

1 WILLIAM BAKER, SBN 157 906
2 Moreno & Associates Law Firm, APC
3 2082 Otay Lakes Road, Ste. 102
4 Chula Vista, CA 91913
5 619-422-4885
6 william.baker@morenoandassociates.com

7 Attorney for petitioner

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 Southern District of California

10 JOSUE SALAS CABALLERO,

11 Petitioner,

12 v.

13 CHRISTOPHER J. LaROSE, Senior Warden
14 Otay Mesa Detention Center; PAMELA BONDI,
15 United States Attorney General; KRISTI NOEM,
16 Secretary of the Department of Homeland
17 Security; PATRICK DIVVER, ICE San Diego
18 Field Office Director, in their official capacities,

19 Respondents.


) Case Number: **'25CV2927 BJC KSC**

) **VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF**
) **HABEAS CORPUS**

) Oral Argument Requested

20 Petitioner alleges:

21 **INTRODUCTION**

22 1. Petitioner JOSUE SALAS CABALLERO (A ) is subjected to unlawful
23 detention by Respondents at the Otay Mesa Detention Center. The immigration judge concluded
24 that he had no jurisdiction to even consider setting a bond based on the case of *Matter of Yajure*
25 *Hurtado*, 29 I & N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). The BIA and immigration judge interpretation of the
26 Immigration and Nationality Act is plainly contrary to the statutory framework and decades of
27 agency practice. Petitioner seeks an order compelling the immigration judge to accept jurisdiction
28 and afford him a bond decision on the merits.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

JURISDICTION

2. This action arises under the Constitution of the United States; the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”), 8 U.S.C. § 1101, *et seq*; and the Administrative Procedures Act (“APA”), 5 U.S.C. § 500, *et seq*.

3. This court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus; 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question); 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act); 5 U.S.C. § 701 *et seq*. (APA); and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202 (Declaratory Judgment Act).

4. The court may grant relief under the habeas corpus statutes, the Declaratory Judgment Act, and the All-Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

VENUE

5. Venue is proper because Petitioner is detained at the Otay Mesa Detention Facility, in San Diego, California, which is within the jurisdiction of this District.

6. Venue is also proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 USC §1391(e) because at least one federal respondent is in this District; and a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims in this action took place in this District. No real property is involved.

REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

7. The Court must grant the habeas corpus petition 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*.

8. 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).

PARTIES

9. Petitioner JOSUE SALAS CABALLERO (“Petitioner”) is a 42-year-old citizen of Mexico. He is detained by the Respondents at the Otay Mesa Detention Center.

1 16. The “usual removal process” involves an evidentiary hearing before an immigration
2 judge. *Dep’t of Homeland Sec. v. Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 108 (2020). Proceedings are initiated
3 under 8 U.S.C. § 1229(a), also known as “full removal,” by filing a Notice to Appear with the
4 Immigration Court. *Matter of E-R-M- & L-R-M-*, 25 I. & N. Dec. 520, 520 (BIA 2011). Section § 1226
5 provides that while removal proceedings are pending, a noncitizen “may be arrested and detained” and
6 that the government “may release the alien on ... conditional parole.” § 1226(a)(2); *accord*
7 *Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 108 (during removal proceedings, applicant may either be “detained” or
8 “allowed to reside in this country”).

9 17. When a person is apprehended under § 1226(a), an ICE officer makes the initial
10 custody determination. *Diaz v. Garland*, 53 F.4th 1189, 1196 (9th Cir. 2022) (citing 8 C.F.R. §
11 236.1(c)(8)). A noncitizen will be released if he or she “demonstrate[s] to the satisfaction of the
12 officer that such release would not pose a danger to property or persons, and that the alien is likely
13 to appear for any future proceeding.” *Id.* (citing 8 C.F.R. § 236.1(c)(8)). “Federal regulations
14 provide that aliens detained under § 1226(a) receive bond hearings at the outset of detention.”
15 *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 306 (2018) (citing 8 CFR §§ 236.1(d)(1)). If, at this hearing,
16 the detainee demonstrates by the preponderance of the evidence that he or she is not “a threat to
17 national security, a danger to the community at large, likely to abscond, or otherwise a poor bail
18 risk,” the IJ will order his or her release. *Diaz*, 53 F.4th at 1197 (citing *Matter of Guerra*, 24 I. & N.
19 Dec. 37, 40 (B.I.A. 2006)).

