

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

---

DEYBIS CRISTOFER RAMIREZ REYNOSO )  
Petitioner, ) Case No. 1:25-cv-24854-KMM  
v. )  
CHARLES PARRA, in his official capacity as )  
Assistant Field Office Director, Krome North )  
Service Processing Center; GARRET RIPA, in his )  
official capacity as Miami Field Office Director, )  
Immigration and Customs Enforcement's )  
Enforcement and Removal Operations; TODD )  
LYONS, in his official capacity as Acting Director )  
of Immigration and Customs Enforcement; )  
KRISTI NOEM, in her official capacity as Secretary )  
of the Department of Homeland Security; and )  
PAMELA BONDI, in her official capacity as )  
Attorney General; EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR )  
IMMIGRATION REVIEW. )  
Respondents. )  
\_\_\_\_\_  
)

**PETITIONER'S REPLY**

## INTRODUCTION

Petitioner is responding within the seven (7) days of service of Respondents' Response, Doc. 6, in accordance with the Order from this Court, Doc. 4. Petitioner is in 8 USC § 1229a removal proceedings, not §1225 proceedings, which make Petitioner eligible for bond. While Respondents discuss the terms "arriving alien" and "applicant for admission," the central issue in this case is which statute governs Petitioner's detention, as that determination defines the rights to which he is entitled.

## ARGUMENT

### **I. Mr. Ramirez is in §1229a Proceedings and Detained Pursuant to §1226, Which Affords Him the Right to Bond.**

There are three relevant statutes to authorize detention. 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). 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). Third, 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). As Mr. Ramirez has not been ordered removed, the two remaining statutes are either 8 U.S.C. §1229a or 8 U.S.C. § 1225.

When a noncitizen is deemed inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(7), the immigration officer must order the noncitizen's removal, unless the noncitizen indicates an intention to apply for asylum or fear of persecution. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i). The noncitizen may be placed

in “expedited removal” proceedings, which contain a condensed asylum process and require that the noncitizen remain detained throughout the process. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1). The noncitizen also may be placed in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings, which have more robust due process protections. Section 1182, however, has a subsection, which allows noncitizens, even those in mandatory detention, to be “paroled” into the United States. 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A).

Unaccompanied Children (“UACs”) “are not subject to expedited removal, and are generally placed in formal removal proceedings under INA §240, regardless of whether found in the United States or at the border.” Congressional Research Service, *Immigration Laws Regulating the Admission and Exclusion of Aliens at the Border*, Jul. 21, 2020, [https://www.congress.gov/crs\\_external\\_products/LSB/PDF/LSB10150/LSB10150.17.pdf](https://www.congress.gov/crs_external_products/LSB/PDF/LSB10150/LSB10150.17.pdf). As Mr. Ramirez is a UAC, who arrived at the age of 13, he could not have been placed in §1225 proceedings, and accordingly was placed in §1229a proceedings.

Furthermore, “under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(iii)(II), a person who has been paroled without first having been placed in expedited removal cannot be designated for expedited removal.” *Espinoza v. Kaiser*, 2025 WL 2675785, at \*5 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 18, 2025) (emphasis in original; citing *Coalition For Humane Immigrant Rights, v. Noem*, No. 25CV-872 (JMC), 2025 WL 2192986, at \*3 (D.D.C. Aug. 1, 2025)); *see also Munoz Materano v. Arteta*, No. 25-CV-6137, 2025 WL 2630826, at \*11 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 12, 2025) (adopting the holding in Coalition); *see also Pedro Yimi Cardin Alvarez*, WL 2898389, at \* 13 (D. Ariz. Oct. 7, 2025). Accordingly, given that Mr. Ramirez was paroled without being placed in expedited removal, then Mr. Ramirez cannot now be designated for expedited removal.

