

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

PABLO MORENO GONZALEZ and)	
FELIPE AGUSTIN ZAMACONA,)	
)	
Petitioners,)	
)	
v.)	No. 25 C 13485
)	
SAM OLSON, Chicago Field Office)	Judge Ellis
Director, U.S. IMMIGRATION AND)	
CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Respondents.)	

RESPONSE TO HABEAS PETITION

Petitioners Pablo Moreno Gonzalez and Felipe Agustin Zamacona are both natives and citizens of Mexico who are challenging their immigration detention. Pet., at ¶ 1. They both claim to have entered the United States without inspection many years ago. Pet. ¶¶2-4. They contend that “Petitioners should be eligible for release from detention on an immigration bond.” Pet. ¶6. About two months ago, the Board of Immigration Appeals ruled that foreign nationals who entered the United States without inspection were not eligible for bond hearings in immigration court because the individuals were technically never admitted to the United States. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I.&N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025) (attached). Petitioner claims that *Yajure Hurtado* was decided incorrectly. Pet. at ¶¶ 54-73.

This issue is being litigated in district courts across the country, including this district. One of these cases is *Ochoa Ochoa v. Noem*, 25 C 10865 (October 16, 2025). Attached is a copy of the government’s brief in that case that presents the arguments that respondents wish to reiterate in this case. Govt. Ex. A. Respondents also submit a copy of the court’s decision in *Ochoa*

Ochoa. Govt. Ex. B. In addition to the Respondents previously filed brief, respondents would like the court to consider the following:

Petitioners are currently detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) and are therefore ineligible for release under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). They seek to circumvent the detention statute under which they are rightfully detained to secure a custody redetermination hearing that they are not entitled to under BIA caselaw. Petitioners argue that, contrary to the plain language of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), the authority for their detention is better understood to arise under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), a detention statute that allows for release on bond or conditional parole. That argument fails to square with the fact that they fall within the statutory definition of aliens subject to detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

Argument

I. Petitioners' Claims Should Be Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction Under Rule 12(B)(1)

A. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(E)(3) Bars Review of Petitioners' Claims.

Section 1252(e)(3) deprives this court of jurisdiction, including habeas corpus jurisdiction, over Petitioner's challenge to [his/her] detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). Section 1252(e)(3) limits judicial review of "determinations under section 1225(b) of this title and its implementation" to only in the District Court for the District of Columbia. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(e)(3). Paragraph (e)(3) further confines this limited review to (1) whether § 1225(b) or an implementing regulation is constitutional or (2) whether a regulation or other written policy directive, guideline, or procedure implementing the section violates the law. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(e)(3)(A)(i)-(ii); *see also* *M.M.V. v. Garland*, 1 F.4th 1100, 1109 (D.C. Cir. 2021). Unlike other provisions within 1252(e), section 1252(e)(3) applies broadly to judicial review of section 1225(b), not just determinations under section 1225(b)(1). *Compare* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(e)(1)(A), (e)(2), *with* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(e)(3)(A). *See* *Russello v. United States*, 464 U.S. 16, 23 (1983) (quoting *United States v. Wong Kim Bo*, 472

F.2d 720, 722 (5th Cir. 1972)) (“[W]here Congress includes particular language in one section of a statute but omits it in another section of the same Act, it is generally presumed that Congress acts intentionally and purposely in the disparate inclusion or exclusion.’ ... We refrain from concluding here that the differing language in the two subsections has the same meaning in each. We would not presume to ascribe this difference to a simple mistake in draftsmanship.”).

Here, Petitioners challenge the determination, set forth in writing by both the Department of Justice and DHS, that aliens who entered the United States without inspection are subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2). *See, e.g.*, Pet. ¶¶ 41-54. Petitioners thus seek judicial review of a written policy or guideline implementing § 1225(b), which is covered by § 1252(e)(3)(A)(ii).¹

B. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) Bars Review of Petitioners’ Claims.

Section 1252(g) categorically bars jurisdiction over “*any* cause or claim by or on behalf of any alien *arising from* the decision or action by the [Secretary of Homeland Security] to *commence proceedings*, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders against any alien.” 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) (emphasis added). The Secretary of Homeland Security’s decision to *commence removal proceedings*, including the decision to detain an alien pending such removal proceedings, squarely falls within this jurisdictional bar. In other words, detention clearly “aris[es] from” the decision to commence removal proceedings against an alien. *See Alvarez v. ICE*, 818 F.3d 1194, 1203 (11th Cir. 2016) (“By its plain terms, [§ 1252(g)] bars us from questioning ICE’s discretionary decisions to commence removal” and also to review “ICE’s decision to take [plaintiff] into custody and to detain him during removal proceedings”); *Tazu v. Att’y Gen. U.S.*, 975 F.3d 292, 298 (3d Cir.

¹ As a responsive pleading, the undersigned presumes that a response to a habeas petition is not subject to the Local Rule 7.1 15-page limit. If this presumption is wrong, the undersigned seeks leave to file this response which is commensurate in length to the habeas petition.

2020) (“The text of § 1252(g)... strips us of jurisdiction to review... [T]o perform or complete a removal, the [Secretary of Homeland Security] must exercise [her] discretionary power to detain an alien for a few days. That detention does not fall within some other part of the deportation process.”) (cleaned up) (internal quotations and citations omitted); *Valencia-Mejia v. United States*, No. CV 08–2943 CAS (PJWx), 2008 WL 4286979, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2008) (“The decision to detain plaintiff until his hearing before the Immigration Judge *arose from* this decision to commence proceedings[.]”) (emphasis added); *Wang v. United States*, No. CV 10-0389 SVW (RCx), 2010 WL 11463156, at *6 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 18, 2010) (citing *Khorrami v. Rolince*, 493 F. Supp. 2d 1061 (N.D. Ill. 2007) (“[Plaintiff’s] detention necessarily *arises from* the decision to initiate removal proceedings against him.”) (emphasis added); *Herrera-Correra v. United States*, No. CV 08-2941 DSF (JCx), 2008 WL 11336833, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2008) (citing *Sissoko v. Rocha*, 509 F.3d 947, 949 (9th Cir. 2007) (“The [Secretary] may arrest the alien against whom proceedings are commenced and detain that individual until the conclusion of those proceedings. ... Thus, an alien’s detention throughout this process *arises from* the [Secretary]’s decision to commence proceedings[.]” and review of claims arising from such detention is barred under § 1252(g)) (emphasis added). In the Supreme Court’s words, detention pending removal is a “specification” of the decision to commence proceedings. *See Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.* (“AADC”), 525 U.S. 471, 485 n.9 (1999) (“§ 1252(g) covers” a “specification of the decision to ‘commence proceedings’”). As such, judicial review of the Petitioners’ claims are barred by § 1252(g).

C. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9) Bars Review of Petitioners’ Claim[S].

Under § 1252(b)(9), “judicial review of all questions of law . . . including interpretation and application of statutory provisions . . . arising from any action taken . . . to remove an alien

from the United States” is only proper before the appropriate court of appeals in the form of a petition for review of a final removal order. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9); *Reno v. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 483 (1999) (“AADC”). Section 1252(b)(9) is an “unmistakable ‘zipper’ clause” that “channels judicial review of all [claims arising from deportation proceedings]” to a court of appeals in the first instance. *Id.*; *see Lopez v. Barr*, No. CV 20-1330 (JRT/BRT), 2021 WL 195523, at *2 (D. Minn. Jan. 20, 2021) (citing *Nasrallah v. Barr*, 590 U.S. 573, 579–80 (2020)).

Moreover, § 1252(a)(5) provides that a petition for review is the exclusive means for judicial review of immigration proceedings.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law (statutory or nonstatutory), . . . a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals in accordance with this section shall be the sole and exclusive means for judicial review of an order of removal entered or issued under any provision of this chapter, except as provided in subsection (e) [concerning aliens not admitted to the United States].

8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(5). “Taken together, § 1252(a)(5) and § 1252(b)(9) mean that *any* issue—whether legal or factual—arising from *any* removal-related activity can be reviewed *only* through the [petition-for-review] process.” *J.E.F.M. v. Lynch*, 837 F.3d 1026, 1031 (9th Cir. 2016) (emphasis in original); *see id.* at 1035 (“§§ 1252(a)(5) and [(b)(9)] channel review of all claims, including policies-and-practices challenges . . . whenever they ‘arise from’ removal proceedings”); *accord Ruiz v. Mukasey*, 552 F.3d 269, 274 n.3 (2d Cir. 2009) (only when the action is “unrelated to any removal action or proceeding” is it within the district court’s jurisdiction); *cf. Xiao Ji Chen v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice*, 434 F.3d 144, 151 n.3 (2d Cir. 2006) (a “primary effect” of the REAL ID Act is to “limit all aliens to one bite of the apple” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

Critically, “[§] 1252(b)(9) is a judicial channeling provision, not a claim-barring one.” *Aguilar v. ICE*, 510 F.3d 1, 11 (1st Cir. 2007). Indeed, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(D) provides that

“[n]othing . . . in any other provision of this chapter . . . shall be construed as precluding review of constitutional claims or questions of law raised upon a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals in accordance with this section.” *See also Ajlani v. Chertoff*, 545 F.3d 229, 235 (2d Cir. 2008) (“[J]urisdiction to review such claims is vested exclusively in the courts of appeals[.]”). The petition-for-review process before the court of appeals ensures that aliens have a proper forum for claims arising from their immigration proceedings and “receive their day in court.” *J.E.F.M.*, 837 F.3d at 1031–32 (internal quotations omitted); *see also Rosario v. Holder*, 627 F.3d 58, 61 (2d Cir. 2010) (“The REAL ID Act of 2005 amended the [INA] to obviate . . . Suspension Clause concerns” by permitting judicial review of “nondiscretionary” BIA determinations and “all constitutional claims or questions of law.”).

In evaluating the reach of subsections (a)(5) and (b)(9), the Second Circuit explained that jurisdiction turns on the substance of the relief sought. *Delgado v. Quarantillo*, 643 F.3d 52, 55 (2d Cir. 2011). Those provisions divest district courts of jurisdiction to review both direct and indirect challenges to removal orders, including decisions to detain for purposes of removal or for proceedings. *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 294–95 (section 1252(b)(9) includes challenges to the “decision to detain [an alien] in the first place or to seek removal[.]”). Here, Petitioner challenges the decision and action to detain [him/her], which arises from DHS’s decision to commence removal proceedings, and is thus an “action taken . . . to remove [him/her] from the United States.” *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9); *see also, e.g., Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 294–95; *Velasco Lopez v. Decker*, 978 F.3d 842, 850 (2d Cir. 2020) (finding that 8 U.S.C. § 1226(e) did not bar review in that case because the petitioner did not challenge “his initial detention”); *Saadulloev v. Garland*, No. 3:23-CV-00106, 2024 WL 1076106, at *3 (W.D. Pa. Mar. 12, 2024) (recognizing that there is no judicial review of the threshold detention decision, which flows from the government’s decision to

“commence proceedings”). As such, the court lacks jurisdiction over this action. The reasoning in *Jennings* outlines why the Petitioners’ claims cannot be reviewed by the court.

While holding that it was unnecessary to comprehensively address the scope of § 1252(b)(9), the Supreme Court in *Jennings* provided guidance on the types of challenges that may fall within the scope of § 1252(b)(9). *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 293–94. The Court found that “§1252(b)(9) [did] not present a jurisdictional bar” in situations where “respondents . . . [were] not challenging the decision to detain them in the first place.” *Id.* at 294–95. In this case, the Petitioner *does* challenge the government’s decision to detain [him/her] in the first place. *See, e.g.*, [CITE COMPLAINT]. Though the Petitioner frames [his/her] challenge as relating to detention authority, rather than a challenge to DHS’s decision to detain [him/her] in the first instance, such creative framing does not evade the preclusive effect of § 1252(b)(9).

The fact that Petitioners are challenging the basis upon which they are detained is enough to trigger § 1252(b)(9) because “detention *is* an ‘action taken . . . to remove’ an alien.” *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 319 (Thomas, J., concurring); 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9). The court should dismiss the Petitioners’ claims for lack of jurisdiction under § 1252(b)(9). The Petitioners must present their claims before the appropriate court of appeals because they challenge the government’s decision or action to detain them, which must be raised before a court of appeals, not this court. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9).

