

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
JACKSONVILLE DIVISION**

CILFIO UDIEL BAUTISTA-OROZCO,

Petitioner,

v.

Case No. 3:25-cv-01215

Garrett RIPA, Field Office Director of Enforcement and Removal Operations, Miami, Field Office, Immigration and Customs Enforcement; Kristi NOEM, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY; Pamela BONDI, U.S. Attorney General; EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW; Scotty RHODEN, Warden of Baker County Detention Center,

Respondents.

/

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner CILFIO UDIEL BAUTISTA-OROZCO is in the physical custody of Respondents at the Baker County Detention Center. He now faces unlawful detention because the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Executive Office of Immigration

Review (EOIR) have concluded Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention.

2. Petitioner is charged with, *inter alia*, having entered the United States without admission or inspection. *See 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i).*

3. Based on this allegation in Petitioner's removal proceedings, DHS denied Petitioner release from immigration custody, consistent with a new DHS policy issued on July 8, 2025, instructing all Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) employees to consider anyone inadmissible under § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i)—i.e., those who entered the United States without admission or inspection—to be subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond.

4. Similarly, on September 5, 2025, the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA or Board) issued a precedent decision, binding on all immigration judges, holding that an immigration judge has no authority to consider bond requests for any person who entered the United States without admission. *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado, 29 I.*
& N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). The Board determined that such

individuals are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond.

5. Petitioner's detention on this basis violates the plain language of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Section 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to individuals like Petitioner who previously entered and are now residing in the United States. Instead, such individuals are subject to a different statute, § 1226(a), that allows for release on conditional parole or bond. That statute expressly applies to people who, like Petitioner, are charged as inadmissible for having entered the United States without inspection.

6. Respondents' new legal interpretation is plainly contrary to the statutory framework and contrary to decades of agency practice applying § 1226(a) to people like Petitioner.

7. Accordingly, Petitioner seeks a writ of habeas corpus requiring that He be released unless Respondents provide a bond hearing under § 1226(a) within seven days.

JURISDICTION

8. Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents. Petitioner is detained at the Baker County Detention Center, in Macclenny, Florida.

9. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(5) (habeas corpus), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), and Article I, section 9, clause 2 of the United States Constitution (the Suspension Clause).

10. This Court may grant relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 et seq., and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

VENUE

11. Pursuant to *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493- 500 (1973), venue lies in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, the judicial district in which Petitioner currently is detained.

12. Venue is also properly in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because Respondents are employees, officers, and agencies of the United States, and because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in the Middle District of Florida.

REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

13. The Court must grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus or order Respondents to show cause “forthwith,” unless the

petitioner is not entitled to relief. 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If an order to show cause is issued, Respondents must file a return “within three days unless for good cause additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is allowed.” *Id.*

14. Habeas corpus is “perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law . . . affording as it does a swift and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or confinement.” *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963) (emphasis added). “The application for the writ usurps the attention and displaces the calendar of the judge or justice who entertains it and receives prompt action from him within the four corners of the application.” *Yong v. I.N.S.*, 208 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted).

PARTIES

15. Petitioner CILFIO UDIEL BAUTISTA-OROZCO is a citizen of Guatemala who has been in immigration detention since September 12, 2025. After arresting Petitioner in Jasper, Florida, ICE did not set bond and Petitioner is unable to obtain review of his custody by an IJ, pursuant to the Board’s decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).

16. Respondent Garrett Ripa is the Director of the Miami Field Office of ICE's Enforcement and Removal Operations division. As such, Mr. Ripa is Petitioner's immediate custodian and is responsible for Petitioner's detention and removal. He is named in his official capacity.

17. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. She is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), and oversees ICE, which is responsible for Petitioner's detention. Ms. Noem has ultimate custodial authority over Petitioner and is sued in her official capacity.

18. Respondent Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is the federal agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA, including the detention and removal of noncitizens.

19. Respondent Pamela Bondi is the Attorney General of the United States. She is responsible for the Department of Justice, of which the Executive Office for Immigration Review and the immigration court system it operates is a component agency. She is sued in her official capacity.

20. Respondent Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) is the federal agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA in removal proceedings, including for custody redeterminations in bond hearings.

