GREEN | EVANS-SCHROEDER, PLLC
130 W. Cushing Street
Tucson, AZ 85718
Tel. (520) 882-8852
Fax (520) 882-8843

Ami Hutchinson | Arizona Bar No. 039150
Email: ami@arizonaimmigration.net

Jesse Evans-Schroeder | Arizona Bar No. 027434
Email: jesse@arizonaimmigration.net

Attorneys for Petitioner
Edy Noe Baten Perez

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Edy Noe Baten Perez,

Petitioner-Plaintiff,

v.

John Cantu, Field Office Director, Phoenix Field Office, U.S. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement; U.S. Department of Homeland Security;

Kristi Noem, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security;

Pamela Bondi, Attorney General of the United States;

Fred Figueroa, Warden of Eloy Detention Center; and

Todd Lyons, Acting Director, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, U.S. Department of Homeland Security;

Respondents-Defendants.

Case No. 2:25-CV-_____

EMERGENCY MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER / PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Challenge to Unlawful Incarceration Under Color of Immigration Detention Statutes; Request for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief

NOTICE OF MOTION

Pursuant to Rule 65(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Rule 65-1 of the Local Rules of this Court, Petitioner moves this Court for an order enjoining Respondents John E. Cantú, in his official capacity as Field Office Director of Enforcement and Removal Operations, Phoenix Field Office, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Kristi Noem, in her official capacity as the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security ("DHS"), Pamela Bondi, in her official capacity as the U.S. Attorney General with authority over the Executive Office for Immigration Review, and Fred Figueroa, in his official capacity as Warden of the Eloy Detention Center, where Petitioner is detained, from continuing to detain Petitioner. Alternatively, Petitioner moves this Court to order the Respondents to provide a constitutionally-compliant bond hearing at which the government must demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that Petitioner is a danger or a flight risk. Petitioner additionally seeks to enjoin Respondents from removing Petitioner from the U.S. to any third country to which he does not have a removal order without first providing him with constitutionally-compliant procedures. Respondents should also not transfer the Petitioner outside the District of Arizona, where he is presently located. Such an order would maintain the status quo while habeas jurisdiction is litigated and would ensure that Petitioner remains close to legal counsel.

The reasons for this Motion are set forth in the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities. As demonstrated therein, Petitioner warrants a preliminary injunction where the legal basis for the IJ's determination that Petitioner is subject to

mandatory detention is fatally flawed. Separately but concurrently, Petitioner files a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus on the same grounds.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that this Court grant his request for a preliminary injunction and/or temporary restraining order which prohibits Respondents from continuing to detain him longer than seven (7) days after an Order to release him is issued, or orders that a bond hearing before an Immigration Judge be provided within seven (7) days, at which the government must demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent's continued detention is justified, and enjoining Respondents from removing Petitioner outside the District of Arizona.

Dated: October 16, 2025

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Ami Hutchinson
Attorney for Petitioner

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner, Edy Noe Baten Perez, seeks a Preliminary Injunction ("PI") and/or Temporary Restraining Order ("TRO") that requires Respondents to either release him from custody within seven days of the issuance of a PI/TRO, or an order requiring Respondents to provide a bond hearing before an immigration judge ("IJ") within seven days where the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") bears the burden of demonstrating that Petitioner's re-detention is justified, and where the IJ must further consider whether, in lieu of detention, alternatives exist to mitigate any risk that Respondents may establish. Petitioner also seeks to enjoin Respondents from removing Petitioner, who does not have an order of removal, from the District of Arizona.

Petitioner should prevail on this motion because he is likely to succeed on the merits of his claims. The text of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) demonstrate that he is not subject to mandatory detention, and numerous federal courts have rejected the government's novel argument that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) governs the detention of *every* noncitizen without lawful immigration status. *See infra* nn. 2 & 3.

Petitioner is suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of a PI or TRO. He has now been detained in Arizona, thousands of miles from his wife and two young children—one of whom suffers complications from a premature birth—for over three months. The balance of equities tips in his favor, and a PI/TRO is in the public interest. Prudential exhaustion is not required here due to futility, irreparable injury, and agency delay. Finally, there is no jurisdictional hurdle barring relief. This Court should thus grant this motion.

II. STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

Petitioner is a 37-year-old native and citizen of Guatemala. He entered the country without inspection in April 2004, shortly before his 18th birthday. He and his wife married in September 2016, and together they have two U.S. citizen children: a daughter, aged 2, and a son, aged 9 months. Petitioner's daughter, K[redacted] was born prematurely at 28 weeks and suffers from bronchopulmonary dysplasia. Respondent is also the stepfather to three children his wife has from a prior relationship, one of whom is a lawful permanent resident (LPR).