II. The Court Should Dismiss the Petition for Writ Of Habeas Corpus as Petitioner is Properly Detained Under 8 U.S.C. § 1225.

A. Applicants for admission are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225.

“As with any question of statutory interpretation, [the] analysis begins with the plain language of the statute.” *Jimenez v. Quarterman*, 555 U.S. 113, 118 (2009) (citing *Lamie v. U.S. Tr.*, 540 U.S. 526, 534 (2004)). Section 1225(a)(1) defines an “applicant for admission” as an

“alien present in the United States who has not been admitted or who arrives in the United States (whether or not at a designated port of arrival . . .)” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1); *see Matter of Velasquez-Cruz*, 26 I&N Dec. 458, 463 n.5 (BIA 2014) (“[R]egardless of whether an alien who illegally enters the United States is caught at the border or inside the country, he or she will still be required to prove eligibility for admission.”). Accordingly, by its very definition, the term “applicant for admission” includes two categories of aliens: (1) arriving aliens, and (2) aliens present without admission. *See Dep’t of Homeland Sec. v. Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 140 (2020) (explaining that “an alien who tries to enter the country illegally is treated as an ‘applicant for admission’” (citing 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1)); *Matter of Lemus*, 25 I&N Dec. 734, 743 (BIA 2012) (“Congress has defined the concept of an ‘applicant for admission’ in an unconventional sense, to include not just those who are expressly seeking permission to enter, but also those who are present in this country without having formally requested or received such permission”); *Matter of E-R-M- & L-R-M-*, 25 I&N Dec. 520, 523 (BIA 2011) (stating that “the broad category of applicants for admission . . . includes, *inter alia*, any alien present in the United States who has not been admitted” (citing 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1))). An arriving alien is defined, in pertinent part, as “an applicant for admission coming or attempting to come into the United States at a port-of-entry [(“POE”)]” 8 C.F.R. §§ 1.2, 1001.1(q).

All aliens who are applicants for admission “shall be inspected by immigration officers.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 235.1(a) (“Application to lawfully enter the United States shall be made in person to an immigration officer at a U.S. [POE] when the port is open for inspection”). An applicant for admission seeking admission at a United States POE “must present whatever documents are required and must establish to the satisfaction of the inspecting officer that the alien is not subject to removal . . . and is entitled, under all of the applicable

provisions of the immigration laws . . . to enter the United States.” 8 C.F.R. § 235.1(f)(1); *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(2)(A) (describing the related burden of an applicant for admission in removal proceedings). “An alien present in the United States who has not been admitted or paroled or an alien who seeks entry at other than an open, designated [POE] . . . is subject to the provisions of [8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)] and to removal under [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)] or [8 U.S.C. § 1229a].” 8 C.F.R. § 235.1(f)(2).

Here, Petitioners did not present themselves at a POE but instead entered the United States without having been admitted after inspection by an immigration officer. Each petitioner is, therefore, an alien present without admission and, consequently, an applicant for admission.

Both arriving aliens and aliens present without admission, as applicants for admission, may be removed from the United States by, *inter alia*, expedited removal procedures under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)² or removal proceedings before an IJ under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(1), (b)(2)(A), 1229a; *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287 (2018) (describing how “applicants for admission fall into one of two categories, those covered by § 1225(b)(1) and those covered by § 1225(b)(2)”). Immigration officers have discretion to apply expedited removal under 8 U.S.C. §

² Section 1225(b)(1) authorizes immigration officers to remove certain inadmissible aliens “from the United States without further hearing or review” if the immigration officer finds that the alien, “who is arriving in the United States or is described in [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(iii)] is inadmissible under [8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C) or (a)(7)].” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i); *see* 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(2)(i). If the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) wishes to pursue inadmissibility charges other than 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C) or (a)(7), DHS must place the alien in removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(3). Additionally, an alien who was not inspected and admitted or paroled, but “who establishes that he or she has been continuously physically present in the United States for the 2–year period immediately prior to the date of determination of inadmissibility shall be detained in accordance with [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)] for a proceeding under [8 U.S.C. § 1229a].” *Id.* § 235.3(b)(1)(ii); *id.* § 1235.6(a)(1)(i) (providing that an immigration officer will issue and serve an NTA to an alien “[i]f, in accordance with the provisions of [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)], the examining immigration officer detains an alien for a proceeding before an immigration judge under [8 U.S.C. § 1229a]”).

1225(b)(1) or to initiate removal proceedings before an IJ under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. *E-R-M- & L-R-M-*, 25 I&N Dec. at 524; *see also Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. 66, 68 (BIA 2025) (“DHS may place aliens arriving in the United States in either expedited removal proceedings under [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)], or full removal proceedings under [8 U.S.C. § 1229a]” (citations omitted)).

B. Applicants for Admission in Expedited Removal Proceedings Are Detained Pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1).

Applicants for admission whom DHS places into expedited removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1); such aliens (including those referred for 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings after establishing a credible fear of persecution or torture) are ineligible for a custody redetermination hearing before an IJ. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii) (providing for detention of any alien who is found to have established a credible fear of persecution in expedited removal proceedings for further consideration of their asylum application), (iii)(IV) (“Any alien subject to the procedures under this clause shall be detained pending a final determination of credible fear of persecution and, if found not to have such a fear, until removed.”); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(2)(iii) (“An alien whose inadmissibility is being considered under this section or who has been ordered removed pursuant to this section shall be detained pending determination and removal.”), (b)(4)(ii) (“Pending the credible fear determination by an asylum officer and any review of that determination by an [IJ], the alien shall be detained.”); *Matter of M-S-*, 27 I&N Dec. 509 (A.G. 2019) (holding that aliens present without admission, placed in expedited removal, and transferred to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings after establishing a credible fear of persecution or torture are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and are ineligible for release under 8 U.S.C. § 1226).