21. Respondent Scotty Rhoden is the Sheriff of Baker County Sheriff's Office and is the Chief Correctional Officer of the Baker County Detention Center, where Petitioner is detained. He has immediate physical custody of Petitioner. He is sued in his official capacity.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

22. The INA prescribes three basic forms of detention for the vast majority of noncitizens in removal proceedings.

23. First, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 authorizes the detention of noncitizens in standard removal proceedings before an IJ. *See 8 U.S.C. § 1229a.* Individuals in § 1226(a) detention are generally entitled to a bond hearing at the outset of their detention, *see 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19(a), 1236.1(d)*, while noncitizens who have been arrested, charged with, or convicted of certain crimes are subject to mandatory detention, *see 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)*.

24. Second, the INA provides for mandatory detention of noncitizens subject to expedited removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and for other recent arrivals seeking admission referred to under § 1225(b)(2).

25. Last, the INA also provides for detention of noncitizens who have been ordered removed, including individuals in withholding-only proceedings, see 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)-(b).

26. This case concerns the detention provisions at §§ 1226(a) and 1225(b)(2).

27. The detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) were enacted as part of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-208, Div. C, §§ 302-03, 110 Stat. 3009-546, 3009-582 to 3009-583, 3009-585. Section 1226(a) was most recently amended earlier this year by the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No. 119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025).

28. Following the enactment of the IIRIRA, EOIR drafted new regulations explaining that, in general, people who entered the country without inspection were not considered detained under § 1225 and that they were instead detained under § 1226(a). See *Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal*

of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum Procedures, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997).

29. Thus, in the decades that followed, most people who entered without inspection and were placed in standard removal proceedings received bond hearings, unless their criminal history rendered them ineligible pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c). That practice was consistent with many more decades of prior practice, in which noncitizens who were not deemed “arriving” were entitled to a custody hearing before an IJ or other hearing officer. *See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)* (1994); *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 229 (1996) (noting that § 1226(a) simply “restates” the detention authority previously found at § 1252(a)).

30. On July 8, 2025, ICE, “in coordination with” DOJ, announced a new policy that rejected well-established understanding of the statutory framework and reversed decades of practice.

31. The new policy, entitled “Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission,” claims that all persons who entered the United States without inspection shall now be subject to mandatory detention provision under § 1225(b)(2)(A). The policy applies regardless of when a person is apprehended, and

affects those who have resided in the United States for months, years, and even decades.

32. On September 5, 2025, the BIA adopted this same position in a published decision, *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*. There, the Board held that all noncitizens who entered the United States without admission or parole are subject to detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A) and are ineligible for IJ bond hearings.

33. Since Respondents adopted their new policies, dozens of federal courts have rejected their new interpretation of the INA's detention authorities. Courts have likewise rejected *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, which adopts the same reading of the statute as ICE.

34. Even before ICE or the BIA introduced these nationwide policies, IJs in the Tacoma, Washington, immigration court stopped providing bond hearings for persons who entered the United States without inspection and who have since resided here. There, the U.S. District Court in the Western District of Washington found that such a reading of the INA is likely unlawful and that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to noncitizens who are not apprehended upon arrival to the United States. *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239 (W.D. Wash. 2025).

35. Subsequently, court after court has adopted the same reading of the INA's detention authorities and rejected ICE and EOIR's new interpretation. *See, e.g., Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11571-JEK, 2025 WL 1869299 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025); *Diaz Martinez v. Hyde*, No. CV 25-11613-BEM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 2084238 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025); *Rosado v. Figueroa*, No. CV 25-02157 PHX DLR (CDB), 2025 WL 2337099 (D. Ariz. Aug. 11, 2025), report and recommendation adopted, No. CV-25-02157-PHX-DLR (CDB), 2025 WL 2349133 (D. Ariz. Aug. 13, 2025); *Lopez Benitez v. Francis*, No. 25 CIV. 5937 (DEH), 2025 WL 2371588 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2025); *Maldonado v. Olson*, No. 0:25-cv-03142-SRN-SGE, 2025 WL 2374411 (D. Minn. Aug. 15, 2025); *Arrazola-Gonzalez v. Noem*, No. 5:25-cv-01789-ODW (DFMx), 2025 WL 2379285 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2025); *Romero v. Hyde*, No. 25-11631-BEM, 2025 WL 2403827 (D. Mass. Aug. 19, 2025); *Samb v. Joyce*, No. 25 CIV. 6373 (DEH), 2025 WL 2398831 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 19, 2025); *Ramirez Clavijo v. Kaiser*, No. 25-CV-06248-BLF, 2025 WL 2419263 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2025); *Leal-Hernandez v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-02428-JRR, 2025 WL 2430025 (D. Md. Aug. 24, 2025); *Kostak v. Trump*, No. 3:25-cv-01093-JE-KDM, 2025 WL 2472136 (W.D. La. Aug. 27, 2025); *Jose*

