UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

MAYNOR ESPINOZA HERNANDEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

SAMUEL OLSON, Field Office Director of Enforcement and Removal Operations, CHICAGO Field Office, Immigration and Customs Enforcement;
MARCOS CHARLES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, Enforcement and Removal Operations, Acting Executive Associate Director;
KRISTI NOEM, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY;
PAMELA BONDI, U.S. Attorney General;
Chief Judge TERESA L. RILEY, EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW;
DALE SCHMIDT, Sheriff, DODGE DETENTION FACILITY,
SCOTT SMITH, Jail Administrator, DODGE DETENTION FACILITY

Respondents.

Case No.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner MAYNOR ESPINOZA HERNANDEZ is in the physical custody of Respondents at the DODGE DETENTION FACILITY. He now faces unlawful detention because the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), in direct collaboration with the adjudicative body with jurisdiction over immigrants (the Executive Office of Immigration Review) (EOIR) have concluded Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention.

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

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

4. Similarly, on September 5, 2025, the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA or Board) issued a precedent decision, binding on all immigration judges, holding that an immigration judge has no authority to consider bond requests for any person who entered the United States without admission. *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). The Board determined that such individuals are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond.

5. Petitioner's detention on this basis violates the plain language of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Section 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to individuals like Petitioner who previously entered and are now residing in the United States. Instead, such individuals are

subject to a different statute, § 1226(a), that allows for release on conditional parole or bond. That statute expressly applies to people who, like Petitioner, are charged as inadmissible for having entered the United States without inspection.

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

7. More importantly, the Government itself has made an abrupt about-face on this issue. Respondents should be judicially estopped from asserting their current interpretation of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), because they previously prevailed in litigation after asserting the opposite interpretation. As explained in *New Hampshire v. Maine*, 532 U.S. 742 (2001), judicial estoppel applies when a party assumes a position in a legal proceeding, succeeds in maintaining that position, and then adopts a contrary position in a subsequent proceeding to gain an unfair advantage. Here, Respondents previously and successfully, argued that individuals who entered the United States without inspection were subject to detention under § 1226(a), and not § 1225(b)(2)(A), and courts accepted that position. Respondents now reverse course and assert that such individuals are subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A), thereby denying them bond hearings. This shift in legal position undermines the integrity of the judicial process and imposes an unfair detriment on Petitioners who relied on the prior interpretation. Accordingly, Respondents should be estopped from asserting this inconsistent position.

8. Furthermore, The Government's own issuance of an I-220A placing Petitioner in custody under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) reflects a discretionary, fact-based determination that Petitioner was not subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). This quasi-judicial decision was made by DHS at the outset of proceedings, based on the facts available to both

parties and Petitioner's own admissions. Critically, DHS itself alleged in the Notice to Appear that Petitioner "entered the United States without inspection and without parole or lawful admission," a factual assertion that squarely contradicts the Government's current position—adopted wholesale by the Board of Immigration Appeals—that Petitioner is ineligible to apply for bond before EOIR. This reversal undermines the integrity of the adjudicative process and triggers the principles of issue preclusion recognized in *B&B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus., Inc.*, 575 U.S. 138 (2015), which require courts to respect agency determinations when the ordinary elements of preclusion are met.

9. Accordingly, Petitioner seeks a writ of habeas corpus requiring that he be released unless Respondents provide a bond hearing under § 1226(a) within seven days.

JURISDICTION

10. Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents. Petitioner is detained at the DODGE DETENTION FACILITY.

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

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

VENUE

13. Pursuant to *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493- 500 (1973), venue lies in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, the judicial district in which Petitioner currently is detained.

14. Venue is also properly in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because Respondents are employees, officers, and agencies of the United States, and because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

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

16. Habeas corpus is "perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law . . . 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). "The application for the writ usurps the attention and displaces the calendar of the judge or justice who entertains it and receives prompt action from him within the four corners of the application." *Yong v. I.N.S.*, 208 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted).