Petitioner was initially apprehended by immigration authorities in February 2017. He was arrested on a warrant issued "pursuant to section[] 236" of the INA, or § 1226, Exh. A, and was released upon the posting of a $1,500 bond, again "[p]ursuant to the authority contained in section 236" of the INA, or § 1226. Exh. B. DHS also issued a Notice to Appear in removal proceedings in which it did not allege that Petitioner was an arriving alien but, instead, was present without being admitted or paroled. Exh. C.

In July 2025, DHS encountered Petitioner while he was on the side of the road having car trouble. DHS took Petitioner back into custody and transferred him to a detention center in Florence, Arizona. On July 31, 2025, Petitioner moved for bond, asking the Immigration Judge to release him upon posting the lowest permissible bond. On August 6, 2025, the IJ denied Petitioner's motion without a hearing, finding he was subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). Exh. D.

Petitioner appealed to the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). On the same day that the BIA issued a briefing schedule for this case, the Board published its decision in

Matter of Yajure Hurtado, holding that noncitizens who are present without admission are subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). In his brief, Petitioner conceded that he was subject to mandatory detention under *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* and asked the BIA to overrule its decision.

III. LEGAL STANDARD

Petitioner is entitled to preliminary injunctive relief if he establishes that he is "likely to succeed on the merits, . . . likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in [his] favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest." *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.,* 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008). Even if Petitioner does not show a likelihood of success on the merits, the Court may still grant relief if he raises "serious questions" as to the merits of his claims, the balance of hardships tips "sharply" in his favor, and the remaining equitable factors are satisfied. *Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127 (9th Cir. 2011). As shown below, Petitioner overwhelmingly satisfies both standards.

IV. ARGUMENT

Petitioner should prevail on this motion because he is likely to succeed on the merits of his claims, likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, the balance of equities tips in his favor, and an injunction is in the public interest.

A. PETITIONER IS LIKELY TO SUCCEED ON THE MERITS OF HIS CLAIM

1. Discretionary Versus Mandatory Detention

Noncitizens detained by DHS while in removal proceedings generally can request

a bond—or "custody redetermination"—hearing before an IJ. 8 U.S.C. 1226(a); 8 C.F.R. 1236.1(d)(1). If the noncitizen does not present a danger to others, a threat to the national security, or a flight risk, the IJ may order that individual released on conditional parole or upon the posting of a monetary bond of no less than $1,500. 8 U.S.C. 1226(a)(2)(A)-(B); *Matter of Guerra*, 24 I&N Dec. 37 (BIA 2006).

Certain categories of noncitizens are subject to mandatory detention while in removal proceedings. Under a provision in IIRIRA, if "an alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, the alien shall be detained for a proceeding under [8 U.S.C. 1229a]." 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(A). In the same bill, Congress defined "admission" and "admitted" as 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). In other words, the terms "admission" and "admitted" "refer to inspection and authorization by an immigration officer at the port of entry." *Hing Sum v. Holder*, 602 F.3d 1092, 1101 (9th Cir. 2010). Thus, as the Supreme Court has explained, 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(A) only applies to noncitizens who are "seeking admission into the country," *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 289 (2018), i.e., those who are "arriving in the United States." *Clark v. Martinez*, 543 U.S. 371 (2005).

Consistent with the text of 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(A), federal regulations preclude IJs from granting bond to "arriving aliens," 8 C.F.R. 1003.19(h)(1)(B)(ii), a phrase defined in relevant part as "an applicant for admission coming or attempting to come into the United States at a port-of-entry." 8 C.F.R. 1001.1(q). The decision to preclude IJs from granting bond to arriving aliens—as distinct from all noncitizens who entered

without admission—was the product of notice and comment rulemaking in 1997 following the enactment of the IIRIRA. As the regulations were initially proposed, all "[i]nadmissible aliens in removal proceedings" would have been ineligible for bond. *Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal*, 62 Fed. Reg. 444, 483 (Jan. 3, 1997). After receiving comments, however, the Attorney General deleted the proposed provision and replaced it with one that would apply only to "[a]rriving aliens." *See* 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10361 (March 6, 1997).