J.O.E. v. Bondi, No. 25-CV-3051 (ECT/DJF), --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 2466670 (D. Minn. Aug. 27, 2025) *Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft*, No. 2:25-cv-12486-BRM-EAS, 2025 WL 2496379 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025); *Vasquez Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02180-DMS-MM, 2025 WL 2549431 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025); *Zaragoza Mosqueda v. Noem*, No. 5:25-CV-02304 CAS (BFM), 2025 WL 2591530 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2025); *Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft*, No. 25-CV-12546, 2025 WL 2609425 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9, 2025); *Sampiao v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11981-JEK, 2025 WL 2607924 (D. Mass. Sept. 9, 2025); *see also*, e.g., *Palma Perez v. Berg*, No. 8:25CV494, 2025 WL 2531566, at *2 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025) (noting that “[t]he Court tends to agree” that § 1226(a) and not § 1225(b)(2) authorizes detention); *Jacinto v. Trump*, No. 4:25-cv-03161-JFB-RCC, 2025 WL 2402271 at *3 (D. Neb. Aug. 19, 2025) (same); *Anicasio v. Kramer*, No. 4:25-cv-03158-JFB-RCC, 2025 WL 2374224 at *2 (D. Neb. Aug. 14, 2025) (same).

36. Courts have uniformly rejected DHS’s and EOIR’s new interpretation because it defies the INA. As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court and others have explained, the plain text of the statutory provisions demonstrates that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to people like Petitioner.

37. Section 1226(a) applies by default to all persons “pending a decision on whether the [noncitizen] is to be removed from the United States.” These removal hearings are held under § 1229a, to “decid[e] the inadmissibility or deportability of a[] [noncitizen].”

38. The text of § 1226 also explicitly applies to people charged as being inadmissible, including those who entered without inspection. *See 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E)*. Subparagraph (E)’s reference to such people makes clear that, by default, such people are afforded a bond hearing under subsection (a). As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court explained, “[w]hen Congress creates ‘specific exceptions’ to a statute’s applicability, it ‘proves’ that absent those exceptions, the statute generally applies.” *Rodriguez Vazquez*, 779 F. Supp. 3d at 1257 (citing *Shady Grove Orthopedic Assocs., P.A. v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 559 U.S. 393, 400 (2010)); *see also Gomes*, 2025 WL 1869299, at *7.

39. Section 1226 therefore leaves no doubt that it applies to people who face charges of being inadmissible to the United States, including those who are present without admission or parole.

40. By contrast, § 1225(b) applies to people arriving at U.S. ports of entry or who recently entered the United States. The statute’s entire framework is premised on inspections at the border of people

who are “seeking admission” to the United States. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Indeed, the Supreme Court has explained that this mandatory detention scheme applies “at the Nation’s borders and ports of entry, where the Government must determine whether a[] [noncitizen] seeking to enter the country is admissible.” *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287 (2018).

41. Accordingly, the mandatory detention provision of § 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to people like Petitioner, who have already entered and were residing in the United States at the time they were apprehended.

FACTS

42. Petitioner has resided in the United States since January 10, 2000 and lives in Orlando, Florida.

43. On August 20, 2025, Petitioner was arrested after a FLOCK notification informed Officer C. Hadley, of the Office of Agricultural Law Enforcement, that Petitioner’s license was suspended under the name “Cilfio Bautista” prompting Officer C. Hadley to conduct a traffic stop of Petitioner’s vehicle. Petitioner was identified as Cilfio Bautista Orozco, and provided Officer C. Hadley with a “Florida learners permit”. Officer C. Hadley then conducted a

search of the license number that was suspended and the “Florida learners permit” Petitioner provided. Officer C. Hadley determined that the “Florida learners permit” was valid, and concluded that Petitioner added “Orozco” to his surname to obtain a new, valid license. Officer C. Hadley then arrested Petitioner, and charged him with Count 1, Fraudulent Application: Drivers License/Identification Card, and Count 2, Driving While License Suspended/Revoked. Petitioner is now detained at the Baker County Detention Center.

