

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

Veronica Sofia Escobar-Ruiz,

Petitioner,

v.

Kevin RAYCRAFT, Field Office Acting
Director of Enforcement and Removal
Operations, Detroit 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; THE GEO
GROUP INC., facility operators; John DOE,
Warden of North Lake Correctional Facility (or
his/her successors),

Respondents.

Case No. 25-1232

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS**

INTRODUCTION

1
2 1. Petitioner VERONICA SOFIA ESCOBAR-RUIZ is in the physical custody of
3 Respondents at the North Lake Correctional Facility. She now faces unlawful detention because
4 the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Executive Office of Immigration Review
5 (EOIR) have concluded Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention.

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

8 3. Based on this allegation in Petitioner's removal proceeding, DHS denied
9 Petitioner release from immigration custody, consistent with a new DHS policy issued on July 8,
10 2025, instructing all Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) employees to consider anyone
11 inadmissible under § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i)—i.e., those who entered the United States without
12 inspection—to be an “applicant for admission” under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore
13 subject to mandatory detention.

14 4. Petitioner seeks a bond redetermination hearing before an Immigration Judge of
15 the Executive Office for Immigration Review. However, following *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29
16 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), EOIR now declines jurisdiction to consider bond for individuals
17 deemed “applicants for admission” under § 1225(b)(2)(A). As a result, despite Petitioner's
18 twenty-five years of continuous residence in the United States, deep family ties, and lack of
19 danger or flight risk, she remains mandatorily detained without any opportunity for
20 individualized review. This categorical denial of bond authority results in indefinite detention
21 without administrative recourse, raising serious constitutional concerns that warrant this Court's
22 intervention under 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

23 5. Petitioner's detention on this basis violates the plain language of the Immigration
24 and Nationality Act. Section 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to individuals like Petitioner who

1 previously entered and are now residing in the United States. Instead, such individuals are
2 subject to a different statute, § 1226(a), that allows for release on conditional parole or bond.
3 That statute expressly applies to people who, like Petitioner, are charged as inadmissible for
4 having entered the United States without inspection.

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

8 7. Accordingly, Petitioner seeks a writ of habeas corpus requiring that she be
9 released unless Respondents provide a bond hearing under § 1226(a) within fourteen (14) days.

10 JURISDICTION

11 8. Petitioner is a resident of Illinois, in the physical custody of Respondents.
12 Petitioner is detained at the North Lake Correctional Facility, 1805 W. 32nd Street, Baldwin, MI,
13 49304.

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

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

19 VENUE

20 11. Pursuant to *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493-
21 500 (1973), venue lies in the United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan,
22 the Southern Division, the judicial district in which Petitioner currently is detained.

23 12. Venue is also properly in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because
24 Respondents are employees, officers, and agencies of the United States, and because a

1 substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in the Southern
2 Division of the Western District of Michigan.

3 **REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243**

4 13. The Court must grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus or order Respondents
5 to show cause “forthwith,” unless the petitioner is not entitled to relief. 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If an
6 order to show cause is issued, the Respondents must file a return “within three days unless for
7 good cause additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is allowed.” *Id.*

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

14 **PARTIES**

15 15. Petitioner VERONICA SOFIA ESCOBAR RUIZ is a citizen of Mexico who has
16 been in immigration detention since September 27, 2025. After arresting Petitioner in Illinois,
17 ICE did not set bond; to date, an Immigration Judge has not set bond because she was deemed an
18 “applicant for admission.” Petitioner has resided in the United States since she arrived in or
19 around 2007 with her sibling.

20 16. Respondent, Kevin Raycraft, is the Director of the Detroit Field Office of ICE’s
21 Enforcement and Removal Operations division. As such, Kevin Raycraft is Petitioner’s
22 immediate custodian and is responsible for Petitioner’s detention and removal. He is named in
23 his official capacity.

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

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

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

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

15 21. Respondent The Geo Group, Inc. is the private entity under contract with ICE
16 operating the North Lake Correctional Facility, where Petitioner is detained. They have
17 immediate physical custody of Petitioner. They are sued in their official capacity.

