

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

4
5 Attorney for petitioner

6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 Southern District of California
8

9 ANSELMO ROMERO SANCHEZ,
10 Petitioner,
11 v.

) Case Number: '25CV3136 JLS JLB

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


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

) Oral Argument Requested

16 Respondents.
17
18

19 Petitioner alleges:

20 **INTRODUCTION**

21 1. Petitioner ANSELMO ROMERO SANCHEZ  is subjected to
22 unlawful immigration detention at the Otay Mesa Detention Center. Respondents recently re-
23 detained petitioner without any explanation. The judges at Otay Mesa conclude there is no
24 jurisdiction to even consider setting a bond based *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I & N Dec. 216
25 (BIA 2025). The BIA and immigration judge interpretation of the Immigration and Nationality Act
26 is plainly contrary to the statutory framework and decades of agency practice. Petitioner seeks an
27 order compelling respondents to immediately release him from custody or for the immigration judge
28 to accept jurisdiction 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).

PARTIES

9. Petitioner ANSELMO ROMERO SANCHEZ (“Petitioner”) is a 48-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
5 or who arrives in the United States” is considered “an applicant for admission.” 8 U.S.C. §
6 1225(a)(1). For certain applicants for admission, 8 U.S.C. § 1225 authorizes “expedited removal.” §
7 1225(b)(1).

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

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

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

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

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

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

14 24. Moreover, given the time spent at liberty following an initial release from detention
15 upon a determination that petitioner was not a flight risk or danger, as well as the government’s
16 implicit promise that any custody redetermination would be based on those same criteria, petitioner
17 has a protected “interest in remaining at liberty unless [he] no longer meets those criteria.” *Espinoza*
18 *v. Kaiser*, No. 1:25-CV-01101 JLT SKO, 2025 WL 2581185, at *13 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 5, 2025)
19 (quoting *Pinchi v. Noem*, No. 5:25-CV-05632-PCP, 2025 WL 2084921, at *4 (N.D. Cal. July 24,
20 2025).

21 FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

22 25. Petitioner has lived in the United States since 1999. He He has no departures or
23 removals.

24 26. is not married. He has one child:  age 21.  is a U.S. citizen. Anselmo’s
25 father is an LPR. He has six siblings, two with lawful status.

26 27. The DHS detained Petitioner and issued him a Notice to Appear (NTA) for a
27 removal hearing. The DHS released petitioner from detention.

28 28. Anselmo works as a landscaper. He has no criminal record.

1 29. The DHS started this removal proceeding. The IJ ordered removal and Anselmo
2 appealed to the BIA. In January 2022, his BIA appeal was administratively closed.

3 30. In October 2025, the DHS moved to reinstate BIA jurisdiction.

4 31. Anselmo was recently called into ERO for his yearly check in. When Anselmo
5 appeared for his “check in” he was detained without explanation and sent to the immigration jail at
6 Otay Mesa

7 32. Petitioner filed a motion for a custody redetermination hearing, which is currently
8 pending. Petitioner anticipates that the immigration judge will deny the bond request, concluding he
9 has no jurisdiction to redetermine bond per *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*.

10 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

11 **COUNT 1**

12 (Violation of the Immigration and Nationality Act)

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

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

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

18 **COUNT 2**

19 (Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act))

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

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

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

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

28 40. Defendants’ refusal to provide a bond hearing to petitioner harms him and

1 constitutes final agency action for purposes of the APA.

2 41. There are no other adequate available remedies.

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

5 **COUNT 3**

6 (Violation of the Due Process Clause)

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

8 44. The DHS released petitioner from detention pending his removal proceeding, thus
9 conceding that he was not a danger to the community or a flight risk. Since then, he has complied
10 with all of the terms and conditions of his OR release. He attended all of his court hearings.

11 45. In October 2025, DHS agents detained petitioner without any explanation or change
12 in circumstances when he reported as directed for a check in at the ICE ERO office. The DHS
13 agents sent him to the Otay Mesa Detention Center.

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

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

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

DATED: 12 November 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ William Baker

William Baker (157 906)
MORENO & ASSOCIATES
2082 Otay Lakes Road, Suites 102
Chula Vista, California 91913
Telephone: (619) 422-4885
william.baker@morenoandassociates
Attorney for petitioner

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.

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.

Anselmo Romero Sanchez
Anselmo Romero Sanchez
Petitioner