

FILED
JAMES J. VILT, JR. - CLERK
NOV 17 2025
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WEST'N. DIST. KENTUCKY

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY**

JOSE MIGUEL JIMENEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

SAMUEL OLSON Field Office Director,
Chicago Field Office, Immigration and Customs
Enforcement, in his official capacity;

KRISTI NOEM, Secretary, U.S. Department
of Homeland Security, in her official capacity;

PAMELA BONDI, U.S. Attorney General, in
her official capacity;

TODD M. LYONS, Acting Director of U.S.
Immigration and Customs Enforcement, in his
official capacity;

MIKE LEWIS, Hopkins County Jail Jailer in
his official capacity,

Respondents.

Case No. **4:25 CV - 147 - BB**

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS**

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner, Jose Miguel Jimenez Lopez is in the physical custody of Respondents at the Hopkins County Jail in Madisonville, Kentucky. He faces unlawful detention because the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) of the Department of Justice (DOJ) have erroneously concluded Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).

2. Petitioner was brought to the United States by his parents when he was 12 years old in 1996. Around 2007, he returned to Mexico for approximately 15 years. He came back to the United States and entered without inspection on or around December 21, 2022 and has been residing in the U.S. ever since.

3. On September 30, 2025, Petitioner was arrested by DHS during an indiscriminate, predawn raid on an apartment building on South Shore Drive in Chicago, Illinois.¹ Although agents did not present him with an arrest warrant until a day *after* his arrest, Petitioner was taken into custody and sent to an ICE office for processing. He was then taken to Brazil, Indiana and held in a jail before being transferred to Hopkins County Jail in Madisonville, Kentucky where he has remained ever since. Up until his arrest, Petitioner was employed at a pizzeria in Chicago. His mother and sister-in-law both live in Chicago.

4. On October 1, 2025, Petitioner was served with a Notice to Appear and placed in removal proceedings, where he is charged with, *inter alia*, having entered the United States

¹ See Rebecca Schneid, 'Military-style' ICE Raid on Chicago Apartment Building Shows Escalation in Trump's Crackdown, Time, Oct. 4, 2025, <https://time.com/7323334/ice-raid-chicago-pritzker-trump/> ("At around 1 a.m. on Tuesday morning, armed federal agents rappelled from helicopters onto the roof of a five-storey residential apartment in the South Shore of Chicago. The agents worked their way through the building, kicking down doors and throwing flash bang grenades, rounding up adults and screaming children alike.")

without inspection. 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i). He is represented by counsel in his removal proceedings.

5. On July 8, 2025, DHS issued a new policy instructing all Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) employees to consider anyone inadmissible under section 1182(a)(6)(A)(i)—i.e., those who entered the United States without inspection—to be an “applicant for admission” under section 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore subject to mandatory detention. Consistent with this policy, DHS has denied Petitioner release from immigration custody.

6. Petitioner’s detention on this basis violates the plain language of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). Section 1225(b)(2) does not apply to individuals like Petitioner, who entered the United States without inspection and who was apprehended hundreds of miles from any border or port of entry. Instead, such individuals are subject to discretionary detention under section 1226(a), which allows for release on conditional parole or bond. That statute expressly applies to people who, like Petitioner, are charged as inadmissible for having entered the United States without inspection.

7. Respondents’ new legal interpretation is plainly contrary to the statutory text, statutory framework, Congressional intent, decades of agency practice, and decisions of federal courts across the nation, which apply section 1226(a) to people like Petitioner. Further, Respondents’ detention of Petitioner without a bond redetermination hearing to determine whether he is a flight risk or danger to others violates his right to due process.

8. Accordingly, Petitioner seeks a writ of habeas corpus requiring that he be released, or in the alternative, that he be provided a prompt bond hearing under section 1226(a).

JURISDICTION

9. Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents and detained at Hopkins County Jail in Madisonville, Kentucky.

10. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. section 2241(c)(5) (habeas corpus), 28 U.S.C. section 1331 (federal question), and Article I, Section 9, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution (the Suspension Clause).

11. This Court may grant relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 2241, the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. section 2201 *et seq.*, and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. section 1651.