18 22. Respondent John Doe (or his/her successors) is employed by The Geo Group, Inc.
19 as Warden of the North Lake Correctional Facility, where Petitioner is detained. He has
20 immediate physical custody of Petitioner. He is sued in his official capacity.

21
22 **LEGAL FRAMEWORK**

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

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

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

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

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

12 28. The detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) were enacted as part of the
13 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996, Pub. L. No.
14 104–208, Div. C, §§ 302–03, 110 Stat. 3009–546, 3009–582 to 3009–583, 3009–585. Section
15 1226(a) was most recently amended earlier this year by the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No. 119–1,
16 139 Stat. 3 (2025).

17 29. Following the enactment of the IIRIRA, EOIR drafted new regulations explaining
18 that, in general, people who entered the country without inspection were not considered detained
19 under § 1225 and that they were instead detained under § 1226(a). *See* Inspection and Expedited
20 Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings;
21 Asylum Procedures, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997).

22 30. Thus, in the decades that followed, most people who entered without inspection
23 and were placed in standard removal proceedings received bond hearings, unless their criminal
24 history rendered them ineligible. That practice was consistent with many more decades of prior

1 practice, in which noncitizens who were not deemed “arriving” were entitled to a custody
2 hearing before an IJ or other hearing officer. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a) (1994); *see also* H.R. Rep.
3 No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 229 (1996) (noting that § 1226(a) simply “restates” the detention authority
4 previously found at § 1252(a)).

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

8 32. The new policy, entitled “Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for
9 Applicants for Admission,”¹ claims that all persons who entered the United States without
10 inspection shall now be deemed “applicants for admission” under 8 U.S.C. § 1225, and therefore
11 are subject to mandatory detention provision under § 1225(b)(2)(A). The policy applies
12 regardless of when a person is apprehended, and affects those who have resided in the United
13 States for months, years, and even decades.

14 33. In a May 22, 2025, unpublished decision from the Board of Immigration Appeals
15 (BIA), EOIR adopts this same position.² That decision holds that all noncitizens who entered the
16 United States without admission or parole are considered applicants for admission and are
17 ineligible for immigration judge bond hearings.

18 34. ICE and EOIR have adopted this position even though federal courts have
19 rejected this exact conclusion. For example, after IJs in the Tacoma, Washington, immigration
20 court stopped providing bond hearings for persons who entered the United States without
21 inspection and who have since resided here, the U.S. District Court in the Western District of
22 Washington found that such a reading of the INA is likely unlawful and that § 1226(a), not §
23

24 ¹ Available at <https://www.aila.org/library/ice-memo-interim-guidance-regarding-detention-authority-for-applications-for-admission>.

² Available at <https://nwirp.org/our-work/impact-litigation/assets/vazquez/59-1%20ex%20A%20decision.pdf>.

1 1225(b), applies to noncitizens who are not apprehended upon arrival to the United States.
2 *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, --- F. Supp. 3d --- 2025 WL 1193850 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 24,
3 2025); *see also Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11571-JEK, 2025 WL 1869299, at *8 (D. Mass.
4 July 7, 2025) (granting habeas petition based on same conclusion).

5 35. DHS's and DOJ's interpretation defies the INA. As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court
6 explained, the plain text of the statutory provisions demonstrates that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b),
7 applies to people like Petitioner.

8 36. Section 1226(a) applies by default to all persons "pending a decision on whether
9 the [noncitizen] is to be removed from the United States." These removal hearings are held under
10 § 1229a, to "decid[e] the inadmissibility or deportability of a[] [noncitizen]."

11 37. The text of § 1226 also explicitly applies to people charged as being inadmissible,
12 including those who entered without inspection. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E). Subparagraph
13 (E)'s reference to such people makes clear that, by default, such people are afforded a bond
14 hearing under subsection (a). As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court explained, "[w]hen Congress
15 creates "specific exceptions" to a statute's applicability, it "proves" that absent those exceptions,
16 the statute generally applies. *Rodriguez Vazquez*, 2025 WL 1193850, at *12 (citing *Shady Grove*
17 *Orthopedic Assocs., P.A. v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 559 U.S. 393, 400 (2010)).

