TIMOTHY COURCHAINE
United States Attorney
District of Arizona
THEO NICKERSON
Assistant United States Attorney
Connecticut State Bar No. 429356
Two Renaissance Square
40 North Central Avenue, Suite 1800
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4449
Telephone: (602) 514-7500
Theo.Nickerson2@usdoj.gov
Attorneys for Respondents

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Carlos Adrian Aguayo Rivera,

Petitioner,

v.

John Cantu, *et al.*,

Respondents.

No. CV 25-03579-DWL (DMF)

RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

INTRODUCTION

Respondents, John Cantu, Arizona Field Office Director, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE"), Todd Lyons, Acting Director of ICE, Kristi Noem, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Pamela Bondi, Attorney General of the United States, and Jospeh B. Edlow, Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, by and through counsel, hereby respond to the instant habeas petition. Doc. 1. Petitioner is an "applicant for admission" who must therefore be detained pending removal proceedings. The plain language of the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA") establishes that any noncitizen present in the United States without being admitted is indeed an "applicant for admission" and therefore subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 297 (2018) ("Read most naturally, §§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2) thus mandate detention of applicants of admission until certain proceedings have concluded.").

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND.

Petitioner Carlos Adrian Rivera Aguayo is a native and citizen of Mexico, born on [redacted] in Sonora, Mexico. *See* Exhibit A, Declaration of Deportation Officer Nellie Martinez ¶ 4. On January 3, 1996, the Petitioner voluntarily returned to Mexico. *Id.* ¶ 5. On January 5, 1997, the Petitioner voluntarily returned to Mexico. *Id.* ¶ 6. On January 5, 1999, the Petitioner was arrested for fraud/misuse of an entry document. *Id.* ¶ 7. Petitioner was processed for expedited removal and was removed to Mexico. *Id.* On August 27, 2003, Petitioner was arrested by the Chandler Police Department. *Id.* ¶ 8. Petitioner was arrested for Driving Under the Influence. *Id.* On September 8, 2003, Petitioner was returned to Mexico. *Id.* ¶ 10. On August 23, 2006, Petitioner was arrested for importing merchandise (5,000 counterfeit one-hundred-dollar Federal Reserve Notes) subject to seizure. *Id.* ¶ 11.

On December 27, 2008, Petitioner applied for admission into the United States from Mexico at the DeConcini Port of Entry in Nogales, Arizona. Exhibit A ¶ 12. The Petitioner presented a Permanent Resident Card that did not belong to Petitioner. *Id.* On December 27, 2008, the Petitioner was determined to be inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the INA. *Id.* ¶ 13. The Petitioner was processed for expedited removal. *Id.* On December 27, 2008, the Petitioner was removed to Mexico. *Id.* ¶ 14. On August 14, 2025, ICE officers brought Petitioner into DHS custody. *Id.* ¶ 17. On August 21, 2025, the Petitioner was placed into removal proceedings and charged with removability under section 212(a)(6)(A)(i) of the INA. *Id.* ¶ 18. On August 22, 2025, DHS added section 212(a)(7)(a)(i)(I) as an additional charge of removability. *Id.* ¶ 19. On August 24, 2025, Petitioner was transferred to Florence, Arizona. *Id.* ¶ 20.

On September 9, 2025, the immigration court scheduled Petitioner's removal hearing for October 27, 2025. Exhibit A ¶ 21. On October 1, 2025, Petitioner filed a motion to administratively close his immigration proceedings. *Id.* ¶ 22. On October 9, 2025, the immigration court denied Petitioner's motion to administratively close his removal proceedings. *Id.* ¶ 23. On October 27, 2025, the Petitioner's removal hearing began. *Id.* ¶ 24.

