

discretionary decision immune from judicial review under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g). *Id.* at 6. Respondents also contend that review of the detention decision is also barred by 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9) (review only available on judicial review of final order of removal) and 8 U.S.C. 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii) (no jurisdiction over discretionary immigration decisions). *Id.* at 6-9. Finally, respondents contend that foreign nationals who were never admitted to the United States do not qualify for bond. *Id.* at 14-21. Respondents assert that the arguments made in that brief apply to this case.

Respondents acknowledge that in the October 20, 2025, decision in the *H.G.V.U.* case, the court rejected many of these arguments and ordered a bond hearing be provided under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). While respondents disagree with many of the court's conclusions, attached is a copy of the decision for the court's consideration. Govt. Ex. C. Also attached is the October 29, 2025, decision in *Corona Diaz v. Olson, et al.*, No. 25 C 12141 (N.D. Ill.), Dkt. 17 (Shah, J.) (same) (Govt. Ex. D), the October 21, 2025, decision in *Miguel v. Noem, et al.*, No. 25 C 11137 (N.D. Ill.), Dkt. 21 (Alonso, J.) (same) (Govt. Ex. E), and the October 16, 2025, decision in *Ochoa Ochoa v. Noem, et al.*, No. 25 C 10865 (N.D. Ill.), Dkt. 20 (Jenkins, J.) (same). Govt. Ex. F.

Respondents request that the habeas petition be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDREW S. BOUTROS
United States Attorney

By: s/ Nicole Flores
NICOLE FLORES
Assistant United States Attorney
219 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 886-9082
nicole.flores3@usdoj.gov