UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 25- 62009-CIV-SMITH

JOSE PEDRO RAMIREZ RAMIREZ,
Petitioner,

v.

PAMELA BONDI, *et al.*,
Respondents.
_______________________________________/

RESPONDENTS' RETURN IN OPPOSITION
TO THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Respondents, by and through the undersigned Assistant United States Attorney, submit the following return in opposition to the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [D.E. 1] (Petition). For the reasons set forth below, the Petition should be denied.[1]

INTRODUCTION

Petitioner, in relevant part, asks this Court to "[i]ssue a Writ of Habeas Corpus ordering Respondents to release Petitioner immediately." *See* D.E. 1, Petition at p. 18. Accordingly, this case comes down to a question of statutory interpretation. Specifically, what statutory provision controls Petitioner's detention.

Section 1225(b)(2)(A) mandates detention for "an alien who is an applicant for admission." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Pursuant to § 1225(a), "[a]n alien present in the United States who has not been admitted … shall be deemed for purposes of this chapter an applicant for admission." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1). Petitioner admits that he entered the United States as an unaccompanied

---

[1] Respondents recognize that courts in this District have rejected similar arguments in granting habeas petitions. *See, e.g.*, *Perez v. Parra*, Case No. 25cv24820 (S.D. Fla.). Nonetheless, Respondents maintain and preserve these arguments for the record in this case.

minor and was processed by the Department of Homeland Security as an alien present without admission or parole. *See* Petition at ¶¶ 18–19. Accordingly, under a plain language reading of § 1225, Petitioner is an applicant for admission and is subject to mandatory detention pursuant to § 1225(b)(2)(A). For the reasons explained more fully below, the Petition should be denied.

Lastly, the Petitioner's contention that he is exempt from mandatory detention, *see* D.E. 1, Petitioner at ¶¶ 60–62, is unavailing as an individual can no longer claim "unaccompanied minor" status upon reaching the age of majority.

BACKGROUND

Petitioner is a native and citizen of Guatemala. *See* Form I-213, Record of Deportable/Inadmissible Alien, (Form I-213), dated April 27, 2021, attached and redacted as Exhibit A. On or about April 27, 2021, the Petitioner, then an unaccompanied fifteen-year-old minor, entered the United States at or near El Paso, Texas and was not then inspected, admitted, or paroled. *See id.* On April 27, 2021, Customs and Border Protection ("CBP"), encountered the Petitioner and determined that he unlawfully entered the United States from Mexico and was inadmissible. *See id.* At this point the Petitioner was designated an Unaccompanied Alien Child (UAC). *See id.* Petitioner was subsequently transferred to the custody of the United States Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR). *See* Declaration of Deportation Officer Vivian Delgado, attached as Exhibit B; *see also* Form I-213, dated April 26, 2025, attached and redacted as Exhibit C. ORR released Petitioner into the custody of his uncle on June 12, 2021. *See* Ex. B, Declaration; *see also* Ex. C, Form I-213.

On January 6, 2023, DHS filed a Notice to Appear charging the Petitioner with inadmissibility under INA § 212(a)(6)(A)(i), as an alien present in the United States without being admitted or paroled, or who arrived in the United States at any time or place other than as

designated by the Attorney General. *See* Form I-862, Notice to Appear (NTA), dated January 6, 2023, attached and redacted as Exhibit D. Petitioner was served the Notice to Appear by mail on January 6, 2023. *See id.*

On May 18, 2023, Petitioner filed an affirmative asylum application with U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). *See* Acknowledgement of Receipt, noticed on June 3, 2023, attached and redacted as Exhibit E. On April 25, 2025, Florida Highway Patrol officers conducted a traffic stop after the Petitioner committed a traffic violation. *See* Ex. C, Form I-213. Upon determining Petitioner was illegally in the United States, Florida Highway Patrol transferred him to CBP custody. *See id.* On April 26, 2025, Petitioner was transferred to the custody of Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE"), Enforcement and Removal Operations ("ERO") at the Krome North Service Processing Center. *See* Detention History, attached and redacted as Exhibit F.

On July 31, 2025, the Petitioner requested a bond before the Executive Office for Immigration Review ("EOIR") Krome Immigration Court, and the hearing was set for August 7, 2025. *See* Notice of Custody Redetermination Hearing, dated July 31, 2025, attached and redacted as Exhibit G. On August 7, 2025, the Immigration Judge denied bond, finding that he lacked jurisdiction because he is an applicant for admission and subject to detention under INA § 235(b)(2). *See* Immigration Judge (IJ) Order, dated August 7, 2025, attached and redacted as Exhibit H.

