying him that USCIS found him to not meet the requirements for asylum in USCIS's initial jurisdiction to review of his application. (*Id.*)

On the same date, ICE issued a Form I-261 providing Rodas with additional grounds for inadmissibility and deportability. (*Id.* ¶ 13, Ex. F.)

The next day, on July 30, 2025, Rodas filed a bond redetermination request. (Lee Decl. ¶ 14, Ex. G.) On that same day an Immigration Judge (IJ) at Fort Snelling, MN granted Rodas bond at \$1,500. (*Id.*) DHS then filed a Form EOIR-43 “Notice of ICE Intent to Appeal Custody Redetermination” and filed a “Notice of Appeal” on August 6, 2025, with the Board of Immigration Appeals. (*Id.* ¶ 15, Ex. H.) That appeal is pending. (*Id.* ¶ 15.)

On August 6, 2025, ICE filed a Form EOIR-26 with the Board of Immigration Appeals in connection with the July 30, 2025 bond decision. (Lee Decl. ¶ 16, Ex. I.) Three weeks later, on August 26, 2025, the IJ issued a bond redetermination granting bond in the amount of \$1,500.00. (*Id.* ¶ 17, Ex. J.)

Rodas remains in DHS’s detention in Freeborn County Jail in Albert Lea, Minnesota, pending the resolution of DHS’s appeal of Rodas’s bond decision and pending removal proceedings. (Lee Decl. ¶ 18.) Rodas is still currently in removal proceedings. (*Id.*) ICE has agreed not to move Petitioner out of the District of Minnesota until after September 19, 2025, or the resolution of the pending habeas matter, whichever comes earlier, with one caveat: in the event of unforeseen circumstance or contingency consistent with Petitioner’s original request, ICE reserves the option, with 72 hours’ notice, to apply to the Court for permission to withdraw from this commitment. (*Id.* ¶ 19.)

The Court ordered Respondents to file their response to the TRO motion and petition by September 10, 2025, at the status conference on September 5. (ECF No. 10.) As such,

the Federal Respondents are combining the two ordered briefs and do not oppose the Court doing likewise and consolidating its analysis of the requested interim relief with the ultimate merits of the petition. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(a)(2).*

II. Legal Background for Individuals Seeking Admission to the United States

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 (“[P]rior 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 Rodas 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 Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216, 224-26 (BIA 2025); *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”) have broad discretionary authority to detain a noncitizen during removal proceedings.¹ *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(1)

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

(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), 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*

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).

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

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 § 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 broad discretionary authority to determine whether to detain or release a noncitizen during his removal proceedings. *See 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.

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.

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).

If an automatic stay is invoked, regulations require the BIA to track the progress of the custody appeal “to avoid unnecessary delays in completing the record for decision.” 8 C.F.R. § 1003.6(c)(3). The stay lapses in 90 days, unless the detainee seeks an extension of time to brief the custody appeal, 8 C.F.R. § 1003.6(c)(4), or unless DHS seeks, and the BIA grants, a discretionary stay. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.6(c)(5). Here, the automatic stay has been in place for just over a month since August 6, 2025. (*See* Lee Decl. ¶ 16, Ex. I.)

ARGUMENT

I. Standard of Review

The purpose of a preliminary injunction or a temporary restraining order “is merely to preserve the relative positions of the parties” until the case can be resolved. *Univ. of Tex. v. Komenich*, 451 U.S. 390, 395 (1981).³ The burden on the party moving for the temporary restraining order is great because injunctive relief is “an extraordinary remedy never awarded as a right.” *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 23 (2008). A court may grant a preliminary injunction only upon a proper showing of (1) the probability of success on the merits, (2) that the movant will suffer irreparable harm absent the injunction, (3) the balance between this harm and the harm an injunction would cause other parties, and (4) where the public interest lies. *Dataphase Systems, Inc. v. CL Systems, Inc.*, 640 F.2d 109, 113-14 (8th Cir. 1981) (en banc). The movant bears the burden of proof for each factor. *Gelco v. Coniston Partners*, 811 F.2d 414, 418 (8th Cir. 1987). The party seeking such relief bears “a heavy burden” and a “difficult task.” *Earth Island Inst. v. Carlton*, 626 F.3d 462, 469 (9th Cir. 2010). This already stringent burden is even higher on a party such as Plaintiff that seeks a mandatory preliminary injunction—one which “alters the status quo by commanding some positive act, as opposed to a prohibitory injunction seeking only to maintain the status quo.” *TruStone Fin. Fed. Credit Union v. Fiserv, Inc.*, No. 14-CV-424 (SRN/SER), 2014 WL 12603061, at *1 (D. Minn. Feb. 24,