PARTIES

17. Petitioner Maynor Espinoza Hernandez is a citizen of Honduras who has been in immigration detention since the 25th of September 2025. After arresting Petitioner at his place of employment, Maple Leaf Dairy, ICE did not set bond and Petitioner is unable to obtain review of his custody by an Immigration Judge, pursuant to the Board's decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). Due to this erroneous

decision, it would be futile for Petitioner to apply to EOIR without the intervention of this honorable Court.

18. Respondent Samuel Olson is the Director of the Chicago Field Office of ICE's Enforcement and Removal Operations division; however, on information and belief, the DHS is rotating their Field Office Director without publishing a schedule of rotation. As such, Samuel Olson or his unknown, unannounced provisional replacement is Petitioner's immediate custodian and is responsible for Petitioner's detention and removal. He or his acting counterpart is named in his or her official capacity.

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

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

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

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

23. Respondent, Sheriff Dale Schmidt and Scott Smith, jail administrator, are employed by the private, for-profit detention corporation contracted by the Government as an agent to confine immigrants at Dodge Detention Facility, where Petitioner is detained. He has immediate physical custody of Petitioner. He is sued in his official capacity.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

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

25. First, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 authorizes the detention of noncitizens in standard removal proceedings before an immigration judge. *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).

26. 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).

27. Last, 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).

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

29. The detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) were enacted as part of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104–208, Div. C, §§ 302–03, 110 Stat. 3009-546, 3009–582 to 3009–583, 3009–585.

Section 1226(a) was most recently amended earlier this year by the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No.119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025).

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

31. Thus, in the decades that followed, most people who entered without inspection and were placed in standard removal proceedings received bond hearings, unless their criminal history rendered them ineligible pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c). That practice was consistent with many more decades of prior practice, in which noncitizens who were not deemed "arriving" were entitled to a custody hearing before an IJ or other hearing officer. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a) (1994); *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 229 (1996) (noting that § 1226(a) simply "restates" the detention authority previously found at § 1252(a)).

32. In *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) explicitly acknowledged that individuals who have already entered the United States and are not apprehended within 100 miles of the border or within 14 days of entry are subject to discretionary detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), not mandatory detention under § 1225(b). During oral argument on November 30, 2016, then–Solicitor General Ian Gershengorn stated: "If they are not detained within 100 miles of the border or within 14 days… then they are under 1226(a) and not 1226(c)" and further clarified, in response to a question concerning "an alien who has come into the United States illegally without

being admitted [and] who takes up residence 50 miles from the border," the Government responded, "The answer is they are held under 1226(a) and that they get a bond hearing…" Transcript of Oral Argument at 7–8, *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. ___ (2018) (No. 15-1204). DHS reiterated that such individuals "would be held under 1226(a)" and cited the administrative record to support that position. *Id.* These statements reflect DHS's prior litigation stance that § 1226(a) governs detention for noncitizens who have entered and are residing in the United States, a position directly contrary to the agency's current interpretation applying § 1225(b)(2)(A) to such individuals. Having prevailed in *Jennings* after taking this position, they should be estopped from taking the contrary position now simply because their political or litigation interests have changed. Estoppel in this case is necessary to preserve the predictability inherent in the rule of law and due process under the Fifth Amendment, as well as to protect the integrity of the judicial system.

33. On July 8, 2025, ICE, "in coordination with" DOJ, announced a new policy that rejected well-established understanding of the statutory framework and reversed decades of practice.

34. The new policy, entitled "Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission,"[1] claims that all persons who entered the United States without inspection shall now be subject to mandatory detention provision under § 1225(b)(2)(A). The policy applies regardless of when a person is apprehended and affects those who have resided in the United States for months, years, and even decades.

[1] *Available at* https://www.aila.org/library/ice-memo-interim-guidance-regarding-detention-authority-for-applications-for-admission.

35. On September 5, 2025, the BIA adopted this same position in a published decision, *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*. There, the Board held that all noncitizens who entered the United States without admission or parole are subject to detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A) and are ineligible for IJ bond hearings.

36. Since Respondents adopted their new policies, several federal courts have rejected their new interpretation of the INA's detention authorities. Courts have likewise rejected *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, which adopts the same reading of the statute as ICE.