On August 18, 2025, the Petitioner filed a motion to terminate with the Miami Immigration Court pending review of the pending asylum application with USCIS, and, on August 31, 2025, the Immigration Judge granted the Petitioner's motion. *See* Immigration Judge (IJ) Order, dated August 31, 2025, attached and redacted as Exhibit I.

On September 2, 2025, ICE filed a new Notice to Appear, with the same charge of removability, INA § 212(a)(6)(A)(i). *See* Form I-862 NTA, dated September 2, 2025, attached and redacted as Exhibit J. On September 10, 2025, Petitioner filed a motion to terminate with the Miami Immigration Court in light of the pending asylum application with USCIS. *See* IJ Order, dated September 11, 2025, attached and redacted as Exhibit K; *see also* Ex. B, Declaration. The Immigration Judge denied the motion on September 11, 2025. *See* Ex. K, IJ Order, dated September 11, 2025. The order states that "DHS will ensure that the I-589 is adjudicated in an expedited basis." *See id.*

On November 5, 2025, USCIS scheduled the interview, on the asylum application and on November 12, 2025, determined that the Petitioner was ineligible for relief. *See* USCIS UAC Decision Notice, dated November 17, 2025, attached and redacted as Exhibit L. USCIS then referred the case to the Immigration Court. *See id.*

The case is set for a hearing on January 21, 2026, to determine whether Petitioner will be seeking alternative relief from removal relief or will be ordered removed. *See* Notice of Hearing, dated December 8, 2025. attached and redacted as Exhibit M.

Petitioner remains detained at Broward Transitional Center (BTC), in Pompano Beach, Florida, pursuant to section 235(b)(2) of the INA. *See* Ex. B, Declaration.

ARGUMENT

I. Section 1225(b)(2) Mandates Detention of Aliens, Like Petitioner, Who Are Present in the United States Without Having Been Lawfully Admitted.

Under the plain language of § 1225(b)(2), the Government is required to detain all aliens, like Petitioner, who are present in the United States without admission and are subject to removal proceedings—regardless of how long the alien has been in the United States or how far from the border they ventured. That unambiguous language resolves this case. *See Little Sisters of the Poor*

Saints Peter & Paul Home v. Pennsylvania, 591 U.S. 657, 676 (2020) ("Our analysis begins and ends with the text.").

A. The Plain Language of § 1225(b)(2) Mandates Detention of Applicants for Admission.

"As with any question of statutory interpretation, [the] analysis begins with the plain language of the statute. It is well established that, when the statutory language is plain, [courts] must enforce it according to its terms." *Jimenez v. Quarterman*, 555 U.S. 113, 118 (2009). Section 1225(a) deems all aliens who either "arrive[] in the United States" or who are "present in the United States [and] who ha[ve] not been admitted" to be "applicant[s] for admission." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1). And "admission" under the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA") means lawful entry after inspection by immigration authorities, and not mere physical entry. 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(13)(A). Thus, an alien who enters the country without permission is and remains an applicant for admission, regardless of the duration of the alien's presence in the United States or the alien's distance from the border.

In turn, § 1225(b)(2) provides that "an alien who is an applicant for admission" "shall be detained" pending removal proceedings if the "alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). The statute's use of the term "shall" makes clear that detention is mandatory, *see Lexecon Inc. v. Milberg Weiss Bershad Hynes & Lerach*, 523 U.S. 26, 35 (1998), and the statute makes no exception based upon the duration of the alien's presence in the country or where in the country the alien is located. Therefore, the statute's plain text mandates that the Government detain all "applicants for admission" who are not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted.

Petitioner falls squarely within the statutory definition. He was "present in the United States," and there is no dispute that he has "not been admitted." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a); *see* Petition

at ¶¶ 18–19. Moreover, Petitioner cannot establish—and has not even alleged that he can establish—that he is "clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Therefore, § 1225(b)(2) mandates Petitioner "be detained for a proceeding under [8 U.S.C. § 1229a]." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

B. Applicants for Admission under § 1225(b)(2) are seeking to be legally admitted into the United States.

As explained above, Petitioner is an "applicant[] for admission" under § 1225(b)(2) and is, therefore, seeking to be legally admitted into the United States. The statute itself makes clear that an alien who is an "applicant for admission" *is* necessarily "seeking admission." Moreover, an alien like Petitioner, who is identified by immigration authorities as unlawfully present, and who does not choose to depart from the United States voluntarily, is "seeking admission," i.e., seeking legal authority to remain in the United States.