As the Attorney General explained, "[t]he effect of this change [was] that inadmissible aliens, except for arriving aliens, have available to them bond redetermination hearings before an IJ, while arriving aliens do not." *Id.* at 10323. In other words, "aliens who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as aliens who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination." *Id.*

The IIRIRA also made subject to mandatory detention those noncitizens who have been convicted of certain crimes or engaged in terrorist activity. For example, noncitizens who are inadmissible by reason of having committed certain criminal offenses, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(A), and those inadmissible for having engaged in terrorist activity, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(D). More recently, under the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No. 119-1, Congress mandated detention for noncitizens who entered without admission and were subsequently charged with, arrested for, convicted of, or admitted to certain offenses. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E). These provisions under § 1226(c) would be

superfluous if all noncitizens who were present without admission were already subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A).

2. The Government's Novel and Widely Rejected Theory That All Noncitizens Who Entered Without Admission Are Subject to Mandatory Detention

On Friday, July 4, 2025, President Trump signed the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, Pub. L. No. 119-21, 139 Stat. 72. Among other things, the bill appropriated $45 billion to ICE to detain noncitizens through fiscal year 2029. § 90003, 139 Stat. 358.

On Tuesday, July 8, 2025, Acting ICE Director Todd Lyons issued a memorandum stating that DHS and the Department of Justice had "revisited" the government's legal position regarding the statutory basis for detaining noncitizens who were present in the country without being admitted. According to Lyons, the government now believed that noncitizens present without admission are subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. 1225(b), rather than discretionary detention under 8 U.S.C. 1226(a), because, under 8 U.S.C. 1225(a)(1), they are deemed "applicant[s] for admission." The memo further stated that this change in legal interpretation might "warrant re-detention of a previously released alien in a given case."

On September 5, 2025, the BIA issued a precedential decision adopting ICE's novel argument that all noncitizens who are present without admission are subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(A). *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). The BIA acknowledged that 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(A) only applies to noncitizens who are "seeking admission," but, like ICE, concluded that the provision applied to all noncitizens who are present without admission as they are also "applicant[s]

for admission" under § 1225(a)(1). 29 I&N Dec. at 218. The BIA acknowledged that its interpretation rendered superfluous multiple provisions of § 1226(c), including one recently enacted in the Laken Riley Act, but it stated that "redundancies are common in statutory drafting." 29 I&N Dec. at 221-22 (quoting *Barton v. Barr*, 590 U.S. 222 (2020)).

A motion to reconsider had been filed in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*. The motion challenges the Board's statutory analysis and asks it to withdraw its decision because (a) the underlying removal proceedings had concluded by the time the Board issued its decision, making the case moot, and (b) the decision conflicts with longstanding regulations issued by the Attorney General.[1]

To date, dozens of federal district judges have either outright rejected the government's novel interpretation,[2] or found that noncitizens challenging the

---

[1] The Board's Decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* is also not entitled to deference because it contravenes the statutory language and legislative history, and it deviates from longstanding agency practice and regulations.

[2] *BDVS v. Forestal*, No. 25-1968 (S.D. In. Oct. 8, 2025) (Evans Barker, J.); Eliseo v. Olson, No. 25-3381, Oct. 8, 2025) (Blackwell, J.); *Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi,* No. 25-3726, (S.D. Tx. Oct. 7, 2025) (Rosenthal, J.); *Echevarria v. Bondi*, No. 25-3252, 2025 LX 492534 (D. Ariz. Oct. 3, 2025); *Belsai D.S. v. Bondi*, No. 25-3682 (D. Mn. Oct. 1, 2025) (Menendez, J.); *Santiago Santiago v. Noem*, No. 25-361 (W.D. Tx. Oct. 1, 2025) (Cardone, J.); *Quispe-Ardiles v. Noem*, No. 25-1382, 2025 WL 2783799 (E.D. Va. Sept. 30, 2025) (Nachmanoff, J.); *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, No. 25-5240, 2025 WL 2782499 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 30, 2025) (Cartwright, J.); *Da Silva v. ICE*, No. 25-284, 2025 WL 2778083 (D.N.H. Sept. 29, 2025) (McCafferty, J.); *Quispe v. Crawford*, No. 25-1471, 2025 WL 2783799 (E.D. Va. Sept. 29, 2025) (Trenga, J.); *Inlago Tocagon v. Moniz*, No. 25-12453, 2025 WL 2778023 (D. Mass. Sept. 29, 2025) (Joun, J.); *Barrios v. Shepley*, No. 25-406, 2025 WL 2772579 (D. Maine Sept. 29, 2025) (Woodcock, Jr.); *J.U. v. Maldonado*, No. 25-4836, 2025 WL 2772765 (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 29, 2025) (Merchant, J.); *Savane v. Francis*, No. 25-6666, 2025 WL 2774452 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 28, 2025) (Woods, J.); *Zumba v. Bondi*, No. 25-14626, 2025 WL 2753496 (D.N.J. Sept. 26, 2025) (Hayden, J.); *Villanueva Herrera v. Tate*, No. 25-3364 (S.D. Tx. Sept 26, 2025) (Hittner, J.); *Gamez Lira v. Noem*, No. 25-855 (D.N.M. 25-855) (Johnson, J.); *Singh v. Lewis*, No. 25-96, 2025 LX 400065 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 22, 2025)

government's interpretation were substantially likely to prevail on the merits.[3] These