Due to insufficient time to complete the Petitioner's hearing, this hearing was continued. *Id.* Petitioner's removal proceedings hearing was rescheduled to December 17, 2025. *Id.*

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The burden is on Petitioner to show that his confinement is unlawful. *See Walker v. Johnston*, 312 U.S. 275, 286 (1941). Specifically, here, Petitioner challenges her temporary civil immigration detention pending completion of her removal proceedings. Judicial review of immigration matters, including of detention issues, is limited. *I.N.S. v. Aguirre-Aguirre*, 526 U.S. 415, 425 (1999); *Hampton v. Mow Sun Wong*, 426 U.S. 88, 101 n.21 (1976) ("the power over aliens is of a political character and therefore subject only to narrow judicial review"). The Supreme Court has thus "underscore[d] the limited scope of inquiry into immigration legislation," and "has repeatedly emphasized that over no conceivable subject is the legislative power of Congress more complete than it is over the admission of aliens." *Fiallo*, 430 U.S. at 792 (internal quotation omitted).

The plenary power of Congress and the Executive Branch over immigration necessarily encompasses immigration detention, because the authority to detain is elemental to the authority to deport, and because public safety is at stake. *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."); *Carlson v. Landon*, 342 U.S. 524, 538 (1952) ("Detention is necessarily a part of this deportation procedure.").

LAW AND ARGUMENT

I. Statutory Framework.

A. Applicants for Admission.

"The phrase 'applicant for admission' is a term of art denoting a particular legal status." *Torres v. Barr*, 976 F.3d 918, 927 (9th Cir. 2020) (en banc). Section 1225(a)(1) states:

> (1) Aliens treated as applicants for admission.— An alien present in the United States who has not been admitted or who arrives in the United States (whether or not at a designated port of arrival ...) shall be deemed for the purposes of this Act an applicant for admission.

8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1).[1] Section 1225(a)(1) was added to the INA as part of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA). Pub. L. No. 104-208, § 302, 110 Stat. 3009-546. "The distinction between an alien who has effected an entry into the United States and one who has never entered runs throughout immigration law." *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001).

Before IIRIRA, "immigration law provided for two types of removal proceedings: deportation hearings and exclusion hearings." *Hose v. I.N.S.*, 180 F.3d 992, 994 (9th Cir. 1999) (en banc). A deportation hearing was a proceeding against a noncitizen already physically present in the United States, whereas an exclusion hearing was against a noncitizen outside of the United States seeking admission. *Id.* Whether an applicant was eligible for "admission" was determined only in exclusion proceedings, and exclusion proceedings were limited to "entering" noncitizens — those noncitizens "coming . . . into the United States, from a foreign port or place or from an outlying possession." *Landon v. Plasencia*, 459 U.S. 21, 24 n.3 (1982) (quoting 8 U:S.C. § 1101(a)(13) (1982)). "[N]on-citizens who had entered without inspection could take advantage of greater procedural and substantive rights afforded in deportation proceedings, while non-citizens who presented themselves at a port of entry for inspection were subjected to more summary exclusion proceedings." *Hing Sum v. Holder*, 602 F.3d 1092, 1100 (9th Cir. 2010); *see also Plasencia*, 459 U.S. at 25-26.

Prior to IIRIRA, noncitizens who attempted to lawfully enter the United States were in a worse position than noncitizens who crossed the border unlawfully. *See Hing Sum*, 602 F.3d at 1100; *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 225-229 (1996). IIRIRA "replaced deportation and exclusion proceedings with a general removal proceeding." *Hing Sum*, 602 F.3d at 1100. IIRIRA added Section 1225(a)(1) to "ensure[] that all immigrants who have not been lawfully admitted, regardless of their physical presence in the country, are placed on equal footing in removal proceedings under the INA." *Torres*, 976 F.3d at 928; *see also* H.R. Rep. 104-469, pt. 1, at 225 (explaining that § 1225(a)(1) replaced "certain aspects of the

[1] Admission is the "lawful entry of an alien into the United States after inspection and authorization by an immigration officer." 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(13).

current 'entry doctrine,'" under which noncitizens who entered the United States without inspection gained equities and privileges in immigration proceedings unavailable to noncitizens who presented themselves for inspection at a port of entry). The provision "places some physically-but-not-lawfully present aliens into a fictive legal status for purposes of removal proceedings." *Torres*, 976 F.3d at 928.