37. Even before ICE or the BIA introduced these nationwide policies, IJs in the Tacoma, Washington, immigration court stopped providing bond hearings for persons who entered the United States without inspection and who have since resided here. There, the U.S. District Court in the Western District of Washington found that such a reading of the INA is likely unlawful and that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to noncitizens who are not apprehended upon arrival to the United States. *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239 (W.D. Wash. 2025).

38. A growing number of federal courts have rejected ICE and EOIR's expanded interpretation of the Immigration and Nationality Act's detention provisions. These courts have consistently held that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b)(2), governs the detention authority applicable in these cases. For example, courts in Massachusetts, Arizona, New York, Maryland, Florida, Minnesota, California, Washington, New Mexico and Nebraska have reached this conclusion. See: *Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11571-JEK (D. Mass. July 7, 2025); *Rosado v. Figueroa*, No. CV 25-02157 PHX DLR (CDB) (D. Ariz. Aug. 11, 2025); *Lopez Benitez v. Francis*, No. 25 CIV. 5937 (DEH) (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2025); *Maldonado v. Olson*, No. 0:25-cv-03142-SRN-SGE (D. Minn. Aug. 15, 2025); *Romero v.*

Hyde, No. 25-11631-BEM (D. Mass. Aug. 19, 2025); *Ramirez Clavijo v. Kaiser*, No. 25-CV-06248-BLF (N.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2025); *Palma Perez v. Berg*, No. 8:25CV494 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025); Hernandez Lopez v. Hardin, 2025 WL 2732717 (M.D. Fla. Sept. 25, 2025); Mena Torres v. Wamsley, 2025 WL 2855379 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 8, 2025);Ortiz Martinez v. Wamsley, 2025 WL 2899116 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 10, 2025); Garcia Domingo v. Castro, 2025 WL 2941217 (D.N.M. Oct. 15, 2025).

39. These decisions reflect a clear judicial consensus that the government's reliance on § 1225(b)(2) is misplaced in cases involving those whose immigration status lawfully falls under § 1226(a).

40. Courts have uniformly rejected DHS's and EOIR's new interpretation because it defies the INA. As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court and others have explained, the plain text of the statutory provisions demonstrates that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to people like Petitioner.

41. Indeed, according to the I-220A, Release on Recognizance document issued to Respondent upon his encounter with Government officials, as well as the DHS's own factual allegations contained in the Notice to Appear, the DHS themselves determined that Petitioner had entered the U.S. under the INA and thus falls under § 1226(a), not § 1225(b).

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

43. The text of § 1226 also explicitly applies to people charged as being inadmissible, including those who entered without inspection. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E).

Subparagraph (E)'s reference to such people makes clear that, by default, such people are afforded a bond hearing under subsection (a). As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court explained, "[w]hen Congress creates 'specific exceptions' to a statute's applicability, it 'proves' that absent those exceptions, the statute generally applies." *Rodriguez Vazquez*, 779 F. Supp. 3d at 1257 (citing *Shady Grove Orthopedic Assocs., P.A. v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 559 U.S. 393, 400 (2010)); *see also Gomes*, 2025 WL 1869299, at *7.

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

45. By contrast, § 1225(b) applies to people arriving at U.S. ports of entry or who recently entered the United States and were not free to mingle with the general population after being free from official restraint. The statute's entire framework is premised on inspections at the border of people who are "seeking admission" to the United States. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Indeed, the Supreme Court has explained that 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." *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287 (2018).

46. Accordingly, the mandatory detention provision of § 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to people like Petitioner, who were encountered at the border and released after a quasi-judicial determination by an immigration official on a form I-220A that Respondent falls under the discretionary arrest provision of § 1226(a) as an uninspected entrant. The Government's own issuance of an I-220A placing Petitioner in custody under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) reflects a discretionary, fact-based determination that Petitioner was not subject

to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). This quasi-judicial decision was made by DHS at the outset of proceedings, based on the facts available to both parties and Petitioner's own admissions. Critically, DHS itself alleged in the Notice to Appear that Petitioner "entered the United States without inspection and without parole or lawful admission," a factual assertion that squarely contradicts the Government's current position—adopted wholesale by the Board of Immigration Appeals—that Petitioner is ineligible to apply for bond before EOIR. This reversal undermines the integrity of the adjudicative process and triggers the principles of issue preclusion recognized in *B&B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus., Inc.*, 575 U.S. 138 (2015), which require courts to respect agency determinations when the ordinary elements of preclusion are met.

