ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney
LISA M. HEMANN, AZ Bar No. 024703
ERIN M. DIMBLEBY, CA Bar No. 323359
Assistant U.S. Attorneys
Office of the U.S. Attorney
880 Front Street, Room 6293
San Diego, CA 92101-8893
Telephone: (619) 546-6964/6987
Facsimile: (619) 546-7751
Email: Lisa.Hemann@usdoj.gov
E-mail: Erin.Dimbleby@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Respondents

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CRISTOFER GARCIA MAGADAN,

Petitioner,

v.

KRISTI NOEM, *Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security;* TODD M. LYONS, *Acting Director, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement;* PATRICK DIVVER, *Field Office Director, San Diego Field Office, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement;* CHRISTOPHER LAROSE, *Senior Warden, Otay Mesa Detention Center;* SIRCE OWEN, *Acting Director of the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR), U.S. Department of Justice;* PAMELA BONDI, *Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice,*

Respondents.

Case No.: 25-cv-02889-JES-KSC

RESPONDENTS' RETURN IN OPPOSITION TO HABEAS PETITION

I. Introduction

Petitioner is currently in removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a and is detained in Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) custody pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). Petitioner's habeas petition seeks release or a bond hearing. Through multiple provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1252, Congress has stripped federal courts of jurisdiction over challenges to the commencement of removal proceedings, including

the consequent detention pending removal proceedings. Moreover, Petitioner's detention is mandated by statute. The Court should deny and dismiss the petition.

II. Factual Background

Petitioner is a citizen and national of Mexico. ECF No. 1, ¶ 33. On an unknown date in 2008, he entered the United States without being admitted, paroled, or inspected. *Id.* On July 16, 2025, Petitioner was issued a Notice to Appear, charging him as inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i), as an alien present who has not been admitted or paroled. Exhibit 1, DHS Form I-862, Notice to Appear; *see also* ECF No. 1, ¶ 38. Petitioner is currently detained at the Otay Mesa Detention Center under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). ECF No. 1, ¶ 14. Petitioner requested and was initially granted bond by an immigration judge (IJ); DHS appealed that decision to the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA).[1] *Id.*, ¶¶ 39, 40. On September 29, 2025, the BIA vacated the IJ's order and confirmed that Petitioner is detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). ECF No. 1-5, Decision of Board of Immigration Appeals.

III. Argument

A. Petitioner's Claims and Requested Relief are Barred by 8 U.S.C. § 1252

Petitioner bears the burden of establishing that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over his claims. *See Ass'n of Am. Med. Coll. v. United States*, 217 F.3d 770, 778-79 (9th Cir. 2000); *Finley v. United States*, 490 U.S. 545, 547-48 (1989). As a threshold matter, Petitioner's claims are jurisdictionally barred under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) and 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9).

In general, courts lack jurisdiction to review a decision to commence or adjudicate removal proceedings or execute removal orders. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) ("[N]o court shall have jurisdiction to hear any cause or claim by or on behalf of any alien arising from the decision or action by the Attorney General to commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders."); *Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-*

[1] In appealing the bond order, DHS invoked the automatic stay provision of 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(i)(2).

Discrimination Comm., 525 U.S. 471, 483 (1999) ("There was good reason for Congress to focus special attention upon, and make special provision for, judicial review of the Attorney General's discrete acts of 'commenc[ing] proceedings, adjudicat[ing] cases, [and] execut[ing] removal orders'—which represent the initiation or prosecution of various stages in the deportation process."); *Limpin v. United States*, 828 Fed. App'x 429 (9th Cir. 2020) (holding district court properly dismissed under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) "because claims stemming from the decision to arrest and detain an alien at the commencement of removal proceedings are not within any court's jurisdiction"). In other words, § 1252(g) removes district court jurisdiction over "three discrete actions that the Attorney may take: her 'decision or action' to 'commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders.'" *Reno*, 525 U.S. at 482 (emphasis removed). Petitioner's claims necessarily arise "from the decision or action by the Attorney General to commence proceedings [and] adjudicate cases," over which Congress has explicitly foreclosed district court jurisdiction. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g).

Section 1252(g) also bars district courts from hearing challenges to the method by which the government chooses to commence removal proceedings, including the decision to detain an alien pending removal. *See Alvarez v. ICE*, 818 F.3d 1194, 1203 (11th Cir. 2016) ("By its plain terms, [§ 1252(g)] bars us from questioning ICE's discretionary decisions to commence removal" and bars review of "ICE's decision to take [plaintiff] into custody and to detain him during his removal proceedings").