1. The "seeking admission" clause does not negate or otherwise limit the statutorily defined term "applicant for admission".

Section 1225(b)(2) requires the detention of an "applicant for admission, if the examining 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) (emphasis added). The statutory text and context show that being an "applicant for admission" is a means of "seeking admission"—no additional affirmative step is necessary. In other words, every "applicant for admission" is inherently and necessarily "seeking admission," at least absent a choice to pursue voluntary withdrawal of their application for admission.

For example, § 1225(a) provides that "[a]ll aliens … who are applicants for admission *or otherwise* seeking admission or readmission … shall be inspected." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3)

(emphasis added). The word "[o]therwise' means 'in a different way or manner[.]'" *Texas Dep't of Hous. & Cmty. Affs. v. Inclusive Communities Project, Inc.*, 576 U.S. 519, 535 (2015) (quoting Webster's Third New International Dictionary 1598 (1971)); *see also Villarreal v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.*, 839 F.3d 958, 963-64 (11th Cir. 2016) (en banc) ("or otherwise" means "the first action is a subset of the second action"). Being an "applicant for admission" is thus a particular "way or manner" of seeking admission, such that an alien who is an "applicant for admission" *is* "seeking admission" for purposes of § 1225(b)(2)(A).[2] No separate affirmative act is necessary. *See Matter of Lemus-Losa*, 25 I&N Dec. 734, 743 (BIA 2012) ("[M]any 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"). Accordingly, § 1225(b) unambiguously provides that an alien who is an "applicant for admission" is "seeking admission," even if the alien is not engaged in some separate, affirmative act to obtain lawful admission.

2. Any perceived redundancy in the statute cannot serve as a basis to avoid the clear language of the statute.

As explained above, an "applicant for admission" is "seeking admission" under § 1225. To the extent this reading results in some redundancy in § 1225(b)(2)(A), that "is not a license to rewrite" § 1225 "contrary to its text." *Barton v. Barr*, 590 U.S. 222, 239 (2020); *see Heyman v. Cooper*, 31 F.4th 1315, 1322 (11th Cir. 2022) ("sometimes drafters *do* repeat themselves and *do* include words that add nothing of substance" especially when "the arguably redundant

---

[2] As § 1225 shows, being an "applicant for admission" is only *one* "way or manner" of "seeking admission," not the exclusive way. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3). For example, lawful permanent residents returning to the United States are not "applicants for admission" because they are already admitted, but they still may be deemed to be "seeking admission" in some circumstances. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1103(A)(13)(C).

words that the drafters employed … are functional synonyms" (alterations accepted and emphasis in original)).

"The canon against surplusage is not an absolute rule." *Marx v. Gen. Revenue Corp.*, 568 U.S. 371, 385 (2013). "Redundancies are common in statutory drafting—sometimes in a congressional effort to be doubly sure, sometimes because of congressional inadvertence or lack of foresight, or sometimes simply because of the shortcomings of human communication." *Barton*, 590 U.S. at 239. "[R]edundancy in one portion of a statute is not a license to rewrite or eviscerate another portion of the statute contrary to its text." *Id.* Thus, as the Supreme Court explained in *Barton*, "[s]ometimes the better overall reading of a statute contains some redundancy." *Id.*

Moreover, "the surplusage cannon … must be applied with statutory context in mind" and should not be employed to undermine congressional intent. *United States v. Bronstein*, 849 F.3d 1101, 1110 (D.C. Cir. 2017). As explained in greater detail below, in 1996, Congress passed the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act ("IIRIRA"), Pub. L. 104-208, 110 Stat. 3009 (Sept. 30, 1996), with the goal of ensuring that aliens who enter the United States unlawfully do not receive greater privileges and benefits than aliens who lawfully present themselves for inspection at a port of entry. The canon against surplusage should not be employed to re-write the statute in contravention of this statutory context.

3. Applicants for admission are seeking admission when they seek to lawfully remain in the United States.

Even if "seeking admission" requires some separate affirmative conduct by the alien, an applicant for admission who attempts to avoid removal from the United States, rather than trying to withdraw their application for admission, is "seeking admission."