47. It has been the settled practice for decades for immigration officials to issue an I-220A, or an Order of Release on Recognizance, to those who encounter immigration officials at or near the border. The issuance of an I-220A under § 236 is not a ministerial act but a formal adjudication of custody status, reflecting DHS's determination that the individual falls under the discretionary detention framework of § 236 rather than the mandatory detention provisions of § 235(b). The Supreme Court has "long favored application of the common law doctrines of collateral estoppel (as to issues) and res judicata (as to claims) to those determinations of administrative bodies that have attained finality." *Astoria Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. Solimino*, 501 U.S. 104, 108 (1991) (citing *United States v. Utah Constr. & Mining Co.*, 384 U.S. 394, 422 (1966)). As the Court explained in *Utah Construction*, "[w]hen an administrative agency is acting in a judicial capacity and resolves disputed issues of fact properly before it which the parties have had an adequate opportunity to litigate, the courts have not hesitated to apply res judicata to enforce

repose." 384 U.S. at 422. This presumption applies because "Congress is understood to legislate against a background of common-law adjudicatory principles." *Astoria*, 501 U.S. at 108 (citing *Briscoe v. LaHue*, 460 U.S. 325 (1983); *Isbrandtsen Co. v. Johnson*, 343 U.S. 779, 783 (1952)). Accordingly, DHS's prior § 236 determination—memorialized in the I-220A—constitutes a binding judgment for purposes of collateral estoppel and cannot be disturbed absent materially changed circumstances or new facts.

FACTS

48. Petitioner has resided in the United States since November 16, 2016, and currently resides physically in Juneau, Wisconsin, where he is detained.

49. Upon his entry into the United States, the DHS released respondent into the country with an I-220A form *Order of Release on Recognizance*, or "OREC," which found that Respondent was detained and released under INA 236, formally documenting that he was arrested, placed in removal proceedings, and released pursuant to INA § 236 (see OREC, Exhibit 4). The OREC expressly states that respondent's release was conditioned on compliance with § 236 and related regulations.

50. The DHS filed a Notice to Appear with EOIR alleging that Petitioner entered the United States without inspection. (see Exhibit 3, Notice to Appear, or "NTA").

51. On or about September 25, 2025, in Manitowoc, Wisconsin, Petitioner was arrested when he was working at his job on a dairy farm in Northeastern Wisconsin. Petitioner is now detained at the Dodge Detention Facility. (See I-213, ICE Report).

52. Post Respondent's arrest, on September 30, 2025, DHS moved to Recalendar removal proceedings before the Chicago Immigration Court pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. ICE has charged Petitioner with, *inter alia*, being inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. §

1182(a)(6)(A)(i) as someone who entered the United States without inspection. *See Motion to Recalendar*. Respondent's counsel was not served with a copy of the Motion to Recalendar, despite being the attorney of record since 2019. Judge Crites granted the motion on October 6, 2025, stating it was unopposed. *See Order of Immigration Judge, dated October 6, 2025.*

53. Previously, Respondent was in removal proceedings from November of 2016 until July 19, 2021, when his removal proceedings were administratively closed pursuant to DHS motion and Immigration Judge Elizabeth Crite's order. *See Order dated July 19, 2021.*

54. He filed an asylum application for the Chicago Immigration court on February 15, 2019. *See court-stamped I-589, dated February 15, 2019.* He had a valid work permit until 2029 and was working pursuant to that work authorization. *See Employment Authorization Document, valid from September 23, 2024, until September 22, 2029.*

55. Maynor Espinoza Hernandez's detention has inflicted profound harm on him. He is a 24-year-old man that has dedicated his entire life to farm work. He is unmarried and has no children, but lives with extended family members. He has lost his family as well as his job. He has never been arrested in his life apart from the apprehension at the border in November of 2016. We have provided a letter of employment confirmation from Maple Leaf Farms.

56. Following Petitioner's arrest and transfer to Dodge Detention Facility, ICE issued a custody determination to continue Petitioner's detention without an opportunity to post bond or be released on other conditions.

