

United States District Court
Western District of Texas
El Paso Division

Luis ERAZO ROJAS,
Petitioner,

v.

Kristi Noem, in her official capacity as
Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland
Security *et al*,
Respondents.

3:25-CV-00443-KC

**Federal Respondents' Response to
Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus**

KEY ISSUES:

1. Whether Mandatory Detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) Is Unconstitutional as Applied to Petitioner.
2. Whether the Writ of Habeas Corpus under § 2241 Provides Any Relief Other Than Release.

Federal¹ Respondents provide the following timely response to Petitioner's habeas petition. Any allegations that are not specifically admitted herein are denied. Petitioner is not entitled to the relief he seeks, including attorney's fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA")², and this Court should deny this habeas petition without the need for an evidentiary hearing.

I. Introduction

Petitioner is lawfully detained on a mandatory basis as an applicant for admission pending removal proceedings before an immigration judge. This case is governed not only by the plain language of the statute, but also by Supreme Court precedent. There is no jurisdiction for this Court to review Petitioner's challenge to the Department of Homeland Security's ("DHS") initial decision to detain him for adjudication of his removal proceedings, because his claims directly arise from the decision to commence and/or adjudicate removal proceedings against him. To the extent that Petitioner challenges the interpretation or the constitutionality of the statute under which his removal proceedings are brought, he must raise that challenge in the court of appeals upon review of a final order of removal. While as applied constitutional challenges may be brought in district court under certain circumstances, Petitioner has not raised any colorable claim that his mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(1) is unconstitutional as applied to him. His detention is neither indefinite, nor prolonged, as it will end upon the completion of his removal proceedings.

Finally, this Court lacks jurisdiction under habeas to order an immigration judge to hold a bond hearing. The only remedy available through habeas is release from custody, which Petitioner does not specifically request here. Even if this Court ordered Petitioner's immediate release, which it should not, such release would not provide him any lawful status in the United States and would

¹ The Department of Justice represents only federal employees in this action.

² *Barco v. Witte*, 65 F.4th 782 (5th Cir. 2023).

produce him no net gain. For these reasons and those that follow, this Court should deny this habeas petition without the need for an evidentiary hearing.

II. Relevant Facts and Procedural History

Petitioner alleges that he is a citizen of Colombia who is seeking asylum. *See* ECF No. 1 ¶¶ 2, 13, 17, 20. He is detained in ICE custody within this district. *Id.* He alleges his detention is unlawful, and he asks the Court to order a bond hearing. *Id.* ¶ 6. Petitioner claims he last entered the United States without inspection on February 13, 2023. *Id.* ¶ 2. He alleges he applied for asylum in September 2023 after being placed into removal proceedings following a credible fear finding. *Id.* ¶¶ 19–20; *see also* ECF No. 1-1 (NTA). ICE took him back³ into custody on or about September 25, 2025. *Id.* ¶ 5. The petition is silent as to whether Petitioner filed a motion for bond with the immigration court in El Paso. Petitioner claims that his final removal hearing is scheduled on the non-detained docket in Chicago in 2028, but the petition is silent as to whether he has filed a motion to change venue to the detained docket in El Paso or otherwise alerted the immigration court of his current detention status. *Id.* ¶ 21. Petitioner, through counsel, filed this habeas petition on or about October 3, 2025, alleging causes of action under the Due Process Clause and the INA. *Id.* ¶ 51–58.

III. Argument

As a threshold issue, the only relief available to Petitioner through habeas is release from custody. 28 U.S.C. § 2241; *DHS v. Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 118–19 (2020). Petitioner, however, has no claim to any lawful status in the United States that would permit him to reside lawfully in the United States upon release. Even if this Court were to order his release from custody, he would be subject to re-arrest as an alien present within the United States without having

³ Petitioner does not allege how he was released from custody after his initial detention.

been admitted. Ordering release in this circumstance produces no net gain to Petitioner, while mandating continued detention until at least the conclusion of removal proceedings furthers the government's interests in enforcing the immigration laws. ICE will release Petitioner from custody, but only under a grant of relief from removal or an executed removal order.