---

(Jennings, J.); *Chafla v. Scott*, No. 25-437, 2025 LX 422663 (D. Maine Sept. 21, 2025) (Neumann, J.); *Hasan v. Crawford*, No. 25-1408, 2025 LX 499354 (E.D. Va. Sept. 19, 2025) (Brinkema, J.); *Barrera v. Tindall*, No. 25-451, 2025 LX 435572 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 19, 2025) (Jenning, J.); *Salazar v. Dedos*, No. 25-835, 2025 WL 2676729 (D.N.M. Sept. 17, 2025) (Urias, J.); *Garcia Cortes v. Noem*, No. 25-2677, 2025 WL 2652880 (D. Colo. Sept. 16, 2025) (Sweeney, J.); *Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft*, No. 25-12546, 2025 WL 2609425 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9, 2025) (White, J.); *Sampiao v. Hyde*, No. 25-11981, 2025 WL 2607924 (D. Mass. Sept. 9, 2025) (Kobick, J.); *Jimenez v. FCI Berlin*, No. 25-326, 2025 LX 360066 (D.N.H. Sept. 8, 2025) (McCafferty, J.); *Doe v. Moniz*, No. 25-12094, 2025 WL 2576819 (D. Mass. Sept. 5, 2025) (Talwani, J.); *Lopez Benitez v. Francis*, No. 25-5937, 2025 WL 2267803 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 8, 2025) (Ho, J.); *Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft*, No. 25-12486, 2025 WL 2496379 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025) (McMillion, J.); *Diaz v. Mattivelo*, No. 25-12226, 2025 WL 2457610 (D. Mass. Aug. 27, 2025) (Kobick, J.); *Jose J.O.E. v. Bondi*, No. 25-3051, 2025 WL 2466670 (D. Minn. Aug. 27, 2025) (Tostrud, J.); *Leal-Hernandez v. Noem*, No. 25-2428, 2025 WL 2430025 (D. Md. Aug. 24, 2025) (Rubin, J.); *Romero v. Hyde*, No. 25-11631, __ F.Supp.3d __, 2025 WL 2403827 (D. Mass. Aug. 19, 2025) (Murphy, J.); *Samb v. Joyce*, No. 25-6373, 2025 WL 2398831 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 19, 2025) (Ho, J.); *dos Santos v. Noem*, No. 25-12052, 2025 WL 2370988 (D. Mass. Aug. 14, 2025) (Kobick, J.); *Diaz Martinez v. Hyde*, No. 25-11613, __ F.Supp.3d __, 2025 WL 2084238 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025) (Murphy, J.); *Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 25-11571, 2025 WL 1869299 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025) (Kobick, J.).

[3] *Flores v. Noem*, No. 25-2490, 2025 LX 444718 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2025) (Birotte, J.); *Roa v. Albarran*, No. 25-7802, 2025 WL 2732923 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2025) (*Seeborg*, J.); *Lopez v. Hardin*, No. 25-830, 2025 WL 2732717 (M.D. Fla. Sept. 25, 2025) (Dudek, J.); *Guerrero Lepe v. Andrews*, No. 1:25-cv-01163 (E.D. Ca Sept. 23, 2025) (Sherriff, J.); *Aceros v. Kaiser*, No. 25-06924, 2025 LX 330524 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 12, 2025) (Chen, J.); *Guzman v. Andrews*, No. 25-01015, 2025 LX 354551 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025) (Sherriff, J.); *Mosqueda v. Noem*, No. 25-2304, 2025 WL 2591530 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2025) (Snyder, J.); *Nieves v. Kaiser*, No. 25-6921, 2025 LX 320701 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025) (Beeler, J.); *Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-2180, 2025 WL 2549431 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025) (Sabraw. J.); *Garcia v. Kaiser*, No. 25-06916, 2025 LX 322337 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 29, 2025) (Gonzalez Rogers, J.); *Kostak v. Trump*, No. 25-1093, 2025 WL 2472136 (W.D. La. Aug. 27, 2025) (Edwards, J.); *Benitez v. Noem*, No. 25-02190, 2025 LX 322897 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 26, 2025) (Klausner, J.); *Ramirez Clavijo v. Kaiser*, No. 25-06248, 2025 WL 2419263 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2025) (Freeman, J.); *Arrazola-Gonzalez v. Noem*, No. 25-01789, 2025 WL 2379285 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2025) (Wright, J.); *Maldonado v. Olson*, No. 25-3142, 2025 WL 2374411 (D. Minn. Aug. 15, 2025) (Nelson, J.); *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 25-01873, 2025 LX 341363 (C.D. Cal. July 28, 2025); *Vazquez v. Bostock*, No. 25-05240, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239 (W.D. Wash. April 24, 2025) (Cartwright, J.). *But see Sixtos Chavez v. Noem*, No. 3:25-cv-02325-CAB-SBC (S.D. Cal. Sep. 24, 2025) (denying temporary restraining order).