44. DHS placed Petitioner in removal proceedings before the Miami Krome Immigration Court, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. ICE has charged Petitioner with, *inter alia*, being inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) as someone who entered the United States without inspection.

45. Mr. Bautista has every reason to return to the Immigration Court, as he intends to pursue fear-based claims related to Withholding of Removal and/or CAT protection. Mr. Bautista has secured a custodial sponsor that has pledged to provide support and assistance as needed throughout her immigration proceedings. Mr. Bautista will supplement further to dispute he is a danger to the community. Mr. Bautista has a fixed address to stay, should he be

released on a monetary bond. Mr. Bautista intends to comply with any terms of release on monetary bond. Mr. Bautista will be represented by the undersigned during these proceedings. Mr. Bautista has friends and family that have pledged to provide transportation for him. Petitioner is neither a flight risk nor a danger to the community.

46. Following Petitioner's arrest and transfer to Baker County Detention Center, ICE issued a custody determination to continue Petitioner's detention without an opportunity to post bond or be released on other conditions.

47. Petitioner subsequently requested a bond redetermination hearing before an IJ.

48. Pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, the immigration judge is unable to consider Petitioner's bond request. On October 5, 2020, Petitioner was granted amelioration of the terms of his release after a bond redetermination hearing before an IJ. The immigration judge found him not to be a flight risk or danger to the community.

49. As a result, Petitioner remains in detention. Without relief from this court, He face the prospect of months, or even years, in immigration custody, separated from their family and community.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I

Violation of the INA

50. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

51. The mandatory detention provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to all noncitizens residing in the United States who are subject to the grounds of inadmissibility. As relevant here, it does not apply to those who previously entered the country and have been residing in the United States prior to being apprehended and placed in removal proceedings by Respondents. Such noncitizens are detained under § 1226(a), unless they are subject to § 1225(b)(1), § 1226(c), or § 1231.

52. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates his continued detention and violates the INA.

COUNT II

Violation of the Bond Regulations

53. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in preceding paragraphs.

54. In 1997, after Congress amended the INA through IIRIRA, EOIR and the then-Immigration and Naturalization Service issued an interim rule to interpret and apply IIRIRA. Specifically, under the heading of “Apprehension, Custody, and Detention of [Noncitizens],” the agencies explained that “[d]espite being applicants for admission, [noncitizens] who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as [noncitizens] who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination.” 62 Fed. Reg. at 10323 (emphasis added). The agencies thus made clear that individuals who had entered without inspection were eligible for consideration for bond and bond hearings before IJs under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and its implementing regulations.

55. Nonetheless, pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, EOIR has a policy and practice of applying § 1225(b)(2) to individual like Petitioner.

56. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates his continued detention and violates 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1, 1236.1, and 1003.19.

COUNT III

Violation of Due Process

57. Petitioner repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

58. The government may not deprive a person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. U.S. Const. amend. V. “Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that the Clause protects.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).

59. Petitioner has a fundamental interest in liberty and being free from official restraint.

60. The government’s detention of Petitioner without a bond redetermination hearing to determine whether he is a flight risk or danger to others violates his right to due process.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that this Court grant the following relief:

- a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- b. Order that Petitioner shall not be transferred outside the Middle District of Florida while this habeas petition is pending;
- c. Issue an Order to Show Cause ordering Respondents to show cause why this Petition should not be granted within three days;
- d. Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus requiring that Respondents release Petitioner or, in the alternative, provide Petitioner with a bond hearing pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven days;
- e. Declare that Petitioner's detention is unlawful;
- f. Award Petitioner attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA"), as amended, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and on any other basis justified under law; and
- g. Grant any other and further relief that this Court deems just and proper.

DATED this 9th day of October, 2025.

By: /s/ Joel Alexis Caminero
Joel Alexis Caminero, Esq.
Florida Bar # 127294
Caminero Law, PLLC
5728 Major Blvd, STE 750
Orlando, FL 32819
Tel. (407) 409-2529
Email: joel@caminerolawfirm.com
Attorney for Petitioner

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system, which will send notice of electronic filing to all counsel in this case on October 9, 2025.

