

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JOSE F. UNAUCHO-CASTRO,)
Petitioner,) Case No. _____
v.)
Unknown, Warden, North Lake Processing Center;)
Marty C. Raybon, Director of Detroit Field Office,)
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement;)
Kristi Noem, Secretary of the U.S. Department of)
Homeland Security; and Pamela Bondi,)
Attorney General of the United States,)
in their official capacities,)
Respondents.)

)

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner, Jose F. Unaicho-Castro, petitions this Court to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, ordering Respondents to show cause within three days, providing reasons, if any, as to why Petitioner's detention is lawful. 28 U.S.C. § 2243. Petitioner was detained on October 12, 2025.
2. Because Petitioner's detention has been unconstitutionally prolonged, Petitioner urges the Court to grant his petition and order Respondent to release him from detention. 28 U.S.C. § 2241.
3. Accordingly, to vindicate Petitioner's constitutional rights, this Court should grant the instant petition for a writ of habeas corpus. Petitioner asks this Court to find that Respondents' detention of Petitioner is an arbitrary and capricious violation of the law, and to immediately issue an order preventing Petitioner's transfer out of this district.

JURISDICTION

4. This action arises under the Constitution of the United States and the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 8 U.S.C. § 1101 *et seq.*
5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), and Article I, § 9, cl. 2 of the United States Constitution (Suspension Clause).
6. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(e)(2), this Court has habeas corpus authority to determine whether Petitioner is a noncitizen.
7. This Court may grant relief under the habeas corpus statutes, 28 U.S.C. § 2241 *et. seq.*, the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*, and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

VENUE

1. Venue is proper because Petitioner is detained at the Northlake Processing Center in Baldwin, Michigan, which is within the jurisdiction of this District.
2. Venue is proper in the Western District of Michigan because that is where Petitioner is detained and where a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to his claims occurred. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

1. The Court must grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus or issue an order to show cause (OSC) to the respondents “forthwith,” unless the petitioner is not entitled to relief. 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If an order to show cause is issued, the Court must require respondents to file a return “within *three days* unless for good cause additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is allowed.” *Id.* (emphasis added).

2. Courts have long recognized the significance of the habeas statute in protecting individuals from unlawful detention. The Great Writ has been referred to as “perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law of England, 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).
3. Petitioner is “in custody” for the purpose of § 2241 because Petitioner is arrested and detained by Respondents.

PARTIES

1. Petitioner is a noncitizen. Petitioner is currently detained at the Northlake Processing Center in Baldwin, Michigan. He is in the custody of the Respondents and under their direct control.
4. Respondent Sam Olson is sued in his official capacity as the Director of the Chicago Field Office of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”). The Chicago Field Office is responsible for local custody decisions relating to non-citizens charged with being removable from the United States, including the arrest, detention, and custody status of non-citizens. Respondent Olson is a legal custodian of Petitioner and has the authority to release him.
5. Respondent Todd Lyons is the acting director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and has authority over the actions of respondent Sam Olson and ICE in general. Respondent Lyons is a legal custodian of Petitioner.
6. Respondent Kristi Noem is sued in her official capacity as the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS). In this capacity, Respondent Noem is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality

Act, and oversees U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the component agency responsible for Petitioner's detention. Respondent Noem is a legal custodian of Petitioner and is charged with faithfully administering the immigration laws of the United States.

7. Respondent Pamela Bondi is sued in her official capacity as the Attorney General of the United States and the senior official of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). In that capacity, she has the authority to adjudicate removal cases and to oversee the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR), which administers the immigration courts and the BIA. Respondent Bondi is a legal custodian of Petitioner.
8. Respondent U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement is the federal agency responsible for custody decisions relating to non-citizens charged with being removable from the United States, including the arrest, detention, and custody status of non-citizens.
9. Respondent U.S. Department of Homeland Security is the federal agency that has authority over the actions of ICE and all other DHS Respondents.
10. This action is commenced against all Respondents in their official capacities.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. Petitioner is a 43-year-old citizen and national of Ecuador.
2. Petitioner has four children.
3. Petitioner entered the United States without inspection or parole in 2022 and has not left since that time.
4. Petitioner was released from immigration custody and granted a bond on May 2022.
5. ICE agents arrested Petitioner without a warrant while at a job site in Illinois on October 12, 2025.