B. Removal Proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229(a).

Removal proceedings under § 1229a are commonly referred to as "full removal proceedings" or "240 removal proceedings" due to the statutory section of the INA in which they appear. 8 U.S.C. § 1229a; INA § 240. The proceedings take place before an IJ, an employee of the Department of Justice. 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(a)(1), (b)(1). Noncitizens in § 1229a proceedings have an opportunity to apply for relief from removal. *See, e.g.*, 8 U.S.C. § 1158 (asylum); 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(b) (cancellation of removal for nonpermanent residents); 8 U.S.C. § 1255 (adjustment of status). These are adversarial proceedings in which the noncitizen has the right to hire counsel, examine and present evidence, and cross-examine witnesses. 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(b)(4). Either party may appeal the IJ decision to the BIA. 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(b)(4)(C); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 1240.15. If the BIA issues a final order of removal, the noncitizen may also seek judicial review at a U.S. Court of Appeals through a petition for review. 8 U.S.C. § 1252.

C. Detention under the INA.

The INA authorizes civil detention of noncitizens during removal proceedings and "[d]etention is necessarily part of this deportation procedure." *Carlson v. Landon*, 342 U.S. 524, 538 (1952); *see also* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), 1226(a), and 1231(a). "Where an alien falls within this statutory scheme can affect whether his detention is mandatory or discretionary, as well as the kind of review process available to him if he wishes to contest the necessity of his detention." *Prieto-Romero v. Clark*, 534 F.3d 1053, 1057 (9th Cir. 2008).

1. Detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225.

The INA mandates the detention of applicants for admission. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2); *see also Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287 (Applicants for admission "fall

into one of two categories, those covered by § 1225(b)(1) and those covered by § 1225(b)(2).”). As explained above, arriving noncitizens and noncitizens present less than two years are subject to expedited removal. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1). If a noncitizen “indicates an intention to apply for asylum,” the noncitizen proceeds through the credible fear process and is subject to mandatory detention. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii); *see also* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(B)(1)(B)(iii)(IV).

Section 1225(b)(2) is “broader” and “serves as a catchall provision.” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287. The Supreme Court recognized that 1225(b)(2) “applies to all applicants for admission not covered by § 1225(b)(1).” *Id.* Under § 1225(b)(2), a noncitizen “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). Section 1225 does not provide for noncitizens to be released on bond, but DHS has discretion to release any applicant for admission 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).

2. Detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226.

Section 1226 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). Under § 1226(a), the government may detain a noncitizen during his removal proceedings, release him on bond, or release him on conditional parole. By regulation, immigration officers can release a noncitizen if the noncitizen demonstrates that he “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).

II. <u>Petitioner Is Subject to Mandatory Detention Under § 1225(b)(2).</u>

Section 1225 applies to “applicants for admission,” such as Petitioner, 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*, 583 U.S. at 287.

Section 1225(b)(1) applies to arriving noncitizens and "certain other" noncitizens "initially determined to be inadmissible due to fraud, misrepresentation, or lack of valid document." *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 noncitizen "indicates an intention to apply for asylum . . . or a fear of persecution," immigration officers will refer the noncitizen for a credible fear interview. *Id.* § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii). A noncitizen "with a credible fear of persecution" is "detained for further consideration of the application for asylum." *Id.* § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii). If the noncitizen 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), a noncitizen "who is an applicant for admission" shall be detained for a removal proceeding "if the examining immigration officer determines that [the] alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A); *see Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 66, 68 (BIA 2025) ("for aliens arriving in and seeking admission into the United States who are placed directly in full removal proceedings, section 235(b)(2)(A) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), mandates detention 'until removal proceedings have concluded.'") (quoting *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 299).