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

21 39. By contrast, § 1225(b) applies to people arriving at U.S. ports of entry or who
22 recently entered the United States. The statute's entire framework is premised on inspections at
23 the border of people who are "seeking admission" to the United States. 8 U.S.C.
24 § 1225(b)(2)(A). Indeed, the Supreme Court has explained that this mandatory detention scheme

1 applies “at the Nation’s borders and ports of entry, where the Government must determine
2 whether a[] [noncitizen] seeking to enter the country is admissible.” *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583
3 U.S. 281, 287 (2018).

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

7 **FACTS**

8 41. Petitioner has resided in the United States since 2007 and lives in Illinois with her
9 three U.S. citizen children.

10 42. On or about September 27, 2025, Petitioner was detained in Illinois while she was
11 pumping gas. She was processed at the ICE correctional facility in Broadview, IL before being
12 transferred to the North Lake Correctional Facility in Michigan. She is being held at the ICE
13 Detention center in Wayne County, Baldwin, MI, operated by The Geo Group, Inc.

14 43. DHS has not placed Petitioner in removal proceedings before the Detroit
15 Immigration Court pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. ICE has charged Petitioner with, *inter alia*,
16 being inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) as someone who entered the United States
17 without inspection.

18 44. Petitioner is the mother of three U.S. citizen children, ages 8, 10, and 15, all of
19 whom depend on her for emotional and financial support. She last entered the United States in
20 2007 at the age of fifteen and has lived continuously in this country for over seventeen years.
21 During that time, she has built a stable family and meaningful ties within her community.
22 Petitioner has maintained consistent employment, paid taxes, and contributed positively through
23 her church and her children’s school activities. She has no criminal history, has complied with all
24

1 prior immigration requirements to the best of her ability, and poses neither a flight risk nor any
2 danger to the community.

3 45. Following Petitioner's arrest and transfer to North Lake Correctional Facility, ICE
4 issued a custody determination to continue Petitioner's detention without an opportunity to post
5 bond or be released on other conditions.

6 46. Petitioner has not had any bond redetermination hearing before an IJ and there is
7 no court proceedings attached to her A-number in the EOIR system.

8 47. To date, no IJ has issued a decision that the court lacks jurisdiction to conduct a
9 bond redetermination hearing because Petitioner was an applicant for admission under §
10 1225(b)(2)(A).

11 48. As a result, Petitioner remains in detention. Without relief from this court, she
12 faces the prospect of months, or even years, in immigration custody, separated from her children,
13 family and community.

14 49. Any appeal to the BIA is futile. DHS's new policy was issued "in coordination
15 with DOJ," which oversees the immigration courts. Further, as noted, the most recent
16 unpublished BIA decision on this issue held that persons like Petitioner are subject to mandatory
17 detention as applicants for admission. Finally, in the *Rodriguez Vazquez* litigation, where EOIR
18 and the Attorney General are defendants, DOJ has affirmed its position that individuals like
19 Petitioner are applicants for admission and subject to detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). *See* Mot.
20 to Dismiss, *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, No. 3:25-CV-05240-TMC (W.D. Wash. June 6,
21 2025), Dkt. 49 at 27–31.

22 **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

23 **COUNT I**

24 **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.

COUNT II

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

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

- a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- b. Issue a writ of habeas corpus requiring that Respondents release Petitioner or provide Petitioner with a bond hearing pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within 14 days;
- c. 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
- d. Grant any other and further relief that this Court deems just and proper.

Dated: October 14, 2025

Respectfully Submitted by:

/s/ William A. Quiceno

Kempster, Corcoran, Quiceno &
Lenz- Calvo, Ltd.
332 S. Michigan Avenue, Suite 1428
Chicago, IL 60604
(312) 341-9730
Atty. Code: 6243695