Petitioners, applicants for admission, have never been subject to expedited removal proceedings and are

therefore not subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1). However, as discussed below, Petitioner is an applicant for admission in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings and is therefore subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

C. Applicants for Admission in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a Removal Proceedings Are Detained Pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

Applicants for admission whom DHS places in § 1229a removal proceedings are similarly subject to detention and ineligible for a custody redetermination hearing before an IJ. Specifically, aliens present without admission placed in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings are both applicants for admission as defined in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1) *and* aliens “seeking admission,” as contemplated in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Such aliens are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and thus ineligible for a bond redetermination hearing before the IJ.

Applicants for admission whom DHS places in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and ineligible for a custody redetermination hearing before an IJ. Section 1225(b)(2)(A) “serves as a catchall provision that applies to all applicants for admission not covered by § 1225(b)(1).” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287; *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), (B). Under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), “an alien who is an applicant for admission” “*shall be detained* for a proceeding under [8 U.S.C. § 1229a]” “if the examining immigration officer determines that [the] alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) (emphasis added); 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(3) (providing that an alien placed into 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings in lieu of expedited removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1225 “shall be detained” pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)); 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(c) (providing that “any arriving alien . . . placed in removal proceedings pursuant to [8

U.S.C. § 1229a] shall be detained in accordance with [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)]” unless paroled pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)).

Thus, according to the plain language of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), applicants for admission in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings “*shall* be detained.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) (emphasis added). “The ‘strong presumption’ that the plain language of the statute expresses congressional intent is rebutted only in ‘rare and exceptional circumstances,’” *Ardestani v. INS*, 502 U.S. 129, 135–36 (1991) (quoting *Rubin v. United States*, 449 U.S. 424, 430 (1981)); see *Lamie*, 540 U.S. at 534 (“It is well established that when the statute’s language is plain, the sole function of the courts—at least where the disposition required by the text is not absurd—is to enforce it according to its terms.” (quotation marks omitted)). As the Supreme Court observed in *Jennings*, nothing in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) “says anything whatsoever about bond hearings.” 583 U.S. at 297. Further, there is no textual basis for arguing that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) applies only to arriving aliens. The distinction the Attorney General drew in the 1997 Interim Rule between “arriving aliens,” see 8 C.F.R. §§ 1.2, 1001.1(q), and “aliens who are present without being admitted or paroled,” Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum Procedures, 62 Fed. Reg. 10,312, 10,323 (Mar. 6, 1997),³ is not supported by the statutory text. No provision within 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)

³ As discussed more below, the preamble language of the 1997 Interim Rule states that “[d]espite being applicants for admission, aliens who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as aliens who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination.” 62 Fed. Reg. at 10,323. However, preambular language is not binding and “should not be considered unless the regulation itself is ambiguous.” *El Comite Para El Bienestar de Earlimart v. Warmerdam*, 539 F.3d 1062, 1070 (9th Cir. 2008); see also *Wards Cove Packing Corp. v. Nat’l Marine Fisheries Serv.*, 307 F.3d 1214, 1219 (9th Cir. 2002) (“[T]he plain meaning of a regulation governs and deference to an agency’s interpretation of its regulation is warranted only when the regulation’s language is ambiguous.” (citing *Christensen v. Harris County*, 529 U.S. 576, 588 (2000))).

refers to “arriving aliens,” or limits that paragraph to arriving aliens, as Congress intended for it to apply generally “in the case of an alien who is an applicant for admission.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Where Congress means for a rule to apply only to “arriving aliens,” it uses that specific term of art or similar phrasing. *See, e.g., id.* §§ 1182(a)(9)(A)(i), 1225(c)(1).

On September 5, 2025, the BIA issued a published decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). In its decision, the BIA affirmed “the Immigration Judge’s determination that he did not have authority over [a] bond request because aliens who are present in the United States without admission are applicants for admission as defined under section 235(b)(2)(A) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), and must be detained for the duration of their removal proceedings.” *Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 220.⁴

The BIA concluded that aliens “who surreptitiously cross into the United States remain applicants for admission until and unless they are lawfully inspected and admitted by an immigration officer. Remaining in the United States for a lengthy period of time following entry without inspection, by itself, does not constitute an ‘admission.’” *Id.* at 228. To hold otherwise would lead to an “incongruous result” that rewards aliens who unlawfully enter the United States without inspection and subsequently evade apprehension for number of years. *Id.*

In so concluding, the BIA rejected the alien’s argument that “because he has been residing in the interior of the United States for almost 3 years . . . he cannot be considered as ‘seeking admission.’” *Id.* at 221. The BIA determined that this argument “is not supported by the plain

⁴ Previously, as alluded to in BIA decisions, DHS and the Department of Justice interpreted 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) to be an available detention authority for aliens present without admission placed directly in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings. *See, e.g., Matter of Cabrera-Fernandez*, 28 I&N Dec. 747, 747 (BIA 2023); *Matter of R-A-V-P-*, 27 I&N Dec. 803, 803 (BIA 2020); *Matter of Garcia-Garcia*, 25 I&N Dec. 93, 94 (BIA 2009); *Matter of D-J-*, 23 I&N Dec. 572 (A.G. 2003). However, as noted by the BIA, the BIA had not previously addressed this issue in a precedential decision. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. at 216.

language of the INA” and creates a “legal conundrum.” *Id.* If the alien “is not admitted to the United States (as he admits) but he is not ‘seeking admission’ (as he contends), then what is his legal status?” *Id.* (parentheticals in original). The BIA’s decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* is consistent not only with the plain language of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), but also with the Supreme Court’s 2018 decision in *Jennings* and other caselaw issued subsequent to *Jennings*. Specifically, in *Jennings*, the Supreme Court explained that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) applies to all applicants for admission, noting that the language of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) is “quite clear” and “unequivocally mandate[s]” detention. 583 U.S. at 300, 303 (explaining that “the word ‘shall’ usually connotes a requirement” (quoting *Kingdomware Technologies, Inc. v. United States*, 579 U.S. 162, 171 (2016))).