In *Jennings*, the Supreme Court evaluated the proper interpretation of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) and stated that "[r]ead most naturally, §§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2) [ ] mandate detention of applicants for admission until certain proceedings have concluded." 583 U.S. at 297. The Court noted that neither § 1225(b)(1) nor § 1225(b)(2) "impose[] any limit on the length of detention" and "neither § 1225(b)(1) nor § 1225(b)(2) say[] anything whatsoever about bond hearings." *Id.* The Court added that the sole means of release for noncitizens detained pursuant to §§ 1225(b)(1) or (b)(2) prior to removal from the United States is temporary parole at the discretion of the Attorney General under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5). *Id.* at 300. The Court observed that because noncitizens held under § 1225(b) may be paroled for "urgent humanitarian

reasons or significant public benefit," "[t]hat express exception to detention implies that there are no *other* circumstances under which aliens detained under § 1225(b) may be released." *Id.* (citations and internal quotation omitted) (emphasis in the original). Courts thus may not validly draw additional procedural limitations "out of thin air." *Id.* at 312. The Supreme Court concluded: "In sum, §§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2) mandate detention of aliens throughout the completion of applicable proceedings." *Id.* at. 302. As such, Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).

The government acknowledges that this Court has explicitly rejected its legal position that aliens who enter without admission, inspection or parole and are charged as removable under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) are applicants for admission under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1), who are therefore subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(A), regardless of how long ago they entered. *Echevarria v. Bondi, et al.*, No. 2:25-cv-03252-PHX-DWL, 2025 WL 2821282 (D. Ariz. Oct. 3, 2025). The government also acknowledges a Massachusetts federal district court decision which is now on appeal to the First Circuit rejecting its legal position. *Martinez v. Hyde*, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2025 WL 2084238 (D. Mass. Jul. 24, 2025), *appeal pending*, No. 25-1902 (1st Cir.). There are, however, at least four federal courts that have joined what the government acknowledges is a minority position on whether § 1225 applies to persons in Petitioner's position rather than § 1226. *Vargas Lopez v. Trump*, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2025 WL 2780351, at *9 (D. Neb. Sept. 30, 2025) (finding alien properly detained under § 1225(b)(2) because he was present in United States without having been admitted, and thus an applicant for admission under § 1225(a)); *Chavez v. Noem*, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2025 WL 2730228, at *4-5 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2025) (same); *Pipa-Aquise v. Bondi*, No. 25-1094, 2025 WL 2490657, at *1 (E.D. Va. Aug. 5, 2025) (same); *Pena v. Hyde*, No. 25-11983, 2025 WL 2108913, at *2 (D. Mass. July 28, 2025) (upholding detention under § 1225(b)(2) of alien "present in the country but [who] has not yet been lawfully granted admission"). Accordingly, the government maintains that Petitioner is properly detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).

III. Petitioner's mandamus and APA claim are not cognizable in this habeas.

As an initial matter, Petitioner's request for mandamus relief is duplicative of his

Administrative Procedures Act ("APA") claim for unreasonable delay. As other courts have recognized, where relief sought via mandamus is duplicative of that sought under the APA, the court must dismiss the petition for writ of mandamus. *Kaur v. Mayorkas*, 2023 WL 4899083, at *13 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 1, 2023) ("Where mandamus relief is duplicative of an APA claim, it must be dismissed.") Here, because Plaintiff seek to compel the same action under the APA that he seeks to compel via mandamus, the Court should dismiss the petition for a writ of mandamus as duplicative and as it is not cognizable within the context of a habeas petition. Indeed, seeking judicial review under the APA is not properly sought through a habeas petition. *See Flores-Miramontes v. INS.*, 212 F.3d 1133, 1140 (9th Cir. 2000) ("For purposes of immigration law, at least, "judicial review" refers to petitions for review of agency actions, which are governed by the APA, while habeas corpus refers to habeas petitions brought directly in district court to challenge illegal confinement."). In any event, Petitioner is not entitled to mandamus or APA relief where his VAWA petition is currently within USCIS's normal processing times. Here, Petitioner filed his VAWA petition (Form I-360, Petition for Amerasian, Widow(er) or Special Immigrant) on August 15, 2023. Doc. 1 13. Current USCIS processing time for these petitions is 44 months, which would be in April of 2027. *See* https://egov.uscis.gov/processing-times/. Thus, Petitioner cannot bring a mandamus or APA action in his habeas nor is he entitled to relief on either of these claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Respondents respectfully request the Court deny Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus.

Respectfully submitted on November 4, 2025.

TIMOTHY COURCHAINE
United States Attorney
District of Arizona

s/Theo Nickerson
THEO NICKERSON
Assistant United States Attorney
Attorneys for Respondents