The record makes clear that Mr. Ramirez is in §1229a proceedings: Respondents originally placed him in those proceedings upon his 2016 encounter as a UAC and later confirmed that classification by re-calendaring the *same* §1229a removal proceedings following his September 16, 2025, encounter. Given that he is in §1229a proceedings, “his detention is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), which allows for the release of noncitizens on bond,” *Puga*, 2025 WL 2938369, at \*3, not § 1225(b)(2), applicable to noncitizen “applicant[s] for admission” to the United States. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

It has been found by courts throughout the country that Respondents’ interpretation of the INA to expand the scope of 8 USC §1225 detention, “directly contravenes the statute, disregards decades of settled precedent,” and is erroneous. *Hernandez Alvarez v. Morris*, 25-24806 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 27, 2025), ECF 6 at 5; *Cerro Perez v. Parra*, 25-24820 (S.D. Fla. Oct 27, 2025), ECF 9 at 6, *Gil-Paulino v. Sec'y of the U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, 25-cv-24292 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 10, 2025), ECF 41 at 10; see also *Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft*, No. 25-cv-12546, 2025 WL 2609425, at \*7 (E.D. Mich. Sep. 9, 2025) (“Finally, the BIA’s decision to pivot from three decades of consistent statutory interpretation and call for Pizarro Reyes’ detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A) is at odds with every District Court that has been confronted with the same question of statutory interpretation.”); *see also Puga*, 2025 WL 2938369, at \*3–6; *Merino v. Ripa*, No. 25-23845, 2025 WL 2941609, at \*3 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 15, 2025); *Lopez v. Hardin*, No. 25-cv830, 2025 WL 2732717, at \*2 (M.D. Fla. Sep. 25, 2025); *Guerra v. Joyce*, No. 25-cv-00534, 2025 WL 2986316, at \*3 (D. Me. Oct. 23, 2025); *Lomeu v. Soto*, 25-cv-16589, 2025 WL 2981296, at \*7–8 (D.N.J. Oct. 23, 2025); *Maldonado v. Cabezas*, No. 25-13004, 2025 WL 2985256, at \*4 (D.N.J. Oct. 23, 2025); *Loa Caballero v. Baltazar*, No. 25-cv-03120, 2025 WL 2977650, at \*5–6 (D. Colo. Oct. 22, 2025); *Aguiar v. Moniz*, No. 25-cv-12706, 2025 WL 2987656, at \*3 (D. Mass.

Oct. 22, 2025); *Rivera v. Moniz*, 25-cv-12833, 2025 WL 2977900, at \*1–2 (D. Mass. Oct. 22, 2025); *Avila v. Bondi*, No. 25-3741, 2025 WL 2976539, at \*5–7 (D. Minn. Oct. 21, 2025); *Maldonado de Leon v. Baker*, No. 25-3084, 2025 WL 2968042, at \*7 (D. Md. Oct. 21, 2025); *Miguel v. Noem*, 25-11137, 2025 WL 2976480, at \*6 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 21, 2025); *Pineda v. Simon*, No. 25-cv-01616, 2025 WL 2980729, at \*2 (E.D. Va. Oct. 21, 2025); *Matheus Araujo DA Silva v. Bondi*, No. 25-cv-12672, 2025 WL 2969163, at \*2 (D. Mass. Oct. 21, 2025); *H.G.V.U. v. Smith*, No. 25-cv-10931, 2025 WL 2962610, at \*4–6 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 20, 2025); *Polo v. Chestnut*, No. 25-cv-01342, 2025 WL 2959346, at \*11 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2025); *Sanchez v. Minga Wofford, Warden, Mesa Verde Immigr. Processing Ctr.*, No. 25-cv-01187, 2025 WL 2959274, at \*3 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2025); *Alvarez v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-1090, 2025 WL 2942648, at \*4–6 (W.D. Mich. Oct. 17, 2025); *Zamora v. Noem*, No. 25-12750, 2025 WL 2958879, at \*1 (D. Mass. Oct. 17, 2025); *Pacheco Mayen v. Raycraft*, 25-cv-13056, 2025 WL 2978529, at \*6–9 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 17, 2025); *Diaz Sandoval v. Raycraft*, No. 25-cv-12987, 2025 WL 2977517, at \*6–9 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 17, 2025); *Contreras-Cervantes v. Raycraft*, No. 25-cv-13073, 2025 WL 2952796, at \*6–8 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 17, 2025); *Ochoa v. Noem*, No. 25-10865, 2025 WL 2938779, at \*4–6 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 16, 2025); *Hernandez v. Crawford*, No. 25-cv-01565, 2025 WL 2940702, at \*2 (E.D. Va. Oct. 16, 2025); *Piña v. Stamper*, No. 25-cv-00509, 2025 WL 2939298, at \*3 (D. Me. Oct. 16, 2025); *Sequen v. Albarran*, No. 25-cv-06487, 2025 WL 2935630, at \*8 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 15, 2025); *Teyim v. Perry*, No. 25-cv-01615, 2025 WL 2950184, at \*2–3 (E.D. Va. Oct. 15, 2025); *Singh v. Lyons*, 25-cv-01606, 2025 WL 2932635, at \*2–3 (E.D. Va. Oct. 14, 2025); *Alejandro v. Olson*, 25-cv-02027, 2025 WL 2896348, at \*7–9 (S.D. Ind. Oct. 11, 2025); *Chavez v. Kaiser*, No. 25-cv-06984, 2025 WL 2909526, at \*5 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 9, 2025); *Donis v. Chestnut*, No. 25-01228, 2025 WL 287514, at \*11 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 9, 2025); *Eliseo A.A. v. Olson*,