6. Petitioner was taken to the Broadview Processing Facility in Broadview, Illinois. Petitioner was held at the Broadview Processing Center in Broadview, Illinois, until he was transferred to the Northlake Processing Center in Michigan.
7. Petitioner is seeking immigration relief and pursuing meritorious challenges to his removal. Petitioner has no prior criminal history. He has never been convicted of any crime and poses no security threat to the United States.
8. Petitioner has no prior immigration record nor history of nonappearance at immigration court proceedings.
9. Petitioner filed an I-589 Petition for Asylum and for Withholding of Removal and the Convention Against Torture on March 04, 2024.
10. Petitioner was scheduled for an Individual Merits Hearing before Immigration Court in Chicago, Illinois, on October 29, 2025. Since his detention, his Individual Merits Hearing has been postponed. He is now scheduled for a Master Calendar Hearing on November 19, 2025.
11. Since being detained, Petitioner has had limited contact with his family and counsel.
12. On January 20, 2025, President Donald Trump issued several executive actions relating to immigration, including “Protecting the American People Against Invasion,” an executive order (EO) setting out a series of interior immigration enforcement actions. The Trump administration, through this and other actions, has outlined sweeping, executive branch-led changes to immigration enforcement policy, establishing a formal framework for mass deportation. The “Protecting the American People Against Invasion” EO instructs the DHS Secretary “to take all appropriate action to enable,” ICE, CBP, and

USCIS to prioritize civil immigration enforcement procedures, including through the use of mass detention.

13. On information and belief, Respondents are detained and transferred Petitioner regardless of the individual facts and circumstances of his case.
14. On information and belief, Respondents are using the immigration detention system, including extra-territorial transfer and detention, as a means to punish individuals through warrantless arrests and detention.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

1. Petitioner is detained under an immigration statute that mandates the detention of all “arriving aliens” without individualized bond hearings. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1255(b)(1)(B)(ii).
2. Noncitizens in immigration proceedings are entitled to Due Process under the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. *Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 306 (1993).
3. The Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides further limits on detention. As the Supreme Court has noted, “[i]t is well-established that the Fifth Amendment entitles [noncitizens] to due process of law in deportation proceedings.” *Demore*, 538 U.S. at 523 (quoting *Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 306 (1993)). “Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of liberty,” that the Due Process Clause protects. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001). This fundamental due process protection applies to all noncitizens, even if they are removable or inadmissible. See *id.* at 721 (Kennedy, J., dissenting) (“[B]oth removable and inadmissible aliens are entitled to be free from detention that is arbitrary or capricious.”). Under these due process principles, detention must “bear [a] reasonable

relation to the purpose for which the individual [was] committed.” *Id.* at 690 (quoting *Jackson v. Indiana*, 406 U.S. 715, 738 (1972))

4. Due process, therefore, requires “adequate procedural protections” to ensure that the government’s asserted justification for physical confinement “outweighs the individual’s constitutionally protected interest in avoiding physical restraint.” *Id.* at 690 (internal quotations omitted). In the immigration context, the Supreme Court has recognized only two valid purposes for civil detention—to mitigate the risks of danger to the community and to prevent flight. *Id.*; *Demore*, 538 U.S. at 538.
5. Following *Zadvydas* and *Demore*, every circuit court to confront the issue has protected the due process rights of people detained in civil immigration detention by requiring a custody hearing for noncitizens subject to unreasonably prolonged detention pending removal proceedings. *See Sopo v. U.S. Att'y Gen.*, 825 F.3d 1199 (11th Cir. 2016); *Reid v. Donelan*, 819 F.3d 486 (1st Cir. 2016); *Lora v. Shanahan*, 804 F.3d 601 (2d Cir. 2015); *Rodriguez v. Robbins* (Rodriguez III), 804 F.3d 1060 (9th Cir. 2015); *Diop v. ICE/Homeland Sec.*, 656 F.3d 221 (3d Cir. 2011); *Ly v. Hansen*, 351 F.3d 263 (6th Cir. 2003).
6. While the Seventh Circuit has not explicitly addressed the issue, the court has noted that “[i]t would be a considerable paradox to confer a constitutional or quasi-constitutional right to release on an alien ordered removed,” as required by *Zadvydas*, “but not on one who might have a good defense to removal.” *Hussain v. Mukasey*, 510 F.3d 739, 743 (7th Cir. 2007). Thus, a noncitizen subjected to prolonged detention “before he is subjected to a final order of removal” may be eligible for habeas relief if there is “[i]nordinate delay” in the proceedings. *Id.*

7. In addition to the amount of time in detention, courts weigh the following factors when assessing reasonableness of detention: (1) how long the detention will likely continue in the absence of judicial relief; (2) the nature and extent of removal proceedings, including whether any delays are attributable to the government or the immigrant; (3) the conditions of detention; and (4) the likelihood that the proceedings and judicial review will end with a removal order. See *Jamal v. Whitaker*, 358 F. Supp. 3d 853, 859-60 (S.D.N.Y. 2018).
8. Custody determinations for individuals in removal proceedings are governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1226. Under § 1226(a), an individual may be released if he does not present a danger to persons or property and is not a flight risk. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).
9. Custody determinations under § 1226(a) are individualized and based on the facts presented in those cases. Unlike § 1226(c), which can provide for categorical determinations for detention regardless of flight risk or safety risks, § 1226(a) requires a case-by-case review of the facts and circumstances.
10. Once a determination to release an individual from custody is made, the release order may be revisited when the facts or circumstances warrant revocation or reconsideration. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(b). For an individual who was once in custody, the Attorney General may take that individual back into custody by revoking the individual's release when the facts and circumstances warrant it.
11. Revocation and return to custody is authorized only based on the individualized facts and circumstances. 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(c)(9). By regulation, revocation decisions are limited in nature and may only be made by certain authorized officials. 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(c)(9).