³ The same legal standard applies to both a request for a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction. *Izabella HMC-MF, LLC v. Radisson Hotels Int'l, Inc.*, 378 F. Supp. 3d 775, 778 n.2 (D. Minn. 2019).

2014). “Mandatory preliminary injunctions are to be cautiously viewed and sparingly used.” *Id.*

II. Petitioner is not entitled to injunctive relief because he is not likely to succeed on the merits of his claim.

In analyzing a motion for injunctive relief, the likelihood of success on the merits is “[t]he most important of the Dataphase factors.” *Shrink Mo. Gov’t PAC v. Adams*, 151 F.3d 763, 764 (8th Cir. 1998). Petitioner does not have a likelihood of success on his claims, and his motion should be denied.

a. This Court does not have jurisdiction over Petitioner’s claims.

As a threshold matter, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1252(g) and (b)(9) preclude review of Petitioner’s claims. Accordingly, Petitioner is unable to show a likelihood of success on the merits.

First, 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

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

“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, 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),

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.

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. *See Axel S.Q.D.C. v. Bondi et al.*, No. 25-cv-3348 (PAM/DLM), ECF No. 17 at 5-6 (D. Minn. Sept. 9, 2025) (denying preliminary injunction and petition for lack of jurisdiction); *but see Jose J.O.E. v. Bondi et al.*, No. 25-cv-3051 (ECT/DJF), ECF No. 24 at 16-18 (D. Minn. Aug. 27, 2025) (finding jurisdiction to grant preliminary injunction).

Second, 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 13-18; ECF No. 1 ¶ 121.) 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). *See Acxel S.Q.D.C.*, No. 25-cv-3348 (PAM/DLM), ECF No. 17 at 5-6; *but see Jose J.O.E.*, No. 25-cv-3051 (ECT/DJF), ECF No. 24 at 16-18.

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).

b. Under the plain text of § 1225, Rodas must be detained pending the outcome of his removal proceedings.

The Court should reject Petitioner's argument that § 1226(a) governs his detention instead of § 1225. (*See* ECF No. 5 at 5-9, 12-16.) 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. It applies only to “applicants for admission”; that is, as relevant here, aliens present in the United States who have not been 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 motion that ICE must put him in proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a, and he argues that his detention is unlawful because 8 U.S.C. § 1226 governs. (ECF No. 5 at 5-6, 15.) That is incorrect.

Rodas is in 1229a proceedings. (See Lee Decl. ¶ 18.) 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 being admitted or paroled or who arrived in the United States as any time or place other than as designated by the Attorney General. (Lee Decl. ¶ 6, Ex. A.) The NTA clearly states at the top that he is in removal proceedings “under Section 240 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.” (Lee Decl. Ex. A at 1.) 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); *see Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 227 (explaining “aliens detained without a warrant while arriving in the United States are mandatorily detained under section 235(b) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1225. . . .”); *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 Rodas does not dispute that he was not admitted or inspected. (See ECF No. 1 ¶¶ 52, 196).

Petitioner’s argument that he should be treated differently because he has been in the interior of the United States is unpersuasive. (See ECF No. 1 ¶¶ 32, 125,) 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 phrase “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.

c. Congress did not intend to treat individuals who unlawfully enter the country 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 (Cf. ECF No. 1 ¶ 127.) 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.

d. 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

⁵ Several of the cases Petitioner cites (ECF No. 5 at 14 n.2) make this argument. *See, e.g., Rodriguez v. Bostock*, No. 3:25-CV-05240-TMC, 2025 WL 1193850, at *13–14 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 24, 2025).

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). Petitioner cannot show a likelihood of success on the merits.

e. The invocation of the automatic stay provision does not change the constitutionality of Petitioner’s detention.