No. 25-3381, 2025 WL 2886729, at \*2–4 (D. Minn. Oct. 8, 2025); *Covarrubias v. Vergara*, No. 25-cv-112, 2025 WL 2950097, at \*3 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 8, 2025); *Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi*, No. 25-3726, 2025 WL 2886346, at \*3 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 7, 2025); *S.D.B.B. v. Johnson*, No. 25-cv-882, 2025 WL 2845170, at \*5 (M.D.N.C. Oct. 7, 2025); *Gonzalez v. Bostock*, 25-cv-01404, 2025 WL 2841574, at \*3–4 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 7, 2025); *Hyppolite v. Noem*, No. 25-4304, 2025 WL 2829511, \*12 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 6, 2025); *Artiga v. Genalo*, No. 25-5208, 2025 WL 2829434, at \*7 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 5, 2025); *Cordero Pelico v. Kaiser*, No. 25-cv-07826, 2025 WL 2822876, at \*15 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2025); *Orellana v. Moniz*, 25-cv-12664, 2025 WL 2809996, at \*5 (D. Mass. Oct. 3, 2025); *Elias Escobar v. Hyde*, No. 25-cv-12620, 2025 WL 2823324, at \*3 (D. Mass. Oct. 3, 2025); *Belsai D.S. v. Bondi*, No. 25-cv-3682, 2025 WL 2802947, at \*5–6 (D. Minn. Oct. 1, 2025).

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and those expressed in the Petition for Habeas Corpus and Request for Order to Show Cause, this Court should find that it has jurisdiction over this case and should grant the petition.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kenia Garcia  
Kenia Garcia, Esq.  
Florida Bar No. 102561  
Garcia & Qayum Law Group, P.A.  
3475 West Flagler Street  
Miami, FL 33135  
(305) 230-4020 Tel  
(305) 503-7370 Fax  
Kenia@GQLawGroup.com  
*Counsel for Petitioner*

Dated: November 12, 2025

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on November 12, 2025, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kenia Garcia

Kenia Garcia, Esq.  
Florida Bar No. 102561  
Garcia & Qayum Law Group, P.A.  
3475 West Flagler Street  
Miami, FL 33135  
(305) 230-4020 Tel  
(305) 503-7370 Fax  
Kenia@GQLawGroup.com  
*Counsel for Petitioner*

Dated: November 12, 2025