20 18. Once released, the noncitizen’s bond is subject to revocation. Under 8 U.S.C. §
21 1226(b), “the DHS has authority to revoke a noncitizen’s bond or parole ‘at any time,’ even if that
22 individual has previously been released.” *Ortega v. Bonnar*, 415 F. Supp. 3d 963, 968 (N.D. Cal.
23 2019). However, if an immigration judge has determined the noncitizen should be released, the
24 DHS may not re-arrest that noncitizen absent a change in circumstance. *See Panosyan v. Mayorkas*,
25 854 F. App’x 787, 788 (9th Cir. 2021) Where the release decision was made by a DHS officer, not
26 an immigration judge, the Government’s practice has been to require a showing of changed
27 circumstances before re-arrest. *See Saravia v. Sessions*, 280 F. Supp. 3d 1168, 1197 (N.D. Cal.
28 2017).

1 19. While “§ 1226 applies to *aliens already present in the United States*,” U.S.
2 immigration law also “authorizes the Government to detain certain *aliens seeking admission into the*
3 *country* under §§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2),” a process that provides for expedited removal. *Jennings*,
4 583 U.S. at 303 (2018)(emphasis added). Under § 1225, a noncitizen “who has not been admitted or
5 who arrives in the United States” is considered “an applicant for admission.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1).
6 For certain applicants for admission, 8 U.S.C. § 1225 authorizes “expedited removal.” § 1225(b)(1).

7 20. Respondents’ central argument is that petitioner is subject to mandatory detention
8 pending removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1), 1225(b)(2)(A). Respondents rely on the
9 BIA’s recent decision in *Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I & N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), affirming the
10 government’s new interpretation of § 1225.

11 21. As a threshold matter, the BIA decision *Yajure Hurtado* is entitled to little or no
12 deference by the District Court. *Loper Bright Enters. v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369, 400 (2024)
13 (observing that while “agencies have no special competence in resolving statutory ambiguities,”
14 “[c]ourts do”).

15 22. Multiple District Courts across the entire United States have recently concluded that
16 the government’s proposed interpretation of the statute (a) disregards the plain meaning of section
17 1225(b)(2)(A); (b) disregards the relationship between sections 1225 and 1226; (c) would render a
18 recent amendment to section 1226(c) superfluous; and (d) is inconsistent with decades of prior
19 statutory interpretation and practice. The following quote is a representative example:

20 “The Court follows other decisions in this Circuit finding that “seeking admission
21 requires an affirmative act such as entering the United States or applying for status,
22 and that it does not apply to individuals who, like [Petitioner], have been residing in
23 the United States and did not apply for admission or a change of status.” *Mosqueda*
24 *v. Noem*, No. 25-CV-2304 CAS (BFM), 2025 WL 2591530, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8,
25 2025); *see, e.g., Vazquez v. Feeley*, No. 2:25-CV-01542-RFB-EJY, 2025 WL
26 2676082, at *11–16 (D. Nev. Sept. 17, 2025); *Rodriguez*, 2025 WL 2782499, at *1
27 (“Every district court to address this question has concluded that the government’s
28 position belies the statutory text of the INA, canons of statutory interpretation,

1 legislative history, and longstanding agency practice.”); *Guzman v. Andrews*, No. 25-
2 CV-1015-KES-SKO (HC), 2025 WL 2617256, at *4–5 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025)
3 (finding that petitioner who was released on bond and rearrested was entitled to a
4 bond hearing under § 1226); *Garcia*, 2025 WL 2549431, at *8 (providing petitioner
5 with an individualized bond hearing under § 1226(a)); *Valdovinos v. Noem*, No. 25-
6 CV-2439 TWR (KSC), slip op. at 9 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2025) (same).” *Esquivel-*
7 *Pina v. LaRose*, No. 25-CV-2672, 2025 WL 2998361 at 8 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2025).

8 23. District Courts have found, once immigration authorities “elect to proceed with full
9 removal proceedings under § 1226, [they] cannot [] reverse course and institute § 1225 expedited
10 removal proceedings.” *Ramirez Clavijo v. Kaiser*, No. 25-CV-06248-BLF, 2025 WL 2419263, at *4
11 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2025).

12 24. Moreover, given the time spent at liberty following an initial release from detention
13 upon a determination that petitioner was not a flight risk or danger, as well as the government’s
14 implicit promise that any custody redetermination would be based on those same criteria, petitioner
15 has a protected “interest in remaining at liberty unless [he] no longer meets those criteria.” *Espinoza*
16 *v. Kaiser*, No. 1:25-CV-01101 JLT SKO, 2025 WL 2581185, at *13 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 5, 2025)
17 (quoting *Pinchi v. Noem*, No. 5:25-CV-05632-PCP, 2025 WL 2084921, at *4 (N.D. Cal. July 24,
18 2025).

19 FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

20 25. Petitioner has lived in the United States since 1993. His last entry was in 2006. He is
21 not married. He has two children, ages 18 and 19. His children are United States citizens. Petitioner
22 works as a self-employed handyman. He has a minimal criminal record consisting of a 2010
23 conviction for petty theft (California Penal Code § 484).