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT ONE

Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act - 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)

Abuse of Discretion

Violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(b), 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(c)(9)

1. Petitioner restates and realleges all paragraphs as if fully set forth here.
2. Under the APA, a court shall “hold unlawful and set aside agency action” that is an abuse of discretion. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).
3. An action is an abuse of discretion if the agency “entirely failed to consider an important aspect of the problem, offered an explanation for its decision that runs counter to the evidence before the agency, or is so implausible that it could not be ascribed to a difference in view or the product of agency expertise.” *Nat'l Ass'n of Home Builders v. Defs. of Wildlife*, 551 U.S. 644, 658 (2007) (quoting *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n of U.S. Inc. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983)).
4. To survive an APA challenge, the agency must articulate “a satisfactory explanation” for its action, “including a rational connection between the facts found and the choice made.” *Dep't of Com. v. New York*, 139 S. Ct. 2551, 2569 (2019) (citation omitted).
5. By categorically detaining, denying Petitioner’s release, and seeking to transfer him away from the district without consideration of his individualized facts and circumstances, Respondents have violated the APA.
6. Respondents have not considered Petitioner’s facts and circumstances and determined that he is a flight risk or danger to the community.

COUNT TWO

Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act - 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)

Not in Accordance with Law and Excess of Statutory Authority

Violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(b), 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(c)(9)

1. Petitioner restates and realleges all paragraphs as if fully set forth here.

2. Under the APA, a court “shall . . . hold unlawful . . . agency action” that is “not in accordance with law;” “contrary to constitutional right;” “in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations;” or “without observance of procedure required by law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)-(D).
3. It is a well-established administrative principle that “agency action taken without lawful authority is at least voidable, if not void ab initio.” *L.M.-M. v. Cuccinelli*, 442 F. Supp. 3d 1, 35 (D.D.C. 2020), citing *SW General, Inc. v. NLRB*, 796 F.3d 67, 79 (D.C. Cir. 2015); see also *Hooks v. Kitsap Tenant Support Servs., Inc.*, 816 F.3d 550, 555 (9th Cir. 2016) (invalidating agency action because it was taken by an unauthorized official).
4. On information and belief, Respondents have detained Petitioner without a warrant, much less probable cause or reasonable suspicion.
5. Because Petitioner’s detention was made by government officials not authorized by law to make this detention, Respondents’ detention of Petitioner is not in accordance with law and in excess of statutory authority.

COUNT THREE
Violation of Fifth Amendment Right to Due Process

1. Petitioner restates and realleges all paragraphs as if fully set forth here.
2. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution prohibits the federal government from depriving any person of “life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.” U.S. Const. Amend. V. Due process protects “all ‘persons’ within the United States, including [non-citizens], whether their presence here is lawful, unlawful, temporary, or permanent.” *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 693; accord *Flores*, 507 U.S. at 306.
3. Due process requires that government action be rational and non-arbitrary. *See U.S. v.*

Trimble, 487 F.3d 752, 757 (9th Cir. 2007).

4. While the government has discretion to detain individuals under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and to revoke custody decisions under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(b), this discretion is not “unlimited” and must comport with constitutional due process. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 698.
5. For these reasons, Petitioner’s detention violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Petitioner respectfully requests this Court to grant the following:

- (1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- (2) Issue an Order to Show Cause ordering Respondents to show cause why this Petition should not be granted within three days;
- (3) Declare that Petitioner’s detention without an individualized determination violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment;
- (4) Declare that Petitioner’s detention was made in violation of statute and regulation;
- (5) Declare the continued detention of the Petitioner to lack statutory authorization;
- (6) Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus ordering Respondents to release Petitioner immediately;
- (7) Issue an Order prohibiting the Respondents from transferring Petitioner from the district without the court’s approval;
- (8) Award Petitioner attorney’s fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act, and on any other basis justified under law; and
- (9) Grant any further relief this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully Submitted,

\s\ Hanna Kayali

VLO, P.C.

Attorney for Petitioner

6732 Cermak Rd

Berwyn, IL 60402

312-600-7000

Dated: October 28, 2025

VERIFICATION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2242

I represent Petitioner, Jose F. Unauch-Castro, and submit this verification on his behalf.

I hereby verify that the factual statements made in the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated this 28 day of October, 2025.

\s\ LaShae Prins
VLO, P.C.
Attorney for Respondent
6732 Cermak Rd
Berwyn, IL 60402
312-600-7000