A. Petitioner Is Detained under § 1225(b)(1), Not § 1225(b)(2).

Petitioner's NTA shows that he was initially arrested shortly after unlawfully entering the United States in 2023 and placed into expedited removal proceedings. ECF No. 1-1. Following a credible fear review, ICE cancelled the expedited removal proceedings and placed him instead into "full" removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a, allowing him to seek further review of his asylum claim. *Id.* Although he is detained on a mandatory basis as an applicant for admission, Petitioner is not detained under the "catchall" provision, because he was intercepted at or near the port of entry shortly after unlawfully entering. *Compare* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(iii) *with* § 1225(b)(2)(A).

In "full" removal proceedings, there are two groups of aliens: (1) those charged with never having been admitted to the United States (*i.e.*, inadmissible under § 1182); and (2) those who were once admitted but no longer have permission to remain (*i.e.*, removable under § 1227). 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(e)(2). As outlined in more detail below, Congress intended for the inadmissible aliens in this context to be detained on a mandatory basis under § 1225(b), while the deportable/removable aliens are detained under § 1226(a) and eligible to seek bond. This interpretation is consistent with the allocation of the burden of proof during removal proceedings. If the NTA charges the alien under § 1182 as inadmissible, the burden lies on the alien to prove admissibility or prior lawful admission. 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(2). On the other hand, the burden is on the government to establish deportability for aliens charged under § 1227. *Id.* § 1229a(c)(3).

B. Start with the Statutory Text: § 1225(b) Unambiguously Defines an Applicant for Admission as an Alien Present in the United States Without Having Been Admitted.

The statutory language is unambiguous: “An alien present in the United States who has not been admitted ... shall be deemed ... an applicant for admission.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1); *Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 109; *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 288 (2018); *Vargas v. Lopez*, No. 25-CV-526, 2025 WL 2780351 at *4–9 (D. Neb. Sept. 30, 2025); *Chavez v. Noem*, No. 25-CV-23250CAB-SBC, 2025 WL 2730228 at *4–5 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2025). Even though DHS encountered Petitioner within the interior of the United States, he is nonetheless an applicant for admission who has not been admitted or paroled into the United States and who has not shown presence in the United States continuously for the two-year period immediately prior to the date of the determination of inadmissibility. *See* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(1)(A)(iii)(II); 1229a. Once found to have a credible fear of persecution, “the alien shall be detained for further consideration of the application for asylum.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii).

Given the plain language of § 1225(a)(1), Petitioner cannot plausibly argue that he is not an applicant for admission. Nor can Petitioner plausibly challenge a DHS’s officer’s determination that he is “seeking admission” simply because he is not currently at the border requesting to come in. The Fifth Circuit explored these nuances in detail while analyzing a different INA provision that is not at issue here (8 U.S.C. § 1182(h)). *See Martinez v. Mukasey*, 519 F. 3d 532, 541–42 (5th Cir. 2008). The Fifth Circuit found the language of the INA to be unambiguous:

For determining ambiguity... if this statutory text stood alone, we would define “admitted” by its ordinary, contemporary, and common meaning. ... Congress has relieved us from this task, however, by providing the following definition: “The terms ‘admission’ and ‘admitted’ mean, with respect to an alien, the lawful entry of that alien into the United States *after inspection and authorization* by an immigration officer.” 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(13)(A) (emphasis added). Under this statutory definition, “admission” is the lawful entry of an alien after inspection....

Id. at 544

Like the Fifth Circuit in *Martinez*, this Court should navigate these nuanced issues by examining the unambiguous language of the controlling INA provisions in this case, which clearly define these various terms in proper context, to determine the following: Petitioner (1) has not been “admitted” to the United States after inspection by an immigration officer [§§ 1182(a)(6), 1101(a)(13)]; (2) is an “applicant for admission” [§ 1225(a)(1)];⁴ and (3) is subject to mandatory detention while he applies for asylum after being found to have a credible fear of persecution [§ 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii)]. DHS is properly detaining Petitioner on a mandatory basis during his removal proceedings.

C. Congress Intended to Mandate Detention of All Applicants for Admission, Not Just Those Who Presented for Inspection at a Designated Port of Entry.