Section 1225(b)(2)(A) applies to an alien who is present in the United States unlawfully, regardless of how long the alien has been in the United States. Although the alien may not have

been affirmatively seeking admission during those years of illegal presence, § 1225(b)(2) is not concerned with the alien's pre-inspection conduct. Rather, the statute's use of present tense language ("seeking" and "determines") shows that its focus is a specific point in time—when "the examining immigration officer" is making a "determin[ation]" regarding the alien's admissibility. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). At that point, the alien is "seeking" admission into the United States, and continues to be an alien seeking admission. *See* The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (defining "seek" and "seeking" as "to endeavor to obtain"). If it were otherwise, the applicant would not attempt to show that he is "clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). That inference is confirmed by § 1225(a)(4), which authorizes an alien to voluntarily withdraw their application for admission and "depart immediately from the United States." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(4). An applicant who forgoes that statutory option and instead endeavors to prove admissibility through § 240 removal proceedings—proceedings in which the alien has the "burden of establishing that [he] is clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted," *id.* § 1229a(c)(2)(A)—is endeavoring to obtain admission to the United States in the same way someone who is encountered just after crossing the border is attempting to obtain admission to the United States.

C. Section 1226 Does Not Support Petitioner's Argument.

Petitioner's reliance upon, and reference to, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 is unavailing. Petitioner's detention is controlled by § 1225(b)(2), not § 1226.

Sections 1225 and 1226 are separate statutory provisions that provide independent bases for detention and, generally, apply to different groups of aliens. While, as explained below, there is some overlap between the aliens subject to detention under the two detention provisions, that overlap does not create a redundance because the two statutes provide for different bases for release.

Section 1226(a) authorizes the Executive to "arrest[] and detain[]" *any* "alien" pending removal proceedings. Section 1226(a) provides the detention authority for the significant group of aliens who are *not* deemed "applicants for admission" subject to § 1225(b)(2)(A)—specifically, aliens who have been admitted to the United States but are now removable, like those who overstay a visa or lawful permanent residents who engage in conduct that renders them removable.[3] Thus, section 1225(b)(2) is the more specific detention provision. *See RadLAX Gateway Hotel, LLC v. Amalgamated Bank*, 566 U.S. 639, 645 (2012) ("the specific governs the general"). Accordingly, § 1226(a) does not control Petitioner's detention.

Section 1226(c) provides for mandatory detention and is an exception to § 1226(a)'s discretionary detention regime. It requires the Executive to detain "any alien" who is deportable or inadmissible for having committed specified offenses or engaged in terrorism-related actions. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(A)-(E). Petitioner has not committed one of the specified offenses and has not engaged in terrorism-related actions. Accordingly, he is not detained under § 1226(c).

Earlier this year, Congress passed the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No. 119-1, 139 Stat. 2 (2025), which amended portions of § 1226(c). While that amendment adds some overlap between aliens subject to detention under § 1225(b)(2) and § 1226(c), that overlap does not apply to Petitioner, and as explained below, it does not create a redundancy as the amendment does independent work.

Congress's desire to further limit the parole power with respect to criminal aliens was one of the principal reasons that it enacted the Laken Riley Act. The Act was adopted in the wake of a heinous murder committed by an inadmissible alien who was "paroled into this country through a

[3] The detention of any of the millions of aliens who have overstayed their visas is governed by § 1226(a), because those aliens (unlike Petitioner) *were* lawfully admitted to the United States.

shocking abuse of that power," 171 Cong. Rec. at H278 (daily ed. Jan. 22, 2025) (Rep. McClintock), and an abdication of the Executive's "fundamental duty under the Constitution to defend its citizens," 171 Cong. Rec. at H269 (Rep. Roy). The Act thus reflects a "congressional effort to be double sure," *Barton*, 590 U.S. at 239, that unadmitted criminal aliens are not paroled into the country through an abuse of the Secretary's exceptionally narrow parole authority. It does not suggest congressional uncertainty about § 1225(b)(2)(A)'s detention mandate, but rather congressional desire to shut down a parole loophole that allowed the Government to circumvent that mandate.