judges have not been unsparing in their criticism of the government's newfound position. One called it a "nonstarter." *Doe v. Moniz*, No. 25-12094, 2025 WL 2576819 at *10 (D. Mass. Sept. 5, 2025). Another called it "willfully blind." *Leal-Hernandez v. Noem*, No. 25-2428, 2025 WL 2430025 at *25 (D. Md. Aug. 24, 2025). Another called it "a policy argument, projected onto Congress." *Romero v. Hyde*, No. 25-11631, __ F. Supp. 3d __, 2025 WL 2403827 at *28 (D. Mass. Aug. 19, 2025). And another noted that the government "could not identify any federal court that has adopted their novel reading of § 1225(b)(2)(A)." *Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft*, No. 25-12546, 2025 WL 2609425 at *20 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9, 2025).

It is not difficult to understand why federal district courts have rejected the government's novel interpretation. By its terms, 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(A) only applies to noncitizens who are "seeking admission," and Congress defined "admission" as 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). Accordingly, "[c]onstruing section 1225(b)(2) to apply to noncitizens already residing in the country would read the word 'entry' out of the definitions of 'admitted' and 'admission.'" *Chafla v. Scott*, No. 25-437, 2025 LX 422663 (D. Maine Sept. 21, 2025) (citing 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(13)(A)). As importantly, if "the [BIA was] correct that § 1225(b)'s mandatory detention provisions apply to all persons who have not been admitted into the United States, that would render superfluous those provisions of § 1226 that apply to certain categories of inadmissible aliens, such as § 1226(c)(1)(A), (D), and (E)." *Hasan v. Crawford*, __ F. Supp. 3d __, 2025 WL 268225 at *22 (E.D. Va. Sept. 19, 2025) (Brinkema, J.). The BIA's

interpretation would also "render the Laken Riley Act a meaningless amendment, since it would have prescribed mandatory detention for noncitizens already subject to it." *Aceros v. Kaiser*, 2025 WL 2637503 at *28 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 12, 2025).

Indeed, the plain text of § 1226 demonstrates that subsection (a) applies to Petitioner. Section 1226(a) permits the release of noncitizens who are detained "pending a decision on whether the [noncitizen] is to be removed from the United States." 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). While § 1226(a) provides the right to seek release, § 1226(c) carves out specific categories of noncitizens—including certain categories of noncitizens who are inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)—and subjects them instead to mandatory detention. *See, e.g.,* § 1226(c)(1)(A), (C). If § 1226(a) could never apply to inadmissible noncitizens, there would be no reason to specify that § 1226(c) governs certain persons who are inadmissible; instead, § 1226(c) would only have needed to address people who are deportable for certain offenses under 8 U.S.C. § 1227(a).

Recent amendments to § 1226 dramatically reinforce that this section covers people like Petitioner, whom DHS alleges to be present without admission. Specifically, the Laken Riley Act added language to § 1226 that directly references those who are inadmissible under § 1182(a)(6) because they are present without admission or under § 1182(a)(7) because of the lack valid documentation. *See* Laken Riley Act (LRA), Pub. L. No. 119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025); 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E). By including such individuals under § 1226(c) and carving them out of § 1226(a) if they have been arrested, charged with, or convicted of certain crimes, Congress reaffirmed that § 1226(a) covers persons charged under § 1182(a)(6) or (a)(7). *See Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock,* No. 3:25-CV-

05240-TMC, 2025 WL 1193850, at *14 (W.D. Wash. June 6, 2025) (explaining these amendments explicitly provide that § 1226(a) covers people like Petitioner because the "'specific exceptions' [in the LRA] for inadmissible noncitizens who are arrested, charged with, or convicted of the enumerated crimes logically leaves those inadmissible noncitizens not criminally implicated under Section 1226(a)'s default rule for discretionary detention."); *Diaz Martinez v. Hyde*, 2025 WL 2084238, at *7 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025) ("if, as the Government argue[s], . . . a non-citizen's inadmissibility were alone already sufficient to mandate detention under section 1225(b)(2)(A), then the 2025 amendment would have no effect." 2025 WL 2084238, at *7; *Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11571-JEK, 2025 WL 1869299, at *7 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025) (similar). *See also Shady Grove Orthopedic Assocs., P.A. v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 559 U.S. 393, 400 (2010) (observing that a statutory exception would be unnecessary if the statute at issue did not otherwise cover the excepted conduct).