Similarly, relying on *Jennings* and the plain language of 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225 and 1226(a), the Attorney General, in *Matter of M-S-*, unequivocally recognized that 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225 and 1226(a) do not overlap but describe “different classes of aliens.” 27 I&N Dec. at 516. The Attorney General also held—in an analogous context—that aliens present without admission and placed into expedited removal proceedings are detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225 even if later placed in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings. 27 I&N Dec. at 518-19. In *Matter of Q. Li*, the BIA held that an alien who illegally crossed into the United States between POEs and was apprehended without a warrant while arriving is detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). 29 I&N Dec. at 71. This ongoing evolution of the law makes clear that all applicants for admission are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). *Cf. Niz-Chavez v. Garland*, 593 U.S. 155, 171 (2021) (providing that “no amount of policy-talk can overcome a plain statutory command”); *see generally Florida v. United States*, 660 F. Supp. 3d 1239, 1275 (N.D. Fla. 2023) (explaining that “the 1996 expansion of § 1225(b) to include illegal border crossers would make little sense if DHS retained discretion to apply §

1226(a) and release illegal border crossers whenever the agency saw fit”).⁵ *Florida’s* conclusion “that § 1225(b)’s ‘shall be detained’ means what it says and . . . is a mandatory requirement . . . flows directly from *Jennings*.” *Florida*, 660 F. Supp. 3d at 1273.

Given 8 U.S.C. § 1225 is the applicable detention authority for all applicants for admission—both arriving aliens and aliens present without admission alike, regardless of whether the alien was initially processed for expedited removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) or placed directly into removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a—and “[b]oth [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2)] mandate detention . . . throughout the completion of applicable proceedings,” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 301–03, IJs do not have authority to redetermine the custody status of an alien present without admission.

Here, Petitioners are applicants for admission (specifically, an alien present without admission), placed directly into removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. They are therefore subject to detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and ineligible for a custody redetermination hearing before an IJ. “It is well established . . . that the Immigration Judges only have the authority to consider matters that are delegated to them by the Attorney General and the [INA].” *Matter of A-W-*, 25 I&N Dec. 45, 46 (BIA 2009). “In the context of custody proceedings, an Immigration Judge’s authority to redetermine conditions of custody is set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(d)” *Id.* at 46. The regulation clearly states that “the [IJ] is authorized to exercise the authority in [8 U.S.C. § 1226].” 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(d); *see id.* § 1003.19(a) (authorizing IJs to

⁵ Though not binding, *Camreta v. Greene*, 563 U.S. 692, 709 n.7 (2011) (quoting 18 J. Moore et al., *Moore’s Federal Practice* § 134.02[1] [d], p. 134–26 (3d ed.2011)) (providing that “[a] decision of a federal district court judge is not binding precedent in either a different judicial district, the same judicial district, or even upon the same judge in a different case”); *Evans v. Skolnik*, 997 F.3d 1060, 1067 (9th Cir. 2021) (same), the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Florida’s decision is instructive here. *Florida* held that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) mandates detention of applicants for admission throughout removal proceedings, rejecting the assertion that DHS has discretion to choose to detain an applicant for admission under either 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b) or 1226(a). 660 F. Supp. 3d at 1275. The court held that such discretion “would render mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) meaningless.” *Id.*

review “[c]ustody and bond determinations made by [DHS] pursuant to 8 C.F.R. part 1236”); *see id.* § 1003.19(h)(2)(i)(B) (“[A]n IJ may not redetermine conditions of custody imposed by [DHS] with respect to . . . [a]rriving aliens in removal proceedings, including aliens paroled after arrival pursuant to [8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)].”). “An [IJ] is without authority to disregard the regulations, which have the force and effect of law.” *Matter of L-M-P-*, 27 I&N Dec. 265, 267 (BIA 2018).

Aliens present without admission in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings are both applicants for admission under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1) and aliens seeking admission under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). As discussed above, such aliens placed in removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a are applicants for admission as defined in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1), subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), and thus ineligible for a bond redetermination hearing before the IJ. Such aliens are also considered “seeking admission,” as contemplated in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). To be sure, “many people who are not *actually* requesting permission to enter the United States in the ordinary sense are nevertheless deemed to be ‘seeking admission’ under the immigration laws.” *Lemus*, 25 I&N Dec. at 743; *see Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 221; *Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. at 68 n.3; *see also Matter of Valenzuela-Felix*, 26 I&N Dec. 53, 56 (BIA 2012) (explaining that “an application for admission [i]s a continuing one”).

In analyzing 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), the Supreme Court in *Jennings* equated “applicants for admission” with aliens “seeking admission.” *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 289. As noted above, the Supreme Court stated that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) “serves as a catchall provision that applies to all applicants for admission not covered by § 1225(b)(1).” *Id.* at 287. In doing so, it specifically cited 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)—and thus did not appear to consider aliens “seeking admission” to be a subcategory of applicants for admission. *Id.* The Supreme Court also stated that “[a]liens who are instead covered by § 1225(b)(2) are detained pursuant to a different process . . . [and]

‘shall be detained for a [removal] proceeding’” *Id.* at 288 (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)). The Supreme Court considered all aliens covered by 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) to be subject to detention under subparagraph (A)—not just a subset of such aliens. Moreover, *Jennings* found that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) “applies primarily to aliens *seeking entry* into the United States (‘*applicants for admission*’ in the language of the statute).” *Id.* at 297 (emphases added). The Court therefore considered aliens seeking admission and applicants for admission to be virtually indistinguishable; it did not consider them to be merely a subcategory of applicants for admission.

Indeed, the Supreme Court explicitly stated that aliens seeking admission are subject to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) detention: “In sum, U.S. immigration law authorizes the Government to detain certain aliens seeking admission into the country under §§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2).” *Id.* at 289. This was recently reiterated by the BIA in *Matter of Q. Li*, which held that for aliens “seeking admission into the United States who are placed directly in full removal proceedings, [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)] . . . mandates detention ‘until removal proceedings have concluded.’” 29 I&N Dec. At 68 (quoting *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 299).