Congress, in the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (“IIRIRA”), corrected an inequity in the prior law by substituting the term “admission” for “entry.” *See Chavez*, 2025 WL 2730228, at *4 (citing *Torres v. Barr*, 976 F.3d 918, 928 (9th Cir. 2020); *United States v. Gambino-Ruiz*, 91 F.4th 918, 990 (9th Cir. 2024)). Under the prior version of the INA, aliens who lawfully presented themselves for inspection were not entitled to seek bond, whereas aliens who “entered” the country after successfully evading inspection were entitled to seek bond. *Id.* Petitioner’s interpretation, however, would repeal the statutory fix that Congress made in IIRIRA. *Id.* IIRIRA, among other things, substituted the term “admission” for “entry,” and replaced deportation and exclusion proceeding with removal proceedings. *See, e.g., Tula Rubio v. Lynch*, 787 F.3d 288, 292 n.2, n.8 (5th Cir. 2015) (collecting cases). In other words, in amending the INA, Congress acted in part to remedy the “unintended and undesirable

⁴ Nothing in § 1101(a)(4) contradicts this definition. Section 1101(a)(4) simply differentiates between an alien seeking admission to the United States at entry (with DHS) versus an alien by applying for a visa (with the State Department) with which to eventually seek admission at entry into the United States.

consequence” of having created a statutory scheme that rewarded aliens who entered without inspection with greater procedural and substantive rights (including bond eligibility) while aliens who had “actually presented themselves to authorities for inspection were restrained by ‘more summary exclusion proceedings’” and subjected to mandatory detention. *Martinez v. Att’y Gen.*, 693 F.3d 408, 414 (3d Cir. 2012) (quoting *Hing Sum v. Holder*, 602 F.3d1092, 1100 (9th Cir. 2010)).

This administration’s interpretation of mandatory detention of applicants for admission only advances Congressional intent to equalize the playing field between those who follow the law and those who do not. The plain language of the statute in this case is clear, regardless of whether the agency interpreted it differently in the past than it interprets it today. *See Loper Bright Enters. v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369, 385-86 (2024); *Niz-Chavez v. Garland*, 593 U.S. 155, 171 (2021) (no amount of policy talk can overcome a plain statutory command). DHS does not dispute that this interpretation differs from the interpretation that the agency has taken previously, nor does it dispute that the agency’s own regulations necessarily support the prior interpretation. The statute itself, however, has not changed.

That does not leave § 1226(a) meaningless. Section 1226(a) applies to aliens within the interior of the United States who were once lawfully admitted but are now subject to removal from the United States under 8 U.S.C. § 1227(a). *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287–88. Section 1226(a) allows DHS to arrest and detain an alien during removal proceedings and release them on bond, but it does not mandate that all aliens found within the interior of the United States be processed in this manner. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). Nothing in the plain language of § 1226(a) entitles an applicant for admission to a bond hearing, especially not one that requires DHS to bear the burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence. Nor does this interpretation render the Laken Riley Act

superfluous simply because it appears redundant. Indeed, “redundancies are common in statutory drafting ... redundancy in one portion of a statute is not a license to rewrite or eviscerate another portion of the statute...” *Barton v. Barr*, 590 U.S. 222, 229 (2020).

D. Petitioner Does Not Overcome Jurisdictional Hurdles.

Where an alien, like this Petitioner, challenges the decision to detain him in the first place or to seek a removal order against him, or if an alien challenges any part of the process by which his removability will be determined, the court lacks jurisdiction to review that challenge. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g); *see also Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 294–95. In *Jennings*, the Court did not find that the claims were barred, because unlike Petitioner here, the aliens in that case were challenging their continued and allegedly prolonged detention during removal proceedings. *Id.* Here, Petitioner is challenging the decision to detain him in the first place, which arises directly from the decision to commence and/or adjudicate removal proceedings against him. *See id.*

Even if the alien claims he is not appropriately categorized as an applicant for admission subject to § 1225(b), such a challenge must be raised before an immigration judge in removal proceedings. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(4). In other words, if an alien contests that he is an applicant for admission subject to removal under § 1225(b), any claim challenging his continued detention under § 1225(b) is inextricably intertwined with the removal proceedings themselves, meaning that judicial review is available only through the court of appeals following a final administrative order of removal. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(4).⁵ This is consistent with the channeling provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9), which mandates that judicial review of all questions of law and fact,

⁵ While bond proceedings under § 1226(a) are separate and apart from removal proceedings under § 1229a, challenges to decisions under § 1225(b), including the mandatory detention provision found within that statute, are to be raised in the same § 1229a proceedings. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(4).

including interpretation and application of constitutional and statutory provisions, arising from any action or proceeding brought to remove an alien from the United States must be reviewed by the court of appeals upon review of a final order of removal. *See SQDC v. Bondi*, No. 25–3348 (PAM/DLM), 2025 WL2617973 (D. Minn. Sept. 9, 2025).