D. The Government's Reading Comports with Congressional Intent.

Before 1996, federal immigration laws required the detention of aliens who presented at a port of entry but allowed aliens who were already unlawfully present in the United States to obtain release pending removal proceedings. In 1996, Congress passed the IIRIRA specifically to stop conferring greater privileges and benefits on aliens who enter the United States unlawfully as compared to those who lawfully present themselves for inspection at a port of entry. Accordingly, the Government's reading of the statute is not only supported by the express language of § 1225, but it also comports with congressional intent. *See King v. Burwell*, 576 U.S. 473, 492 (2015) (rejecting interpretation that would lead to a result "that Congress designed the Act to avoid"); *New York State Dep't of Soc. Servs. v. Dublino*, 413 U.S. 405, 419-20 (1973) ("We cannot interpret federal statutes to negate their own stated purposes.").

The INA, as amended, contains a comprehensive framework governing the regulation of aliens, including the creation of proceedings for the removal of aliens unlawfully in the United States and requirements for when the Executive is obligated to detain aliens pending removal.

Prior to 1996, the INA treated aliens differently based on whether the alien had physically "entered" the United States. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216, 222-223 (BIA 2025)

(citing 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(a), 1251 (1994)); *see Hing Sum v. Holder*, 602 F.3d 1092, 1099-1100 (9th Cir. 2010) (same). "Entry" referred to "any coming of an alien into the United States," 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(13) (1994), and whether an alien had physically entered the United States (or not) "dictated what type of [removal] proceeding applied" and whether the alien would be detained pending those proceedings, *Hing Sum*, 602 F.3d at 1099. Accordingly, the INA's prior framework, which distinguished between aliens based on physical "entry," had

> the 'unintended and undesirable consequence' of having created a statutory scheme where aliens who entered without inspection 'could take advantage of the greater procedural and substantive rights afforded in deportation proceedings,' *including the right to request release on bond*, while aliens who had 'actually presented themselves to authorities for inspection … were subject to mandatory custody.

Hurtado, 29 I&N Dec. at 223 (emphasis added) (quoting *Martinez v. Att'y Gen.*, 693 F.3d 408, 413 n.5 (3d Cir. 2012)); *see also Hing Sum*, 602 F.3d at 1100 (similar); H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 225 (1996) ("House Rep.") ("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").

Congress discarded that regime through enactment of IIRIRA. Among other things, that law had the goal of "ensur[ing] that all immigrants who have not been lawfully admitted, regardless of their legal presence in the country, are placed on equal footing in removal proceedings under the INA." *Torres v. Barr*, 976 F.3d 918, 928 (9th Cir. 2020) (en banc). To that end, IIRIRA replaced the prior focus on physical "entry" and instead made lawful "admission" the governing touchstone. IIRIRA defined "admission" to mean "the *lawful* entry of the alien into the United States after inspection and authorization by an immigration officer." 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(13)(A) (emphasis added). In other words, the immigration laws would no longer distinguish aliens based on whether they had managed to evade detection and enter the country without permission. Instead, the "pivotal factor in determining an alien's status" would be "whether or not the alien has been

lawfully admitted." House Rep., *supra*, at 226 (emphasis added); *Hing Sum*, 602 F.3d at 1100 (similar).

Petitioner's interpretation would restore the regime Congress sought to discard: It would require detention for those who present themselves for inspection at the border in compliance with law yet grant bond hearings to aliens who evade immigration authorities, enter the United States unlawfully, and remain here unlawfully for years, or even decades, until an involuntary encounter with immigration authorities. That is *exactly* the perverse preferential treatment for illegal entrants that IIRIRA sought to eradicate. Accordingly, this Court should reject Petitioner's interpretation. *King*, 576 U.S. at 492 (rejecting "petitioners' interpretation because it would … create the very [thing] that Congress designed the Act to avoid").

The Government's reading, on the other hand, is true to Congress's intent and should be adopted.

E. The Government's Reading Accords with *Jennings*.

The Government's interpretation is consistent with the Supreme Court's decision in *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281 (2018). *Jennings* reviewed a Ninth Circuit decision that applied constitutional avoidance to "impos[e] an implicit 6-month time limit on an alien's detention" under § 1225(b) and § 1226. *Id.* at 292. The Court held that neither provision is so limited. *Id.* at 292, 296-306. In reaching that holding, the Court did not—and did not need to—resolve the precise groups of aliens subject to § 1225(b) or § 1226. Nonetheless, consistent with the Government's reading, the Court recognized in its description of § 1225(b) that § "1225(b)(2) …. serves as a catchall provision that applies to all applicants for admission not covered by § 1225(b)(1)." *Id.* at 287.