Other courts have held, "[f]or the purposes of § 1252, the Attorney General commences proceedings against an alien when the alien is issued a Notice to Appear before an immigration court." *Herrera-Correra v. United States*, No. 08-2941 DSF (JCx), 2008 WL 11336833, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2008). "The Attorney General may arrest the alien against whom proceedings are commenced and detain that individual until the conclusion of those proceedings." *Id.* at *3. "Thus, an alien's detention throughout this process arises from the Attorney General's decision to commence proceedings" and review of claims arising from such detention is barred

under § 1252(g). *Id.* (citing *Sissoko v. Rocha*, 509 F.3d 947, 949 (9th Cir. 2007)); *Wang*, 2010 WL 11463156, at *6; 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g). *But see Vasquez Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02180-DMS-MMP, 2025 WL 2549431, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025).

Moreover, under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9), "[j]udicial review of all questions of law and fact . . . arising from any action taken or proceeding brought to remove an alien from the United States under this subchapter shall be available only in judicial review of a final order under this section." Further, judicial review of a final order is available only through "a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals." 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(5). The Supreme Court has made clear that § 1252(b)(9) is "the unmistakable 'zipper' clause," channeling "judicial review of all" "decisions and actions leading up to or consequent upon final orders of deportation," including "non-final order[s]," into proceedings before a court of appeals. *Reno*, 525 U.S. at 483, 485; *see J.E.F.M. v. Lynch*, 837 F.3d 1026, 1031 (9th Cir. 2016) (noting § 1252(b)(9) is "breathtaking in scope and vise-like in grip and therefore swallows up virtually all claims that are tied to removal proceedings"). "Taken together, § 1252(a)(5) and § 1252(b)(9) mean that *any* issue—whether legal or factual—arising from *any* removal-related activity can be reviewed *only* through the [petition for review] PFR process." *J.E.F.M.*, 837 F.3d at 1031 ("[W]hile these sections limit how immigrants can challenge their removal proceedings, they are not jurisdiction-stripping statutes that, by their terms, foreclose *all* judicial review of agency actions. Instead, the provisions channel judicial review over final orders of removal to the courts of appeal.") (emphasis in original); *see id.* at 1035 ("§§ 1252(a)(5) and [(b)(9)] channel review of all claims, including policies-and-practices challenges . . . whenever they 'arise from' removal proceedings").

Critically, "1252(b)(9) is a judicial channeling provision, not a claim-barring one." *Aguilar v. ICE*, 510 F.3d 1, 11 (1st Cir. 2007). Indeed, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(D) provides that "[n]othing . . . in any other provision of this chapter . . . shall be construed as precluding review of constitutional claims or questions of law raised upon a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals in accordance with this section."

See also Ajlani v. Chertoff, 545 F.3d 229, 235 (2d Cir. 2008) ("[J]urisdiction to review such claims is vested exclusively in the courts of appeals[.]"). The petition-for-review process before the court of appeals ensures that noncitizens have a proper forum for claims arising from their immigration proceedings and "receive their day in court." *J.E.F.M.*, 837 F.3d at 1031–32 (internal quotations omitted); *see also Rosario v. Holder*, 627 F.3d 58, 61 (2d Cir. 2010) ("The REAL ID Act of 2005 amended the [INA] to obviate . . . Suspension Clause concerns" by permitting judicial review of "nondiscretionary" BIA determinations and "all constitutional claims or questions of law."). These provisions divest district courts of jurisdiction to review both direct and indirect challenges to removal orders, including decisions to detain for purposes of removal or for proceedings. *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 294–95 (section 1252(b)(9) includes challenges to the "decision to detain [an alien] in the first place or to seek removal").

In evaluating the reach of subsections (a)(5) and (b)(9), the Second Circuit has explained that jurisdiction turns on the substance of the relief sought. *Delgado v. Quarantillo*, 643 F.3d 52, 55 (2d Cir. 2011). Those provisions divest district courts of jurisdiction to review both direct and indirect challenges to removal orders, including decisions to detain for purposes of removal or for proceedings. *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 294–95 (section 1252(b)(9) includes challenges to the "decision to detain [an alien] in the first place or to seek removal[.]"). Here, Petitioner challenges the government's decision and action to detain him, which arises from DHS's decision to commence removal proceedings, and is thus an "action taken . . . to remove [him] from the United States." *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9); *see also, e.g.*, *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 294–95; *Velasco Lopez v. Decker*, 978 F.3d 842, 850 (2d Cir. 2020) (finding that 8 U.S.C. § 1226(e) did not bar review in that case because the petitioner did not challenge "his initial detention"); *Saadulloev v. Garland*, No. 3:23-CV-00106, 2024 WL 1076106, at *3 (W.D. Pa. Mar. 12, 2024) (recognizing that there is no judicial review of the threshold detention decision, which flows from the government's decision to "commence

proceedings"). *But see Vasquez Garcia*, No. 25-cv-02180-DMS-MMP, 2025 WL 2549431, at *3-4. As such, the Court lacks jurisdiction over this action. The reasoning in *Jennings* outlines why Petitioner's claims are unreviewable here.