The structure of the statutory scheme prior to the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA). Pub. L. No. 104-208, div. C, 110 Stat. 3009-546 (1996) bolsters the understanding that under the current statutory scheme, all applicants for admission are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). The broad definition of applicants for admission was added to the INA in 1996. Before 1996, the INA only contemplated inspection of aliens arriving at POEs. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a) (1995) (discussing “aliens arriving at ports of the United States”); *id.* § 1225(b) (1995) (discussing “the examining immigration officer at the port of arrival”). Relatedly, any alien who was “in the United States” and within certain listed classes of deportable aliens was deportable. *Id.* § 1231(a) (1995). One such class of deportable

aliens included those “who entered the United States without inspection or at any time or place other than as designated by the Attorney General.” *Id.* § 1231(a)(1)(B) (1995) (former deportation ground relating to entry without inspection). Aliens were excludable if they were “seeking admission” at a POE or had been paroled into the United States. *See id.* §§ 1182(a), 1225(a) (1995). Deportation proceedings (conducted pursuant to former 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b) (1995)) and exclusion proceedings (conducted pursuant to former 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) (1995)) differed and began with different charging documents. *See Sale v. Haitian Ctrs. Council, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 155, 175 (1993) (explaining the “important distinction” between deportation and exclusion); *Matter of Casillas*, 22 I&N Dec. 154, 156 n.2 (BIA 1998) (noting the various forms commencing deportation, exclusion, or removal proceedings). The placement of an alien in exclusion or deportation proceedings depended on whether the alien had made an “entry” within the meaning of the INA. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(13) (1995) (defining “entry” as “any coming of an alien into the United States, from a foreign port or place or from an outlying possession”); *see also Rosenberg v. Fleuti*, 374 U.S. 449, 462 (1963) (concluding that whether a lawful permanent resident has made an “entry” into the United States depends on whether, pursuant to the statutory definition, he or she has intended to make a “meaningfully interruptive” departure).

Former 8 U.S.C. § 1225 provided that aliens “seeking admission” at a POE who could not demonstrate entitlement to be admitted (“excludable” aliens) were subject to mandatory detention, with potential release solely by means of parole under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5) (1995). 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)-(b) (1995). “Seeking admission” in former 8 U.S.C. § 1225 appears to have been understood to refer to aliens arriving at a POE.⁶ *See id.* The legacy Immigration and Naturalization

⁶ Given Congress’s overhaul of the INA, including wholesale revision of the definition of which aliens are considered applying for or seeking admission, Congress did not intend for the former understanding of “seeking admission” to be retained in the new removal scheme. Generally,

Service (“INS”) regulations implementing former 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) provided that such aliens arriving at a POE had to be detained without parole if they had “no documentation or false documentation,” 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b) (1995), but could be paroled if they had valid documentation but were otherwise excludable, *id.* § 235.3(c) (1995). With regard to aliens who entered without inspection and were deportable under former 8 U.S.C. § 1231, such aliens were taken into custody under the authority of an arrest warrant, and like other deportable aliens, could request bond. *See* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1231(a)(1)(B), 1252(a)(1) (1995); 8 C.F.R. § 242.2(c)(1) (1995).

As a result, “[aliens] who had entered without inspection could take advantage of the greater procedural and substantive rights afforded in deportation proceedings,’ while [aliens] who actually presented themselves to authorities for inspection were restrained by ‘more summary exclusion proceedings.’” *Martinez v. Att’y Gen.*, 693 F.3d 408, 413 n.5 (3d Cir. 2012) (quoting *Hing Sum v. Holder*, 602 F.3d 1092, 1100 (9th Cir. 2010)). “To remedy this unintended and undesirable consequence, the IIRIRA substituted ‘admission’ for ‘entry,’ and replaced deportation and exclusion proceedings with the more general ‘removal’ proceeding.” *Id.* Consistent with this dichotomy, the INA, as amended by IIRIRA, defines *all* those who have not been admitted to the United States as “applicants for admission.” IIRIRA § 302.

“[w]hen administrative and judicial interpretations have settled the meaning of an existing statutory provision, repetition of the same language in a new statute indicates . . . the intent to incorporate its administrative and judicial interpretations as well.” *Bragdon v. Abbott*, 524 U.S. 624, 645 (1998). However, the prior construction canon of statutory interpretation “is of little assistance here because, . . . this is not a case in which ‘Congress re-enact[ed] a statute without change.’” *Public Citizen Inc. v. U.S. Dep’t of Health and Human Servs.*, 332 F.3d 654, 668 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (quoting *Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. v. Curran*, 456 U.S. 353, 382 n.66 (1982)). Rather, the presumption “of congressional ratification” of a prior statutory interpretation “applies only when Congress reenacts a statute without relevant change.” *Holder v. Martinez Gutierrez*, 566 U.S. 583, 593 (2012) (citing *Jama v. Immigration and Customs Enforcement*, 543 U.S. 335, 349 (2005)).

Moreover, Congress’s use of the present participle—seeking—in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) should not be ignored. *United States v. Wilson*, 503 U.S. 329, 333 (1992) (“Congress’ use of a verb tense is significant in construing statutes.”). By using the present participle “seeking,” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) “signal[s] present and continuing action.” *Westchester Gen. Hosp., Inc. v. Evanston Ins. Co.*, 48 F.4th 1298, 1307 (11th Cir. 2022). The phrase “seeking admission” “does not include something in the past that has ended or something yet to come.” *Shell v. Burlington N. Santa Fe Ry. Co.*, 941 F.3d 331, 336 (7th Cir. 2019) (concluding that “having” is a present participle, which is “used to form a progressive tense” that “means presently and continuously” (citing Bryan A. Garner, *Garner’s Modern American Usage* 1020 (4th ed. 2016))). The present participle “expresses present action in relation to the time expressed by the finite verb in its clause,” *Present Participle*, MerriamWebster, <http://www.merriamwebster.com/dictionary/present%20participle> (last visited Aug. 7, 2025), with the finite verb in the same clause of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) being “determines.” Thus, when pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) an “examining immigration officer determines” that an alien “is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted” the officer does so contemporaneously with the alien’s present and ongoing action of seeking admission. Interpreting the present participle “seeking” as denoting an ongoing process is consistent with its ordinary usage. *See, e.g., Samayoa v. Bondi*, 146 F.4th 128, 134 (1st Cir. 2025) (alien inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) but “seeking to remain in the country lawfully” applied for relief in removal proceedings); *Garcia v. USCIS*, 146 F.4th 743, 746 (9th Cir. 2025) (“USCIS requires all U visa holders seeking permanent resident status under 8 U.S.C. § 1255(m) to undergo a medical examination . . .”). Accordingly, just as the alien in *Samayoa* is not only an alien present without admission but also seeking to remain in the United States, Petitioners in this case are not only aliens present without admission, and therefore

applicants for admission as defined in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1), but also aliens seeking admission under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