Unlike 8 U.S.C. § 1226, section 1225(b) requires the detention of certain individuals who are arriving at U.S. ports of entry or who recently entered the United States. As relevant here, § 1225(b)(2)(A) applies only to individuals who are "seeking admission" to the United States.[4] *See Vasquez-Garcia et al. v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2549431 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025) (rejecting DHS' contention that an individual who entered the

[4] 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) concerns "expedited removal of inadmissible arriving [noncitizens]," including those who present themselves for inspection upon "arriving" and other individuals designated by the Attorney General who have been present in the United States for less than two years, and who are "inadmissible under section 1182(a)(6)(C) or § 1182(a)(7)." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i). Subsection (b)(1) does not require Petitioner's detention because he did not present himself for inspection.

United States without inspection "is automatically understood to be 'seeking admission' within the meaning of § 1225(b)(2)(A), without need[ing] to affirmatively apply for admission or parole"); *Arrazola Gonzalez v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2379285 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2025) (concluding that habeas petitioner showed likelihood of success on the merits of argument that "[t]o ignore the 'seeking admission' language [in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) . . . would render the language purposeless and violate a key rule of statutory construction"); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 1.2 (addressing noncitizens who are presently "coming or attempting to come into the United States").

8 U.S.C. § 1225 further defines its scope by reference to "inspections"—a term not defined in the INA, but which typically connotes an examination upon or soon after physical entry. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225 (titled "Inspection by immigration officers; expedited removal of inadmissible arriving [noncitizens]; referral for hearing"); §§ 1225(b)(1)–(2) (referring to "inspections" in their titles); § 1225(b)(2)(A), (b)(4) (referring to "examining immigration officers'); § 1225(d)(1) (authorizing immigration officials to search certain conveyances in order to conduct "inspections" where noncitizens "are being brought into the United States"); *see also Dubin v. United States*, 599 U.S. 110, 120–21 (2023) (emphasis added) (relying on section title to help construe statute). Many statutory provisions, various regulations, and agency precedent also discuss "inspection" in the context of admission processes at ports of entry, further supporting the conclusion that § 1225 has a limited temporal and geographic scope. *See*, *e.g.*, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1187(h)(2)(B)(i), 1225A; 8 U.S.C. § 1752a; 8 C.F.R. § 235.1; *Matter of Quilantan*, 25

I&N Dec. 285 (BIA 2010)); *see also King v. Burwell*, 576 U.S. 473, 492 (2015) (looking to an Act's "broader structure . . . to determine [the statute's] meaning").

The statutory and regulatory text's use of the present and present progressive tenses further excludes noncitizens apprehended in the interior, because they are no longer in the process of arriving in or seeking admission to the United States. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(C) (addressing the "[t]reatment of [noncitizens] *arriving* from contiguous territory," i.e. those who are "*arriving* on land") (emphasis added). As the Supreme Court recognized, 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," and § 1225 is concerned "primarily [with those] seeking entry." *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287, 297 (2018).

The Board in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* ignored the "seeking admission" requirement and instead focused solely on whether an individual who enters the U.S. without inspection is "applicant for admission," as § 1225(b)(2)(A) also requires. But as the Ninth Circuit has explained, "when deciding whether language is plain, [courts] must read the words in their context and with a view to their place in the overall statutory scheme." *San Carlos Apache Tribe v. Becerra*, 53 F.4th 1236, 1240 (9th Cir. 2022) (internal quotation marks omitted). In context, the differential phrasing of "applicant for admission" and "seeking admission" in the same statutory subsection is significant, because "applicant for admission" is a term of art that has been analyzed as such by both the Supreme Court and the Ninth Circuit. *See DHS v. Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 109 (2020); *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287, 297 (2018); *see also Torres v. Barr*,

976 F.3d 918, 927 (9th Cir. 2020) (en banc) (an individual submits an "application for admission" only at "the moment in time when the immigrant actually applies for admission into the [U.S.]."). By contrast, an individual who has not presented at a port of entry or filed any affirmative application for immigration benefits is not "seeking" anything under the plain meaning of the word. *See* Merriam Webster's Dictionary (2025) (defining "seek" as, inter alia, "to go in search of" or "to try to acquire or gain").