The fact that DHS has invoked the automatic stay provision to keep Rodas in detention during DHS’s bond appeal does not change the constitutionality of his detention. Here, the automatic stay was invoked in support of the statutory scheme implemented by Congress under 8 U.S.C. § 1225, which requires mandatory detention. (Lee Decl. ¶ 16, Ex. I (certification by the Chief Counsel that a non-frivolous argument under section 1225 is the basis for ICE’s appeal)).

Judge Davis recently rejected a constitutional challenge to the same provision of the regulations implementing the exercise of the Secretary’s discretion related to bond under § 1226(a). Order, *Ernesto Ruben Barajas Farias v. Garland, et al.*, No. 24-cv-04366 (MJD/LIB) (Dec. 6, 2024) (ECF No. 18, hereinafter “Order Denying Petition”). There, Judge Davis was considering a challenge 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(h)(2)(i)(C), which allowed

DHS to exempt a category of individuals from receiving any bond hearing under 1226(a).

The provision at issue here is the preceding subsection, § 1003.19(h)(2)(i)(B).

Judge Davis explained the statutory structure of immigration detention as set out in Section 1226 and the accompanying DOJ regulations. Order to Show Cause, 24-cv-4366 (MJD/LIB) (Dec. 4, 2024) (ECF No. 14, hereinafter “Order to Show Cause”). Congress’s scheme in 1226 clearly gave discretion to the Attorney General under 1226(a) to make detention decisions for the individuals in removal proceedings. Judge Davis wrote:

In exercising that discretion, the Attorney General has decided that some detainees . . . will not be released on bond, while other detainees will be given a more granular determination. This appears entirely consistent with the delegation of authority to the Attorney General effected by 1226(a).

Order to Show Cause at 3. Judge Davis recognized that this statutory structure was like one Congress set up for the Bureau of Prisons that the Supreme Court upheld in *Lopez v. Davis*, 531 U.S. 230 (2001). Order to Show Cause at 3-4. There, the Supreme Court upheld a BOP regulation categorically denying a sentence reduction provision to a category of inmates, as an exercise of discretion given to it by Congress. Order to Show Cause at 4 (citing *Lopez*, 531 U.S. at 233, 244).

In his Order Denying the Petition, Judge Davis carefully considered and rejected several arguments made by the petitioner. Judge Davis’s reasoning focused on the text of section 1226, “which expressly commits” detention authority to the Attorney General’s discretion. Order Denying Petition at 4. The Attorney General’s further delegation, via regulation, to immigration judges is constrained by the Attorney General’s finding that for individuals charged under section 1227(a)(4), no IJ review is allowed. *Id.* at 5. Judge

Davis rejected an argument that *Lopez* was not applicable because this detention is in the civil context. *Id.* at 6-7.

Finally, Judge Davis highlighted the Eighth Circuit's very recent precedent in *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). The *Banyee* decision rejects a constitutional challenge to mandatory detention under 1226(c) for the length of an individual's removal proceedings. 115 F. 4th at 931 ("The rule has been clear for decades: '[d]etention during deportation proceedings [i]s ... constitutionally valid.'") (citing *Demore*, 538 U.S. at 523). The only other Eighth Circuit case that has addressed detention during removal proceedings also highlighted that detention during removal proceedings is not, on its face, unconstitutional. *Farass Ali v. Brott, et al.*, No. 19-1244, 2019 WL 1748712 (8th Cir. Apr. 16, 2019) (holding that detention for over a year after an IJ denial of bond was constitutional without consideration of reasonableness factors imposed by district court). Even if this Court were to consider the merits of the detention question here, there is no question that this short period of detention, coupled with the process afforded in the regulations implementing Sections 1225-1226, is valid.

The present case is distinct from other recent cases in this district in which invocation of the automatic stay has been found to be a constitutional violation. In *Mohammed H. v. Trump*, No. CV 25-1576 (JWB/DTS), 2025 WL 1692739, at *5 (D. Minn. June 17, 2025), Judge Blackwell's decision was premised on a finding that "Petitioner remained in custody only because the Government invoked the automatic stay provision." Petitioner in the Mohammed H. case had been detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), a

statutory scheme that expressly allows for a bond hearing in front of an Immigration Judge, 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(a), not 1225, which expressly does not allow for a bond hearing, 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(h).⁶ In *Gunaydin v. Trump*, No. 25-CV-01151 (JMB/DLM), 2025 WL 1459154, at *6 (D. Minn. May 21, 2025), the question presented by the Petition was distinct: “whether a regulation can permit an agency official to unilaterally detain a person after a judge has ordered the person's release and after a judge has dismissed the underlying proceedings.” The court's decision was heavily dependent on the fact that Gunaydin's proceedings had been terminated—a critical fact not present here.