While holding that it was unnecessary to comprehensively address the scope of § 1252(b)(9), the Supreme Court in *Jennings* provided guidance on the types of challenges that may fall within the scope of § 1252(b)(9). *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 293–94. The Court found that "§ 1252(b)(9) [did] not present a jurisdictional bar" in situations where "respondents . . . [were] not challenging the decision to detain them in the first place." *Id.* at 294–95. In this case, Petitioner does challenge the government's decision to detain him in the first place. Though Petitioner attempts to frame his challenge as one relating to detention authority, rather than a challenge to DHS's decision to detain him in the first instance, such creative framing does not evade the preclusive effect of § 1252(b)(9). Indeed, the fact that Petitioner is challenging the basis upon which he is detained is enough to trigger § 1252(b)(9) because "detention is an 'action taken . . . to remove' an alien." *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. 318, 319 (Thomas, J., concurring); 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9). As such, Petitioner's claims would be more appropriately presented before the appropriate federal court of appeals because he challenges the government's decision or action to detain him, which must be raised before a court of appeals, not this Court. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9).

Accordingly, this Court lacks jurisdiction over this petition under 8 U.S.C. § 1252.

B. Petitioner is Lawfully Detained

Petitioner's claims for alleged statutory and constitutional violations fail because he is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225.

Based on the plain language of the statute, the Court should reject Petitioner's argument that § 1226(a) governs his detention instead of § 1225. *See* ECF No. 1, ¶¶ 44-45. Section 1225(b)(2)(A) requires mandatory detention of "'an alien who is *an applicant for admission*, if the examining immigration officer determines that an alien

seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted[.]'" *Chavez v. Noem*, No. 3:25-cv-02325, 2025 WL 2730228, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2025) (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)) (emphasis in original). Section 1225(a)(1) "expressly defines that '[a]n alien present in the United States who has not been admitted … shall be deemed for purposes of this Act *an applicant for admission*.'" *Id.* (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1)) (emphasis in original). Here, Petitioner is an "alien present in the United States who has not been admitted." Thus, as found by the district court in *Chavez v. Noem* and as mandated by the plain language of the statute, Petitioner is an "applicant[] for admission" and subject to the mandatory detention provisions of § 1225(b)(2).

When the plain text of a statute is clear, "that meaning is controlling" and courts "need not examine legislative history." *Washington v. Chimei Innolux Corp.*, 659 F.3d 842, 848 (9th Cir. 2011). But to the extent legislative history is relevant here, nothing "refutes the plain language" of § 1225. *Suzlon Energy Ltd. v. Microsoft Corp.*, 671 F.3d 726, 730 (9th Cir. 2011). Congress passed the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA) to correct "an anomaly whereby immigrants who were attempting to lawfully enter the United States were in a worse position than persons who had crossed the border unlawfully." *Torres v. Barr*, 976 F.3d 918, 928 (9th Cir. 2020) (en banc), *declined to extend by, United States v. Gambino-Ruiz*, 91 F.4th 981 (9th Cir. 2024); *see Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 223-34 (citing H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 225 (1996)). It "intended to replace certain aspects of the [then] current 'entry doctrine,' under which illegal aliens who have entered the United States without inspection gain equities and privileges in immigration proceedings that are not available to aliens who present themselves for inspection at a port of entry." *Id.* (quoting H.R. Rep. 104-469, pt. 1, at 225). The Court should reject Petitioner's interpretation because it would put aliens who "crossed the border unlawfully" in a better position than those "who present themselves for inspection at a port of entry." *Id.* Aliens who presented at a port of entry would be subject to mandatory

detention under § 1225, but those who crossed illegally would be eligible for a bond under § 1226(a). *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 225 ("The House Judiciary Committee Report makes clear that Congress intended to eliminate the prior statutory scheme that provided aliens who entered the United States without inspection more procedural and substantive rights that those who presented themselves to authorities for inspection."). Thus, the Court should "'refuse to interpret the INA in a way that would in effect repeal that statutory fix' intended by Congress in enacting the IIRIRA." *Chavez,* 2025 WL 2730228, at *4 (quoting *Gambino-Ruiz*, 91 F.4th at 990).