Thus, Petitioner prevails regardless of the scope of § 1225(a)(1)'s definition of "applicant for admission." This is because classification as an "applicant for admission" is not sufficient to render someone subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2). The "applicant for admission" must *also* be "seeking admission," and that is clearly not the case for Petitioner. In sum, § 1226 governs this case. The mandatory detention provision of § 1225 applies only to individuals arriving in the United States as specified in the statute, while § 1226 applies to those who previously entered without admission.

B. PETITIONER WILL SUFFER IRREPARABLE HARM IN THE ABSENCE OF A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION.

In the absence of a PI/TRO, Petitioner will continue to be unlawfully detained by Respondents under § 1225(b)(2) and denied the freedom the IJ has already established is appropriate. Petitioner has now been in custody following his detention for around three months. "Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty" that the Due Process Clause protects. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001). Further, it "is well established that the deprivation of constitutional rights unquestionably constitutes irreparable

injury." *Melendres v. Arpaio*, 695 F.3d 990, 1002 (9th Cir. 2012) (citation modified); *Warsoldier v. Woodford*, 418 F.3d 989, 1001-02 (9th Cir. 2005); *see also Hernandez v. Sessions*, 872 F.3d 976, 994–95 (9th Cir. 2017) (concluding that Plaintiffs who showed unconstitutional deprivation of physical liberty "also carried their burden as to irreparable harm."); *Maldonado Bautista et al. v. Santacruz, et al.,* No. 5:25-cv- 01873-SSS-BFM (C.D. Cal. July 28, 2025), Order Granting TRO, Dkt. 14 at 9 ("[T]he Court finds that the potential for Petitioners' continued detention without an initial bond hearing would cause immediate and irreparable injury, as this violates statutory rights [] under § 1226(a).").

Detainees in ICE custody are held in "prison-like conditions" which have real consequences for their lives. *Preap v. Johnson*, 831 F.3d 1193, 1195 (9th Cir. 2016). During his time in the U.S., Petitioner and his wife married in September 2016, and together they have two U.S. citizen children: a daughter, aged 2, and a son, aged 9 months. Petitioner's daughter, K[redacted] was born prematurely at 28 weeks and suffers from bronchopulmonary dysplasia. Respondent is also the stepfather to three children his wife has from a prior relationship, one of whom is a LPR. Continued detention in such "prison-like" conditions which separate Petitioner from his family constitute an irreparable harm

Further, Petitioner will suffer irreparable harm were he to be removed to a third country without first being provided with constitutionally-compliant procedures to ensure that his right to apply for fear-based relief is protected. Individuals removed to third countries under DHS's policy have reported that they are now stuck in countries where they do not have government support, do not speak the language, and have no

network.[5] Thus, preliminary injunctive relief is necessary to prevent Petitioner from suffering irreparable harm by remaining in unlawful and unjust detention, and by being summarily removed to any third country where he may face persecution or torture.

C. THE BALANCE OF EQUITIES TIPS IN PETITIONER'S FAVOR AND A PI IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

Because the government is a party, these two factors are considered together. *Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 435 (2009). Petitioner has established that the public interest factor weighs in his favor because his claim asserts that the new policy violates federal laws. *See Valle del Sol Inc. v. Whiting*, 732 F.3d 1006, 1029 (9th Cir. 2013); *Moreno Galvez v. Cuccinelli*, 387 F. Supp. 3d 1208, 1218 (W.D. Wash. 2019) (holding that where a policy "is inconsistent with federal law, . . . the balance of hardships and public interest factors weigh in favor of a preliminary injunction.".

Further, any burden imposed by requiring the Respondents to release Petitioner from custody or provide a hearing before an IJ is both de minimis and clearly outweighed by the substantial harm he continues to suffer. *See Lopez v. Heckler*, 713 F.2d 1432, 1437 (9th Cir. 1983) ("Society's interest lies on the side of affording fair procedures to all persons, even though the expenditure of governmental funds is required.").

Finally, if preliminary relief is not entered, the government would effectively be granted permission to detain Petitioner or to summarily remove him to any third country, in violation of the requirements of Due Process.

---

[5] NPR, "Asylum seekers deported by the U.S. are stuck in Panama unable to return home (May 5, 2025), https://www.npr.org/2025/05/05/nx-s1-5369572/asylum-seekers-deported-by-the-u-s-are-stuck-in-panama-unable-to-return-home.