Lastly, Congress’s significant amendments to the immigration laws in IIRIRA support DHS’s position that such aliens are properly detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)—specifically, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Congress, for example, eliminated certain anomalous provisions that favored aliens who illegally entered without inspection over aliens arriving at POEs. A rule that treated an alien who enters the country illegally, such as Petitioners, more favorably than an alien detained after arriving at a POE would “create a perverse incentive to enter at an unlawful rather than a lawful location.” *Gambino-Ruiz*, 91 F.4th at 990 (quoting *Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 140) (rejecting such a rule as propounded by the defendant). Such a rule reflects “the precise situation that Congress intended to do away with by enacting” IIRIRA. *Id.* “Congress intended to eliminate the anomaly ‘under which illegal aliens who have entered the United States without inspection gain equities and privileges in immigration proceedings that are not available to aliens who present themselves for inspection at a [POE]’” by enacting IIRIRA. *Ortega-Lopez v. Barr*, 978 F.3d 680, 682 (9th Cir. 2020) (quoting *Torres*, 976 F.3d at 928); *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 225–29 (1996).

As discussed by the BIA in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 222-24, during IIRIRA’s legislative drafting process, Congress asserted the importance of controlling illegal immigration and securing the land borders of the United States. *See* H.R. Rep. 104-469, pt. 1, at 107 (noting a “crisis at the land border” allowing aliens to illegally enter the United States). As alluded to above, one goal of IIRIRA was to “reform the legal immigration system and facilitate legal entries into the United States” H.R. Rep. No. 104-828, at 1 (1996). Nevertheless, after the enactment of IIRIRA, the DOJ took the position—consistent with pre-IIRIRA law—that

“despite being applicants for admission, aliens who are present without being admitted or paroled . . . will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination.” 62 Fed. Reg. at 10,323. Affording aliens present without admission, who have evaded immigration authorities and illegally entered the United States bond hearings before an IJ, but not affording such hearings to arriving aliens, who are attempting to comply with U.S. immigration law, is anomalous with and runs counter to that goal. *Cf.* H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 225 (noting that IIRIRA replaced the concept of “entry” with “admission,” as aliens who illegally enter the United States “gain equities and privileges in immigration proceedings that are not available to aliens who present themselves for inspection at a [POE]”).

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, Petitioners, as aliens present without admission in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings, are applicants for admission and alien seeking admission and is therefore subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and ineligible for a bond redetermination hearing before an IJ.

D. Applicants for Admission May Only Be Released from Detention on an 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5) Parole.

Importantly, applicants for admission may only be released from detention if DHS invokes its discretionary parole authority under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5). DHS has the exclusive authority to temporarily release on parole “any alien applying for admission to the United States” on a “case-by-case basis for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit.” 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5); *see* 8 C.F.R. § 212.5(b). In *Jennings*, the Supreme Court placed significance on the fact that 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5) is the specific provision that authorizes release from detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), at DHS’s discretion. *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 300. Specifically, the Supreme Court emphasized that “[r]egardless of which of those two sections authorizes . . . detention, [8 U.S.C.

§ 1225(b)(1) or (b)(2)(A)], applicants for admission may be temporarily released on parole”
Id. at 288.

Parole, like an admission, is a factual occurrence. *See Hing Sum*, 602 F.3d at 1098; *Matter of Roque-Izada*, 29 I&N Dec. 106 (BIA 2025) (treating whether an alien was paroled as a question of fact). The parole authority under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5) is “delegated solely to the Secretary of Homeland Security.” *Matter of Castillo-Padilla*, 25 I&N Dec. 257, 261 (BIA 2010); *see* 8 C.F.R. § 212.5(a). Thus, neither the BIA nor IJs have authority to parole an alien into the United States under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5). *Castillo-Padilla*, 25 I&N Dec. at 261; *see also Matter of Arrabally and Yerrabelly*, 25 I&N Dec. 771, 777 n.5 (BIA 2002) (indicating that “parole authority [under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)] is now exercised exclusively by the DHS” and “reference to the Attorney General in [8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)] is thus deemed to refer to the Secretary of Homeland Security”); *Matter of Singh*, 21 I&N Dec. 427, 434 (BIA 1996) (providing that “neither the [IJ] nor th[e] Board has jurisdiction to exercise parole power”). Further, because DHS has exclusive jurisdiction to parole an alien into the United States, the manner in which DHS exercises its parole authority may not be reviewed by an IJ or the BIA. *Castillo-Padilla*, 25 I&N Dec. at 261; *see Matter of Castellon*, 17 I&N Dec. 616, 620 (BIA 1981) (noting that the BIA does not have authority to review the way DHS exercises its parole authority).

Importantly, parole does not constitute a lawful admission or a determination of admissibility, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1101(a)(13)(B), 1182(d)(5)(A), and an alien granted parole remains an applicant for admission, *id.* § 1182(d)(5)(A); *see* 8 C.F.R. §§ 1.2 (providing that “[a]n arriving alien remains an arriving alien even if paroled pursuant to [8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)], and even after any such parole is terminated or revoked”), 1001.1(q) (same). Parole does not place the alien “within the United States.” *Leng May Ma*, 357 U.S. at 190. An alien who has been paroled into

the United States under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5) “is not . . . ‘in’ this country for purposes of immigration law” *Abebe*, 16 I&N Dec. at 173 (citing, *inter alia*, *Leng May Ma*, 357 U.S. at 185; *Kaplan*, 267 U.S. at 228). Following parole, the alien “shall continue to be dealt with in the same manner as that of any other applicant for admission to the United States,” 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A), including that they remain subject to detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).