24 26. On June 4, 2010, the DHS detained Petitioner and issued him a Notice to Appear
25 (NTA), then released him on his own recognizance pending his removal hearing at the San Diego
26 Immigration Court.

27 27. The NTA charges Petitioner with removability under 212(a)(6)(A)(i) of the INA, as
28 an alien present in the USA without being admitted or paroled. Petitioner conceded removability.

1 28. In 2013, Petitioner filed applications for cancellation of removal and asylum.

2 29. In March 2013, the immigration judge granted Petitioner's unopposed motion for an
3 administrative closure of the removal case. The removal case was closed.

4 30. In September 2025, the immigration judge granted the DHS motion to re-calendar
5 the removal case. The judge scheduled a master calendar hearing for October 21, 2025.

6 31. Before the new court hearing, the DHS detained petitioner without explanation and
7 sent him to the Otay Mesa Detention Center, where he remains today.

8 32. Petitioner filed a motion for a custody redetermination seeking a bond allowing
9 release from the immigration jail. On September 22, 2025 the immigration judge denied the bond
10 request, concluding he had no jurisdiction to redetermine bond per *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*.

11 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

12 **COUNT 1**

13 (Violation of the Immigration and Nationality Act)

14 33. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 32.

15 34. The DHS detains petitioner pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226, not 8 U.S.C. § 1225;
16 therefore he is entitled to a bond redetermination hearing before an immigration judge.

17 35. Petitioner's continued detention under Section 1226(a) in the absence of a bond
18 hearing violates the INA.

19 **COUNT 2**

20 (Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act))

21 36. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 35.

22 37. Section 706 of 5 U.S.C. provides that a reviewing court shall compel agency action
23 unlawfully withheld and hold unlawful and set aside agency action not in accordance with law. 5
24 U.S.C. § 706(1)-(2).

25 38. Petitioner has a statutory and due process right to have an Immigration Judge
26 conduct a bond hearing pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226.

27 39. Moreover, the respondents' arbitrary re-detention of petitioner—and others—without
28 explanation or a change in circumstances is unlawful and smacks of malice.

1 40. Defendants' refusal to provide a bond hearing to petitioner harms him and
2 constitutes final agency action for purposes of the APA.

3 41. There are no other adequate available remedies.

4 42. Respondents' actions constitute an unlawful withholding of an agency action and
5 unlawful agency action in violation of the APA.

6 **COUNT 3**

7 (Violation of the Due Process Clause)

8 43. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 41.

9 44. In June 2010, the DHS detained petitioner for a removal proceeding but then
10 released him upon his own recognizance (OR), conceding that he was neither a flight risk nor a
11 danger to the community.

12 45. In September 2025, DHS agents detained petitioner on the street without explanation
13 and sent him to the Otay Mesa Detention Center.

14 46. The re-detention of petitioner after his OR release without any explanation or change
15 in circumstances violates Ninth Circuit case law and the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment
16 to the United States Constitution

17 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

18 WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests this Court to grant the following:

19 (1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;

20 (2) Issue an Order to Show Cause ordering Respondents to show cause why this Petition
21 should not be granted within three days;

22 (3) Declare that Petitioner's detention violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth
23 Amendment, the INA, and the APA;

24 (4) Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus ordering Respondents to release Petitioner immediately or
25 schedule a bond hearing on the merits before an immigration judge;

26 (5) Issue an order prohibiting respondents from continuing to detain petitioner on the basis
27 that he is subject to mandatory detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2);
28

1 (6) Award Petitioner attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act (28
2 U.S.C. § 2412), and any other applicable statute or regulation; and

3 (7) Grant any further relief this Court deems just and proper.

4 DATED: 28 October 2025

5 Respectfully submitted,

6 */s/ William Baker*

7
8 William Baker (157 906)
9 MORENO & ASSOCIATES
10 2082 Otay Lakes Road, Suites 102
11 Chula Vista, California 91913
12 Telephone: (619) 422-4885
13 william.baker@morenoandassociates
14 Attorney for petitioner
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

VERIFICATION


DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that I am the petitioner; I have read the petition or had it read to me in a language I understand, and the information in the petition is true and correct. I understand that a false statement of a material fact may serve as the basis for prosecution for perjury.

VERIFICACIÓN

DECLARACIÓN BAJO PENA DE PERJURIO

Declaro bajo pena de perjurio según las leyes de los Estados Unidos que soy el peticionario; He leído la petición o me la han leído en un idioma que entiendo, y la información de la petición es verdadera y correcta. Entiendo que una declaración falsa de un hecho material puede servir como base para el enjuiciamiento por perjurio.



JOSUE SALAS CABALLERO
Petitioner/Peticionario