D. PRUDENTIAL EXHAUSTION IS NOT REQUIRED.

Prudential exhaustion does not require Petitioner to be forced to endure the very harm he is seeking to avoid by awaiting a BIA decision, where the Board's recent precedential decision makes the outcome of appeal a foregone conclusion. "[T]here are a number of exceptions to the general rule requiring exhaustion, covering situations such as where administrative remedies are inadequate or not efficacious, . . . [or] irreparable injury will result." *Laing v. Ashcroft*, 370 F.3d 994, 1000 (9th Cir. 2004) (citation omitted). Administrative exhaustion is not required where a request for relief before the agency would be futile because the agency has "predetermined the issue before it." *McCarthy v. Madigan*, 503 U.S. 140, 148 (1992). Here, the exceptions regarding futility, irreparable injury, and agency delay warrant waiving any exhaustion requirement.

Futility. The BIA's decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* renders prudential exhaustion futile in bond cases involving individuals who entered the U.S. without inspection. *Zaragoza Mosqueda, et al. v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2591530, at *7 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2025). The BIA's decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* "predetermine[s]" the outcome of DHS's administrative appeal. *McCarthy*, 503 U.S. at 148. Prudential exhaustion is therefore unnecessary, and the Court should take jurisdiction over Petitioner's case.

Irreparable Injury. Because Petitioner was denied access to a bond, each day he remains in detention is one in which his statutory and constitutional rights have been violated. Similarly situated district courts have repeatedly recognized this fact. As one court has explained, "because of delays inherent in the administrative process, BIA review would result in the very harm that the bond hearing was designed to prevent:

prolonged detention without due process." *Hechavarria v. Whitaker*, 358 F. Supp. 3d 227, 237 (W.D.N.Y. 2019) (internal quotation marks omitted). Indeed, "if Petitioner is correct on the merits of his habeas petition, then Petitioner has *already* been unlawfully deprived of a [lawful] bond hearing [,] [and] . . . each additional day that Petitioner is detained without a [lawful] bond hearing would cause him harm that cannot be repaired." *Villalta v. Sessions*, No. 17-CV-05390-LHK, 2017 WL 4355182, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 2, 2017) (internal quotation marks and brackets omitted); *see also Cortez v. Sessions*, 318 F. Supp. 3d 1134, 1139 (N.D. Cal. 2018) (similar).

Agency Delay. Third, the BIA's delays in adjudicating bond appeals warrant excusing any exhaustion requirement. A court's ability to waive exhaustion based on delay is especially broad here given the "fundamental" interest in physical liberty that is at stake for Petitioner. *Hernandez*, 872 F.3d at 993. The BIA's months-long review is unreasonable and results in ongoing injury. *See, e.g.*, *Perez*, 445 F. Supp. 3d at 286.

E. THERE IS NO JURISDICTIONAL HURDLE BARRING RELIEF

Finally, there is no jurisdictional bar under the INA because Petitioner does not seek review of an order of removal, but of custody, and his challenge does not fall within the discrete actions specified in the bar at 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g). *Maldonado Bautista et al.*, No. 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM, Order Granting TRO (addressing "zipper clause" at 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9)).

V. REQUIREMENTS OF F.R.C.P. 65(b)(1)

Finally, Petitioner asks this Court to find that Petitioner has complied with the requirements of Rule 65, Fed.R.Civ.P., for the purposes of granting a Temporary

Restraining Order. Pursuant to Rule 65(b)(1), this Court may issue a TRO without written or oral notice to the adverse party or its attorney only if a) specific facts in an affidavit . . . clearly show that immediate and irreparable injury, loss or damage will result to the petitioner before the adverse party can be heard in opposition; and 2) the petitioner's attorney certifies in writing any efforts made to give notice and the reasons why it should not be required.

Here, Petitioner respectfully submits that sufficient notice has been given to Respondents since the Chief of the Civil Division of the United States Attorney's Office has been provided with a copy of the instant motion. *See* Exhibit E, Letter from Ami Hutchinson to Katherine Branch, October 16, 2025. The U.S. Attorney's Office represents Respondents in civil litigation in which they are named as Defendants or Respondents. While proper service may not have been made on Respondents' counsel, for the purpose of Rule 65(b)(1), this Court should find that written notice has, in fact, been provided to the adverse party. In the event this Court finds that not to be the case, it should nevertheless find that the requirements of Rule 65(b)(1)(A) and (B) have been met. *See* Exhibit F, Affidavit of Ami Hutchinson.

VI. CONCLUSION

For these reasons, the Court should grant Petitioner's Motion for a Preliminary Injunction or Temporary Restraining Order.

Executed on this 16th day of October, 2025 in Tucson, Arizona.

/s/Ami Hutchinson
Ami Hutchinson
Attorney for Petitioner