F. Under *Loper Bright*, the Statute Controls, Not Prior Agency Practice

Any argument that prior agency practice applying § 1226(a) to Petitioner is unavailing because under *Loper Bright Enters. v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369, 411 (2024) (overturning *Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837 (1984)), the plain language of the statute and not prior practice controls. *Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 225–26. In overturning *Chevron*, the Supreme Court recognized that courts often change precedents and "correct[] our own mistakes." *Loper Bright*, 603 U.S. at 411. *Loper Bright* overturned a decades old agency interpretation of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act that itself predated IIRIRA by twenty years. *Id.* at 380. Thus, longstanding agency practice carries little, if any, weight under *Loper Bright*.

II. Petitioner's Prior Status as an Unaccompanied Minor Does Not Foreclose the Application of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b).

Contrary to his allegations in this case, Petitioner here is an "applicant for admission" subject to the removal and detention provisions at § 1225(b)(2). Petitioner entered the custody of the Department of Homeland Security on April 27, 2021, as an unaccompanied child ("UAC"). *See* D.E. 1, Petition, at ¶¶ 18–19. Under the Homeland Security Act of 2002 ("HSA"), a UAC is someone who: "(A) has no lawful immigration status in the United States; (B) has not attained 18 years of age; and (C) with respect to whom—(i) there is no parent or legal guardian in the United States; or (ii) no parent or legal guardian in the United States is available to provide care and physical custody." 6 U.S.C. § 279(g)(2) ("Section 279"). The HSA transferred the responsibility for care of UACs in Federal custody by reason of their immigration status to the Office of Refugee Resettlement ("ORR") within the Department of Health and Human Services ("HHS"). *Id.* § 279(a), (b)(1)(A). The TVPRA provides that "the care and custody of all unaccompanied alien children, including responsibility for their detention, where appropriate, shall be the responsibility

of the Secretary of Health and Human Services." 8 U.S.C. § 1232(b)(1) ("Section 1232"). Although the TVPRA transferred responsibility for care and custody of UACs to ORR, "it did not alter their immigration status." *Mendez Ramirez v. Decker*, et al., 612 F. Supp. 3d 200, 206 (S.D.N.Y. 2020).

An individual is not a UAC if and when he is released to a parent's custody. *Id.* Moreover, a UAC ceases to be a UAC when he turns eighteen. *Id.* at 212 (citing 6 U.S.C. § 279(g) (2)(B). Petitioner does not, and cannot, allege that he was under the age of eighteen at the time of his arrest in April 2025. Despite the fact that he was an UAC when he arrived in the United States in 2021, he was not an UAC when he was detained in April 2025. Consequently, he is in the same position as any "applicant for admission," as contemplated by § 1225.

To the extent the Petitioner challenges his detention based on *J.O.P v. DHS*, No 8:19-CV-01944-SAG (D. Md.), *see* Petition at ¶ 22, that settlement agreement does not prevent detention, but merely requires USCIS to take initial jurisdiction over Form I-589s, Applications for Asylum and for Withholding of Removal, filed by class members and render a final decision before a removal order can be executed. *See* Section III(I) of the *J.O.P.* Settlement Agreement, attached hereto as Exhibit N. Here, USCIS took initial jurisdiction of the Petitioner's Form I-589, expedited its adjudication, and then referred the matter to the Immigration Court. *See* Ex. B, Declaration of Officer Delgado at ¶ 22–23. Therefore, the Respondents have met their burdens to the extent that the *J.O.P.* Settlement Agreement applies here.

Thus, Plaintiff is subject to the statute's mandatory removal and detention provisions.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus should be denied.

Dated: December 15, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

JASON A. REDING QUIÑONES
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

/s/ David Werner
DAVID WERNER
Assistant United States Attorney
Fla. Bar. No. 113436
99 N.E. 4th Street
Miami, Florida 33132
Telephone: (786) 439-3194
Facsimile: (305) 530-7139
Email: David.Werner@usdoj.gov
Counsel for United States of America

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 15, 2025, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF. I also certify that the foregoing document is being served this day on all counsel of record identified on the Service List via CM/ECF.

By: ***/s/ David Werner***
David E. Werner
Assistant United States Attorney

Jan Peter Weiss, Esquire
Law Office of Jan Peter Weiss
1926 10th Avenue North, Suite 400
Lake Worth, Florida 33461
Phone: (561) 582-6401; Fax: (561) 582-5458
Email: legal@janpweissesq.com
Counsel for Petitioner