/s/Joel Alexis Caminero
Joel Alexis Caminero, Esq.
Florida Bar # 127294
Attorney for Petitioner

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS
CILFIO UDIEL BAUTISTA-OROZCO
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)
 Joel Alexis Caminero, Esq.
 Florida Bar # 127294
 Caminero Law, PLLC

DEFENDANTS

Garrett RIPP, Field Office Director of Enforcement and Removal Operations, Miami, Field Office, Immigration and

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant

(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED

Attorneys (If Known)

 Pamela Bondi, United States Attorney General
 James Uthmeier, Florida Attorney General

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

<input type="checkbox"/> 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Federal Question <i>(U.S. Government Not a Party)</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 U.S. Government Defendant	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Diversity <i>(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)</i>

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF
Citizen of This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Citizen of Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Foreign Nation	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
110 Insurance	<input type="checkbox"/> PERSONAL INJURY	<input type="checkbox"/> PERSONAL INJURY	<input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	<input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act
120 Marine	<input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane	<input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	<input type="checkbox"/> 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))
130 Miller Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	<input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment
140 Negotiable Instrument	<input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander	<input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability	INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS	<input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust
150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	<input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud	<input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights	<input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking
151 Medicare Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine	<input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending	<input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent	<input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce
152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	<input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage	<input type="checkbox"/> 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application	<input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation
153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	<input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle	<input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage	<input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark	<input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
160 Stockholders' Suits	<input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 390 Other Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 880 Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016	<input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit (15 USC 1681 or 1692)
190 Other Contract	<input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury	<input type="checkbox"/> 400 Other Fraud	SOCIAL SECURITY	<input type="checkbox"/> 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act
195 Contract Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	<input type="checkbox"/> 410 Other Personal Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff)	<input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV
196 Franchise			<input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923)	<input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS	<input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	<input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions
210 Land Condemnation	<input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus:	<input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI	<input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts
220 Foreclosure	<input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting	<input type="checkbox"/> 463 Alien Detainee	<input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g))	<input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	<input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	<input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act
240 Torts to Land	<input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/ Accommodations	<input type="checkbox"/> 530 General	<input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	<input type="checkbox"/> 896 Arbitration
245 Tort Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty	<input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party	<input type="checkbox"/> 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision
290 All Other Real Property	<input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other	Other:	26 USC 7609	<input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
	<input type="checkbox"/> 448 Education	<input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other		
		<input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights		
		<input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition		
		<input type="checkbox"/> 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement		

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 Original Proceeding	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Removed from State Court	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Remanded from Appellate Court	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Reinstated or Reopened	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Transferred from Another District (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File
---	---	--	---	--	--	---

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity)

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Brief description of cause:

Petitioner is challenging the pre-trial detention order entered by the immigration judge in his removal proceedings.

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:
 CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P

DEMAND \$

 CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:
JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY
(See instructions):

JUDGE

DOCKET NUMBER

DATE

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

Oct 9, 2025


/s/ Joel Caminero, Esq.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

 RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFFP JUDGE MAG JUDGE

Johonna Davis

9.8.25



To whom It may concern:


I, Johonna Davis, am writing on behalf of my co-worker, Cilfio Uziel Bautista Orozco. I have known Cilfio for nine years and worked with him for all of that time. He is a hard worker, and he always goes beyond the call of duty for us. Furthermore, he is kind, polite, and friendly. I wish I had more people to work as hard as he does with all of his knowledge. I am glad to know him, and I count on him a great deal in our daily working life.

Please call me if you have further questions. Thank you -

Johonna Davis



Wanda ramos



To: The Honorable Immigration Judge

Re: Support for release of Cilfio U diel Bautista Orozco A: [REDACTED]


D.O.B. [REDACTED]

TO: The Honorable Immigration judge:

I, wanda Ramos, am writing this letter for my dear friend cilfio udie Bautista Orozco, whom I have known for 14 years since he live in Guatemala and continued once he came here to the United states, since then, he was always been a good friend to me and my family, considers him like one of our own, like family as well.


I have always known him to be an honest and kind man, and he always does right by his friends And his family. I have always know him to be hardworking man, and he works hard for everything that has. I hope that he can continue to stay in the beautiful county and continue To work and live peacefull.

