

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

Uriel MENDOZA ARAIZA,

Petitioners,

v.

Cammilla WAMSLEY, et al.,

Respondents.

Case No. 2:25-cv-2139-TL

**EX PARTE MOTION FOR
DECISION**

Note on Motion Calendar:
December 5, 2025

INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Uriel Mendoza Araiza submits this motion to request an immediate decision on his petition for a writ of habeas corpus. Defendants have not defended the legality of his detention *whatsoever* and have conceded he is a class member of the Bond Denial Class in *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Hermosillo*, No. 3:25-cv-05240 (W.D. Wash.). In other similarly situated cases, this Court has granted the habeas petitions of class members within two weeks or less. Yet here, Mr. Mendoza remains incarcerated at the Northwest Immigration and Customs Enforcement Processing Center (NWIPC), even though the law as declared in *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, No. 3:25-cv-05240-TMC, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 2782499 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 30, 2025) requires Respondents to afford him an immediate bond hearing where he is likely to be ordered released on bond.

1 **ARGUMENT**

2 Mr. Mendoza filed this case on October 30, 2025. Dkt. 1. In his petition, he alleged that
3 he was being unlawfully detained as a class member of the certified Bond Denial Class in
4 *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Hermosillo*, No. 3:25-cv-05240 (W.D. Wash.). *See generally id.* His
5 petition and the accompanying motion for an order to show cause noted that the Immigration
6 Judge had found him to be subject to the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No. 119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025)
7 (LRA) because of a 2006 shoplifting conviction. Dkt. 1 ¶¶ 7–10. But as he explained in those
8 filings, the LRA is not retroactive. Dkt. 1 ¶¶ 11–14; Dkt. 2 at 3–6. As a result, because he
9 otherwise meets the requirements for inclusion in the *Rodriguez Vazquez* Bond Denial Class, he
10 is entitled to a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).

11 Respondents have not asserted otherwise in this case. In their return—which was filed on
12 November 17—they simply they acknowledged that they “do not oppose this Petitioner being
13 considered [a] member[] of the Bond Denial Class for purposes of this litigation.” Dkt. 9 at 3.
14 Petitioner filed his traverse the same day, urging the Court to immediately grant the habeas
15 petition. Dkt. 10.

16 Immediately granting the habeas petition in this case is warranted for two reasons. First,
17 habeas “is a swift and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or confinement.” *Fay v.*
18 *Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963), *overruled on other grounds by Wainwright v. Sykes*, 433 U.S.
19 72 (1977). As a result, “[u]ndue delay in the disposition of habeas corpus cases is unacceptable.”
20 *In re Habeas Corpus Cases*, 216 F.R.D. 52, 53 (E.D.N.Y. 2003). The reason for the urgency in
21 habeas cases is that “[t]ardiness may prejudice the petitioner in supporting the petition. Some of
22 his or her claims may merit release, with postponement leading to unnecessary continuation in
23 custody.” *Id.* Here, that rationale applies with particular force, as Respondents have not opposed
24 granting this habeas petition and Mr. Mendoza would likely be out of detention, but for
25 Respondents’ illegal conduct.

26 Second, most cases like this one—i.e., those involving a claim to Bond Denial Class
27 membership—have been addressed expeditiously. In related cases, which have involved several

1 petitioners, the Court has typically granted the petitioners a writ of habeas corpus within two
2 weeks of the filing of the petition. Mr. Mendoza's case has lingered for far longer, even though
3 Respondents have mounted no defense to his petition. *See, e.g.*, Order Granting Pet. for Writ of
4 Habeas Corpus, *Garcia v. Wamsley*, No. 2:25-cv-01980-TMC (W.D. Wash.), Dkt. 11 (granting
5 petition for three class members eight days after filing of petition); Order Granting Pet. for Writ
6 of Habeas Corpus, *Cantero Garcia v. Wamsley*, No. 2:25-cv-2092-TMC (W.D. Wash.), Dkt. 13
7 (granting petition for four out of five petitioners two weeks after filing of the petition); Order
8 Granting Pet. for Writ of Habeas Corpus, *Corralles Castillo v. Wamsley*, No. 2:25-cv-2172-TMC
9 (W.D. Wash.), Dkt. 13 (granting petition for three out of four petitioners just over two weeks
10 after filing of the petition); Order Granting Pet. for Writ of Habeas Corpus, *Leon Figueroa v.*
11 *Wamsley*, No. 2:25-cv-2228-TMC (W.D. Wash.), Dkt. 23 (granting petition for four petitioners
12 twelve days after filing of petition) of petition; Order Granting Pet. for Writ of Habeas Corpus,
13 *Hernandez Ramos v. Hermosillo*, No. 2:25-cv-2273 (W.D. Wash.), Dkt. 11 (granting habeas
14 petition for six petitioners one week after filing of petition).

15 Accordingly, Mr. Mendoza respectfully requests that the Court immediately grant this
16 petition, holding that the LRA is not retroactive to his shoplifting offense and that Mr. Mendoza
17 is entitled to a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) by virtue of his membership in the Bond
18 Denial Class.

19 Respectfully submitted this 5th day of December, 2025.

20 s/ Matt Adams
21 Matt Adams, WSBA No. 28287
22 matt@nwirp.org

s/ Aaron Korthuis
Aaron Korthuis, WSBA No. 53974
aaron@nwirp.org

23 s/ Glenda M. Aldana Madrid
24 Glenda M. Aldana Madrid, WSBA No. 46987
glenda@nwirp.org

s/ Leila Kang
Leila Kang, WSBA No. 48048
leila@nwirp.org

25 s/ Amanda Ng
26 Amanda Ng, WSBA No. 57181
amanda@nwirp.org

*Counsel certifies that this motion contains 761
words, in compliance with the Local Civil
Rules.*

1 NORTHWEST IMMIGRANT
RIGHTS PROJECT
2 615 Second Ave., Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98104
3 (206) 957-8611

4 *Counsel for Petitioner*

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