Petitioner's argument that application of the plain language of the § 1225(b)(2) contradicts § 1226(a) is unpersuasive. *See* ECF No. 1, ¶ 45. This exact argument was recently rejected by the district court in *Chavez v. Noem*. There, the court noted that § 1226(a) "'generally governs the process of arresting and detaining' certain aliens, namely 'aliens who were inadmissible at the time of entry *or who have been convicted of certain criminal offenses since admission*.'" *Chavez,* 2025 WL 2730228, at *5 (quoting *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 288) (emphasis in original). In turn, individuals who have not been charged with specific crimes listed in § 1226(c) are still subject to the discretionary detention provisions of § 1226(a) *as determined by the Attorney General. See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) ("*On a warrant issued by the Attorney General*, an alien may be arrested and detained pending a decision on whether the alien is to be removed from the United States.") (emphasis added). Therefore, heeding the plain language of § 1225(b)(2) has no effect on § 1226(a).

Similarly, the application of § 1225's explicit definition of "applicants for admission" does not render the addition of § 1226(c) by the Riley Laken Act superfluous. Once again correctly determined by the district court in *Chavez v. Noem*, the addition of § 1226(c) simply removed the Attorney General's detention discretion for aliens charged with specific crimes. 2025 WL 2730228, at *5.

Petitioner's interpretation also reads "applicant for admission" out of § 1225(b)(2)(A). One of the most basic interpretative canons instructs that a "statute

should be construed so that effect is given to all its provisions." *See Corley v. United States*, 556 U.S. 303, 314 (2009) (cleaned up). Petitioner's interpretation fails that test. It renders the phrase "applicant for admission" in § 1225(b)(2)(A) "inoperative or superfluous, void or insignificant." *See id.* If Congress did not want § 1225(b)(2)(A) to apply to "applicants for admission," then it would not have included the phrase "applicants for admission" in the subsection. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A); *see also Corley*, 556 U.S. at 314.

Finally, Petitioner's argument that the phrase "alien seeking admission" limits the scope of § 1225(b)(2)(A) fails. *See* ECF No. 2-1 at 18-19. The BIA has long recognized that "many people who are not *actually* requesting permission to enter the United States in the ordinary sense are nevertheless deemed to be 'seeking admission' under the immigration laws." *Matter of Lemus-Losa*, 25 I&N Dec. 734, 743 (BIA 2012) (emphasis in original). Petitioner "provides no legal authority for the proposition that after some undefined period of time residing in the interior of the United States without lawful status, the INA provides that an applicant for admission is no longer 'seeking admission,' and has somehow converted to a status that renders him or her eligible for a bond hearing under section 236(a) of the INA." *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 221 (citing *Matter of Lemus-Losa*, 25 I&N Dec. at 743 & n.6).

Statutory language "is known by the company it keeps." *Marquez-Reyes v. Garland*, 36 F.4th 1195, 1202 (9th Cir. 2022) (quoting *McDonnell v. United States*, 579 U.S. 550, 569 (2016)). The phrase "seeking admission" in § 1225(b)(2)(A) must be read in the context of the definition of "applicant for admission" in § 1225(a)(1). Applicants for admission are both those individuals present without admission and those who arrive in the United States. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1). Both are understood to be "seeking admission" under §1225(a)(1). *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 221; *Lemus-Losa*, 25 I&N Dec. at 743. Congress made that clear in § 1225(a)(3), which requires all aliens "who are applicants for admission or otherwise seeking admission" to be inspected by immigration officers. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3). The word "or" here

"introduce[s] an appositive–a word or phrase that is synonymous with what precedes it ('Vienna or Wien,' 'Batman or the Caped Crusader')." *United States v. Woods*, 571 U.S. 31, 45 (2013).

Because Petitioner is properly detained under § 1225, he cannot show entitlement to relief.

Finally, Respondents acknowledge that the Court has recently rejected similar arguments in other similar habeas matters. While Respondents maintain that Petitioner is properly subject to mandatory detention under § 1225, to the extent the Court finds this Petitioner subject to detention authority under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), Respondents' position is that the proper remedy would be directing a new bond hearing under § 1226(a). This Court lacks jurisdiction in this matter to order release or the reinstatement of the IJ's bond order that was vacated by the BIA. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(e) ("No court may set aside any action or decision by the Attorney General under this section regarding the detention or any alien or the revocation or denial of bond or parole."); *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 295 (2018) ("As we have previously explained, § 1226(e) precludes an alien from 'challeng[ing] a "discretionary judgment" by the Attorney General or a "decision" that the Attorney General has made regarding his detention or release.' But § 1226(e) does not preclude 'challenges [to] the statutory framework that permits [the alien's] detention without bail.'").

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Respondents respectfully request that the Court deny the Petition.

DATED: November 3, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney

s/ Lisa M. Hemann
LISA M. HEMANN
Assistant United States Attorney
Attorney for Respondents