57. On October 7, 2025, Petitioner submitted a bond request to Chicago Immigration Court. The bond hearing was scheduled for October 27, 2025, before Immigration Judge

Saltzman, but was then subsequently rescheduled a few minutes after the hearing was to begin at 9 a.m., to October 29, 2025, again at 9 a.m. The case was classified as a Bond Matter, separate from his pending removal proceedings initiated by a charging document dated November 16, 2016. The Immigration Judge has not yet issued a decision on the bond request, although it is expected that he will find no jurisdiction over the bond request, even though the DHS had previously released the Respondent under section 236 of the INA.

58. Pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, the immigration judge is unable to consider Petitioner's bond request, and his unlawful detention cannot be litigated before that body, who collaborated with the DHS – who is a party to these contested proceedings – to adopt the DHS position wholesale, because such efforts will be futile.

59. As a result, Petitioner remains in detention. Without relief from this court, he faces the prospect of months, or even years, in immigration custody, separated from his job, family and community.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I
Violation of the INA

60. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

61. 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 received an I-220A and who were subsequently accused by DHS of having "entered" the United States. Those actions by DHS, followed by the Petitioner's concession to those charges before EOIR,

represent a quasi-judicial determination by an agency which precludes further litigation of the issue unless new, material, and previously unavailable facts emerge. Such noncitizens continue to be detained under § 1226(a), unless they are subject to § 1225(b)(1), § 1226(c), or § 1231.

62. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates his continued detention and violates the INA.

COUNT II
Violation of the Bond Regulations

63. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in preceding paragraphs.

64. In 1997, after Congress amended the INA through IIRIRA, EOIR and the then-Immigration and Naturalization Service issued an interim rule to interpret and apply IIRIRA. Specifically, under the heading of "Apprehension, Custody, and Detention of [Noncitizens]," the agencies explained that "[d]espite being applicants for admission, [noncitizens] who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as [noncitizens] who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination." 62 Fed. Reg. at 10323 (emphasis added). The agencies thus made clear that individuals who had entered without inspection were eligible for consideration for bond and bond hearings before IJs under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and its implementing regulations.

65. Nonetheless, pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, EOIR has a policy and practice of applying § 1225(b)(2) to individual like Petitioner.

66. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandate his continued detention and violates 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1, 1236.1, and 1003.19.

COUNT III
Violation of Due Process

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

68. The government may not deprive a person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. U.S. Const. amend. V. "Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that the Clause protects." *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).

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

70. The government's detention of Petitioner without a bond redetermination hearing to determine whether he is a flight risk or danger to others violates [his/her/their] right to due process.

Judicial Estoppel

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

72. The Government is judicially estopped from asserting that Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). In prior litigation, including *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, the Government successfully argued that individuals who entered without inspection and were not apprehended near the border or within 14 days were subject to discretionary detention under § 1226(a), not mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). See *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, No. 15-1204, Tr. of Oral Arg. at 7–8 (Nov. 30, 2016). Courts accepted that position. Now, the Government reverses course and asserts the opposite interpretation to deny bond hearings. Under *New Hampshire v. Maine*, 532 U.S. 742 (2001), judicial estoppel applies where a party assumes a position, prevails, and then

adopts a contrary position to gain an unfair advantage. The Government's reversal undermines the integrity of the judicial process and prejudices Petitioners who relied on the prior interpretation.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;

b. Order that Petitioner shall not be transferred outside the Eastern District of Wisconsin while this habeas petition is pending;

c. Issue an Order to Show Cause ordering Respondents to show cause why this Petition should not be granted within three days;

d. Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus requiring that Respondents release Petitioner or, in the alternative, provide Petitioner with a bond hearing pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven days;

e. Declare that Petitioner's detention is unlawful;

f. 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

g. Grant any other and further relief that this Court deems just and proper.

DATED this 27th day of October 2025.

/s/ Maria T Ryan, Esq.

Maria T. Ryan, Esq.
Attorney for Petitioner
Wisconsin Bar No. 1056653
Ryan Immigration Law, LLC
128 W. Mineral Street

Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53204
Telephone: (414) 383-8800
Email: maria@ryanimmigration.com

Attorney for Petitioner