Banyee makes clear that this Court's review of the detention is constrained and that mandatory detention is not constitutionally objectionable for the limited time period needed to complete removal proceedings. Judge Davis distinguished and disagreed with out-of-district authority to the contrary (Order to Show Cause at 7), and the more recent cases from this district are factually distinguishable and otherwise not consistent with *Banyee*. This Court should adopt Judge Davis's reasoning and find that Rodas's detention is constitutional as his removal proceedings progress. Though the bond order is stayed, and he is subject to ongoing detention, there is no due process violation. The Court should deny the motion for a temporary restraining order.

⁶ The United States has appealed this decision. Notice of Appeal, No. 25-cv-1576 (D. Minn. July 29, 2025) (ECF 38); 25-2516 (8th Cir.).

f. 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. (ECF No. 5 at 13-18, 21-22.) 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’ 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 with any Due Process concerns without engaging in the *Mathews v. Eldridge* test. *See generally Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690-91.

g. Petitioner's claims related to his arrest are subject to dismissal.

Petitioner's arguments regarding the alleged illegality of his arrest are 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). This claim is not likely to succeed on the merits and as a result Rodas's request for a temporary restraining order should be denied.

III. The remaining *Dataphase* factors do not support a temporary restraining order.

This Court should deny Petitioner's motion because he has not established sufficient irreparable harm, and the public interest and balance of the equities favor the United States' position. As a threshold matter, the Court need not even reach these factors, given Petitioner's failure to show a likelihood of success on the merits of his claim. *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."). But even if the Court were to consider the other factors, Petitioner's claim fails.

a. Irreparable Harm

Regardless of the merits his or her claims, 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 being further from his family and the possibility of not being able to communicate with counsel as a basis for irreparable harm. (ECF No. 5 at 12; ECF No. 1 ¶ 12.) 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 19, 2025, or the resolution of the pending habeas matter (Lee Decl. ¶ 19), these claims for emergency relief are moot. (See ECF No. 1 at 71, ¶¶ 3-4.) As such, he cannot meet his burden to establish irreparable harm. See *Acxel S.Q.D.C.*, No. 25-cv-3348 (PAM/DLM), ECF No. 17 at 5-6 (denying preliminary injunction and petition for lack of jurisdiction); but see *Jose J.O.E.*, No. 25-cv-3051 (ECT/DJF), ECF No. 24 at 16-18 (D. Minn. Aug. 27, 2025) (granting preliminary injunction); *Francisco T. v. Bondi et al.*, No. 25-cv-3219 (JMB/DTS), ECF No. 17, at 9-11 (D. Minn. Aug. 29, 2025) (same); *Aguilar-Maldonado v. Olsen et al.*, 25-cv-3142 (SRN/SGE), ECF No. 17, 2025 WL 2374411 (D. Minn. Aug. 12, 2025) (granting preliminary injunction); *Ferrera Bejarano v. Bondi et al.*, No. 25-cv-3236 (NEB/JFD), ECF Nos. 17, 18) (D. Minn. Aug 18, 2025) (same); *Aguilar Vazquez v. Bondi et al.*, No. 25-cv-3162 (KMM/ECW), ECF No. 17 (D. Minn. Aug. 19,

2025) (enjoining Respondents from denying bond to Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)).

b. Public Interest, Balance of the Equities

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 and the petition.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Respondents respectfully request that the Court deny Petitioner’s motion for temporary restraining order, deny his habeas petition, and dismiss the case.

Dated: September 10, 2025

JOSEPH H. THOMPSON
Acting United States Attorney

s/ Erin M. Secord

BY: ERIN M. SECORD
Assistant U.S. Attorney
Attorney ID No. 0391789
Email: erin.secord@usdoj.gov
600 U.S. Courthouse
300 South Fourth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415
612-664-5600

Attorneys for Federal Respondents