I hope this letter is enough for you, and if you need any additional information, please don't Hesitate to contact me at the information above. THANK YOU:



Wanda Ramos

JOSE REYES:



09/07/2025

A QUIEN LE PUEDA INTERESAR:


YO : JOSE REYES ,YO CERTIFICO QUE HE CONOSIDO A CILFIO UDIEL BAUTISTA OROZCO HACE10 ANOS,HE TRABAJADO CON EL MUCHAS OBRAS,Y HE SIDO QUE ES UN HOMBRE, TRABAJADOR Y HA SERVIDO A LA COMUNIDAD CON RESPETOS Y VALORES Y TENGO LA DICHA DE CONOSER A SU FAMILIA, SERTIFICO QUE NUNCA HA FALLADO COMO HUMANO ,SI ES POSIBLE QUE EL PUEDA SEGUIR EN ESTE ESTADO QUE LO A AYUDADO Y RESPETADO COMO PERSONA, PORFAVOR DELEN LA OPORTUNIDAD A ESTE SER HUMANO DE SIGIR AHY.GRACIAS POR SU RESPETO.

Jose I. Reyes.

JOSE REYES.

Sandra ramos lopez

9/7/2025



TO whom it may concern,

I,Sandra ramos lopez,am writing this letter to my dear friend cilfio udiel Bautista Orozco,

Whom I have known for 12 years he lived in Guatemala and continued once he came here to the united state,since then,he had always been a good friend to me and my family considers him like one of our.like family as well,


Ihave always know himlike a good family responsible person and a hard working man,with respect and personality .i hope the this letter is enough for any one. he will respect any law off united states.

Any additional information ,please don"hesitate to contact me at the information above.thank you;

attn:
Sandra R Lopez

Sept, 8th 2025

Cassandra Wren



To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing this letter to share my heartfelt recommendation for my dear friend, Clifio Udiel Bautista Orozco. I have had the privilege of knowing Clifio for the past four years, and throughout this time, I have witnessed firsthand the remarkable qualities that define his character and work ethic.

Clifio is an incredibly family-oriented and hardworking individual, always putting his loved ones and his responsibilities first. He has a strong sense of integrity, and his unwavering commitment to doing what is right serves as a model for those around him. Beyond his professional dedication, Clifio is a person who brings joy to every situation. His positive energy is contagious, and he has an innate ability to brighten any room he enters.

Whether in the workplace or in personal interactions, Clifio is always eager to lend a helping hand to anyone in need, ensuring that everyone feels valued and appreciated. His manners and professionalism are exemplary, and he approaches every task with determination and diligence. His strong work ethic, combined with his genuine kindness, makes him an asset in any environment.

I have no doubt that Clifio will continue to achieve great success in whatever he sets his mind to, and I am honored to call him my friend. I wholeheartedly support him in all of his endeavors and am confident that his future will be filled with great accomplishments.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter and learn more about the incredible individual that Clifio is.

Sincerely,
Cassandra Wren



Declaration of Financial Support

Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

USCIS
Form I-134
OMB No. 1615-0014
Expires 12/31/2027

► START HERE - Type or print in black ink.

Part 1. Basis for Filing

1. I am filing this form on behalf of:

Myself as the beneficiary. (Complete **Parts 2., 4., and 7 - 8.** Skip **Parts 3., 5., and 6.**)
 Another individual who is the beneficiary. (Complete **Parts 2. - 3. and Parts 5. - 8.** Skip **Part 4.**)

Part 2. Information About the Individual Agreeing to Financially Support the Beneficiary

All filers must complete **Part 2.**

1. Current Legal Name (Do not provide a nickname.)

Family Name (Last Name)

Ramos Gonzalez

Given Name (First Name)

Wanda

Middle Name (if applicable)

Ivette

2. Other Names Used

Provide all other names you have ever used, including aliases, maiden name, and nicknames. If you need extra space to complete this section, use the space provided in **Part 8. Additional Information.**

Family Name (Last Name)

Ramos

Given Name (First Name)

Wanda

Middle Name (if applicable)

3. Current Mailing Address

In Care Of Name (if any)

Clarissa Guajardo Law Firm

Street Number and Name

4101 Greenbriar Dr

Apt. Ste. Flr. Number

317

City or Town

Houston

State

ZIP Code

TX

77098

Province

Postal Code

Country

US

4. Is your current mailing address the same as your current physical address?

Yes No

If you answered "No" to **Item Number 4.**, provide your current physical address in **Item Number 5.**