E. Section 1226 Does Not Impact the Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission.

Section 1226(a) is the applicable detention authority for aliens who have been admitted and are deportable who are subject to removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1226, 1227(a), and 1229a, and does not impact the directive in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) that “if the examining immigration officer determines that an alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, the alien shall be detained for a proceedings under [8 U.S.C. § 1229a],” *id.* § 1225(b)(2)(A).⁷ As the Supreme Court explained, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) “applies to aliens already present in the United States” and “creates a default rule for those aliens by permitting—but not requiring—the [Secretary] to issue warrants for their arrest and detention pending removal proceedings.” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 289, 303; *Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. at 70; *see also*

⁷ The specific mandatory language of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) governs over the general permissive language of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). “[I]t is a commonplace of statutory construction that the specific governs the general” *Morales v. Trans World Airlines, Inc.*, 504 U.S. 374, 384 (1992); *see RadLAX Gateway Hotel, LLC v. Amalgamated Bank*, 566 U.S. 639, 645 (2012) (explaining that the general/specific canon is “most frequently applied to statutes in which a general permission or prohibition is contradicted by a specific prohibition or permission” and in order to “eliminate the contradiction, the specific provision is construed as an exception to the general one”); *Perez-Guzman v. Lynch*, 835 F.3d 1066, 1075 (9th Cir. 2016) (discussing, in the context of asylum eligibility for aliens subject to reinstated removal orders, this canon and explaining that “[w]hen two statutes come into conflict, courts assume Congress intended specific provisions to prevail over more general ones”). Here, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) “does not negate [8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)] entirely,” which still applies to admitted aliens who are deportable, “but only in its application to the situation that [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)] covers.” A. Scalia & B. Garner, *Reading Law: The Interpretation of Legal Texts* 185 (2012).

M-S-, 27 I&N Dec. at 516 (describing 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) as a “permissive” detention authority separate from the “mandatory” detention authority under 8 U.S.C. § 1225).⁸

Generally, such aliens may be released on bond or their own recognizance, also known as “conditional parole.” 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a); *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 303, 306. Section 1226(a) does not, however, confer the *right* to release on bond; rather, both DHS and IJs have broad discretion in determining whether to release an alien on bond as long as the alien establishes that he or she is not a flight risk or a danger to the community. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1(c)(8), 1236.1(c)(8); *Matter of Guerra*, 24 I&N Dec. 37, 39 (BIA 2006); *Matter of Adeniji*, 22 I&N Dec. 1102 (BIA 1999). Further, ICE must detain certain aliens due to their criminal history or national security concerns under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c). *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1), (c)(2); 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1(c)(1)(i), 1236.1(c)(1)(i); *see also id.* § 1003.19(h)(2)(i)(D). Release of such aliens is permitted only in very specific circumstances. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(2).

Notably, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c) references certain grounds of inadmissibility, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(A), (D)–(E), and the Supreme Court in *Barton v. Barr*—after issuing its decision in *Jennings*—recognized the possibility that aliens charged with certain grounds of inadmissibility

⁸ Importantly, a warrant of arrest is not required in all cases. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1357(a). For example, an immigration officer has the authority “to arrest any alien who in his presence or view is entering or attempting to enter the United States in violation of any law or regulation” or “to arrest any alien in the United States, if he has reason to believe that the alien so arrested is in the United States in violation of any such law or regulation and is likely to escape before a warrant can be obtained for his arrest” *Id.* § 1357(a)(2); 8 C.F.R. § 287.3(a), (b) (recognizing the availability of warrantless arrests); *see Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. at 70 n.5. Moreover, DHS may issue a warrant of arrest within 48 hours (or an “additional reasonable period of time” given any emergency or other extraordinary circumstances), 8 C.F.R. § 287.3(d); doing so does not constitute “post-hoc issuance of a warrant,” *Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. at 69 n.4. While the presence of an arrest warrant is a threshold consideration in determining whether an alien is subject to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) detention authority under a plain reading of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), there is nothing in *Jennings* that stands for the assertion that aliens processed for arrest under 8 U.S.C. § 1225 cannot have been arrested pursuant to a warrant. *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 302.

could be detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226. 590 U.S. 222, 235 (2020); *see also Nielsen v. Preap*, 586 U.S. 392, 416-19 (2019) (recognizing that aliens who are inadmissible for engaging in terrorist activity are subject to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)). However, in interpreting provisions of the INA, the BIA does not view the language of statutory provisions in isolation but instead “interpret[s] the statute as a symmetrical and coherent regulatory scheme and fit[s], if possible, all parts into an harmonious whole.” *Matter of C-T-L-*, 25 I&N Dec. 341, 345 (BIA 2010) (internal quotation marks omitted) (quoting *FDA v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*, 529 U.S. 120, 133 (2000)). As the Supreme Court in *Barton* also noted, “redundancies are common in statutory drafting—sometimes in a congressional effort to be doubly sure, sometimes because of congressional inadvertence or lack of foresight, or sometimes simply because of the shortcomings of human communication.” *Barton*, 590 U.S. at 239. “Redundancy in one portion of a statute is not a license to rewrite or eviscerate another portion of the statute contrary to its text” *Id.*; *see also Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 222 (“Interpreting the provisions of section [1226(c)] as rendering null and void the provisions of section [1225](b)(2)(A) (or even the provisions of section... 1225(b)(1)), would be in contravention of the ‘cardinal principle of statutory construction,’ which is that courts are to give effect, if possible, to every clause and word of a statute, rather than to emasculate an entire section.”) (quoting *United States v. Menasche*, 348 U.S. 528, 538–39 (1955)). The statutory language of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)—including the most recent amendment pursuant to the Laken Riley Act, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E), merely reflects a “congressional effort to be doubly sure” that certain aliens are detained, *Barton*, 590 U.S. at 239.

To reiterate, to interpret 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) as not applying to all applicants for admission would render it meaningless. As explained above, Congress expanded 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) in 1996 to apply to a broader category of aliens, including those aliens who crossed the

border illegally. IIRIRA § 302. There would have been no need for Congress to make such a change if 8 U.S.C. § 1226 was meant to apply to aliens present without admission. Thus, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 does not have any controlling impact on the directive in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) that “if the examining immigration officer determines that an alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, the alien shall be detained for a proceeding under [8 U.S.C. § 1229a].” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

Conclusion

Respondents acknowledge that courts in the district have rejected many of these arguments and ordered a bond hearing be provided. Nevertheless, respondents request that the habeas petition be denied.

Respectfully submitted,
ANDREW S. BOUTROS
United States Attorney

By: s/ Craig A. Oswald

CRAIG A. OSWALD
Assistant United States Attorney
219 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 886-9080
craig.oswald@usdoj.gov