E. On Its Face, and As Applied to Petitioner, § 1225(b) Comports with Due Process.

Section 1225 does not provide for a bond hearing, regardless of whether the applicant for admission is placed into full removal proceedings. The Supreme Court upheld the facial constitutionality of § 1225(b) in *Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 140 (finding that applicants for admission are entitled only to the protections set forth by statute and that “the Due Process Clause provides nothing more”). An “expectation of receiving process is not, without more, a liberty interest protected by the Due Process Clause.” *Olim v. Wakinekona*, 461 U.S. 238, 250 n.12 (1983).

That the alien in *Thuraissigiam* failed to request his own release in his prayer for relief does not make the holding any less binding here. *But see Lopez-Arevelo v. Ripa*, No. 25–CV–337–KC, 2025 WL 2691828 (W.D. Tex. Sept. 22, 2025). Indeed, Petitioner here does not even specifically request his own release. The alien in *Thuraissigiam* undisputedly brought his claim in habeas, and the Court noted that even if he had requested release, his claim would have failed. *Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 118–19. Just like the alien in *Thuraissigiam* was on “the threshold of entry” as an applicant for admission detained under § 1225(b)(1)(A), Petitioner here is also an applicant for admission. Petitioner is not entitled to more process than what Congress provided him by statute, regardless of whether the applicable statute is § 1225(b) or § 1226(a). *Id.*; *see also Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 297–303. Petitioner here, however, still received more process than the alien in *Thuraissigiam* received, because unlike that alien, Petitioner here was found to have a credible fear of persecution. *See* ECF No. 1-1 (NTA).

Mandatory detention of an applicant for admission during “full” removal proceedings does not violate due process, because the constitutional protections are built into those proceedings, regardless of whether the alien is detained. 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. The alien is served with a charging document (NTA) outlining the factual allegations and the charge(s) of removability against him. *Id.* § 1229a(a)(2). He has an opportunity to be heard by an immigration judge and represented by counsel of his choosing at no expense to the government. *Id.* § 1229a(b)(1), (b)(4)(A). He can seek reasonable continuances to prepare any applications for relief from removal, or he can waive that right and seek immediate removal or voluntary departure. *Id.* § 1229a(b)(4)(B), (c)(4). Should he receive any adverse decision, he has the right to seek judicial review of the complete record and that decision not only administratively, but also in the circuit court of appeals. *Id.* § 1229a(b)(4)(C), (c)(5). Moreover, relief applications are heard more expeditiously on the detained docket than the non-detained docket. *See* Section 9.1(e), Executive Office for Immigration Review | 9.1 - Detention | United States Department of Justice (last accessed Oct. 18, 2025). Some relief applications are subject to an annual cap, requiring immigration judges to “reserve” decisions to grant the application. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1240.21(c); OPPM 17-04 (last accessed Oct. 18, 2025). Judges are not required to reserve decisions in detained cases, however. *Id.*

While an as-applied constitutional challenge, such as a prolonged detention claim, may be brought before the district court in certain circumstances, Petitioner here raises no such claim where he has been detained for only a brief period pending his removal proceedings. For aliens, like Petitioner, who are detained during removal proceedings as applicants for admission, what Congress provided to them by statute satisfies due process. *Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 140. As applied here to Petitioner, § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii) does not violate due process. *See Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 140.

III. Conclusion

Petitioner is not left without a remedy. Though sparsely granted in only the most extenuating circumstances, Petitioner nonetheless may seek a humanitarian parole, which is granted in the exercise of DHS's discretion. 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5). Petitioner is already in "full" removal proceedings before an immigration judge, which includes the right to counsel at no expense to the government and the right to seek judicial review administratively and through the circuit court. 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. Finally, detention is not indefinite, because removal proceedings will end, either with a grant of relief or with an order of removal. The Court should deny the Petition.

Respectfully submitted,

Justin R. Simmons
United States Attorney

By: /s/ Lacy L. McAndrew

Lacy L. McAndrew
Assistant United States Attorney
Florida Bar No. 45507
601 N.W. Loop 410, Suite 600
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(210) 384-7325 (phone)
(210) 384-7312 (fax)
lacy.mcandrew@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Federal Respondents