VENUE

12. Pursuant to *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493-500 (1973), venue lies in the United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky, the judicial district in which Petitioner currently is detained.

13. Venue is also properly in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 1391(e) because Respondents are employees, officers, and agents of the United States, and because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims that occurred in the Western District of Kentucky.

REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

14. The Court must grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus or order Respondents to show cause “forthwith,” unless the petitioner is not entitled to relief. 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If an order to show cause is issued, the Respondents must file a return “within three days unless for good cause additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is allowed.” *Id.*

15. Habeas corpus is “perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law . . . 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). “The application for the writ usurps the attention and displaces the calendar of the judge or justice who entertains it and receives prompt action from him within the four corners of the application.” *Yong v. INS*, 208 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted).

PARTIES

16. Petitioner Jose Miguel Jimenez Lopez has resided in the United States continually since approximately December 21, 2022. Petitioner has been in immigration detention since September 30, 2025.

17. Respondent Samuel Olson is the ICE Field Office Director whose area of responsibility includes Illinois, Kansas, Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, Wisconsin. As such, Respondent Olson is Petitioner’s immediate custodian and is responsible for Petitioner’s detention and removal. He is named in his official capacity.

18. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. She is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), and oversees ICE, which is responsible for Petitioner’s detention. Ms. Noem has ultimate custodial authority over Petitioner and is sued in her official capacity.

19. Respondent Pamela Bondi is the Attorney General of the United States. She is responsible for the Department of Justice, of which the Executive Office for Immigration Review and the immigration court system it operates is a component agency. She is sued in her official capacity.

20. Respondent Todd Lyons is the Acting Director of ICE. As the head of ICE, he is responsible for decisions related to the detention and removal of certain noncitizens, including Petitioner. As such, he is also a legal custodian of Petitioner. He is sued in his official capacity.

21. Respondent Jailer Mike Lewis is the Jailer for Hopkins County Jail in Madisonville, Kentucky where Petitioner is currently detained. He is an immediate custodian of Petitioner. He is sued in his official capacity.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

22. As alleged by the government, Petitioner is a 41-year-old national of Mexico. At the age of 12, he was brought to the United States by his parents and entered without inspection. He left the United States around 2007. Petitioner returned to the United States and entered without inspection in 2022 and has lived here ever since. Prior to his detention, he lived in Chicago, Illinois.

23. On September 30, 2025, Petitioner was arrested by DHS during the agency's violent raid on the apartment building in which Petitioner resided on South Shore Drive. During this raid, which received national attention, armed DHS, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, and Federal Bureau of Investigations agents wearing tactical gear forcibly and arbitrarily removed men, women, and children from their homes in the middle of the night. Residents were detained for several hours while the agents ransacked their apartments.² DHS agents stopped Petitioner in the stairwell of the apartment building and zip-tied his hands. Initially, the agents asked for neither his name nor other identifying information and did not identify any reason for his arrest. Once Petitioner was led outside, the agents took his phone and

² Cindy Hernandez, *Massive Immigration Raid on Chicago Apartment Building Leaves Residents Reeling: 'I feel Defeated'*, Chicago Sun Times, (Oct. 1, 2025), <https://chicago.suntimes.com/immigration/2025/10/01/massive-immigration-raid-on-chicago-apartment-building-leaves-residents-reeling-i-feel-defeated>.

wallet and ran his name through their database. At no point during this night was Petitioner presented with an arrest warrant. That night, DHS agents drove Petitioner to a Chicago ICE office where he was processed. Petitioner was then transferred to Clay County Jail in Brazil, Indiana, before being transferred to Hopkins County Jail in Madisonville, Kentucky where he is now detained.

24. After arresting him, DHS placed Petitioner in removal proceedings before the Chicago immigration court pursuant to 8 U.S.C. section 1229(a) by filing a Notice to Appear. Ex. A [Notice to Appear]. ICE charged Petitioner with, *inter alia*, being inadmissible under U.S.C. section 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) as someone who entered the United States without inspection. *Id.* Petitioner is represented by counsel in his removal proceedings. He has attended all of his immigration court hearings.

25. Petitioner does not have any significant criminal history. Beyond parking tickets, he had a brush-in with the police in 2006, nearly 20 years ago. During the incident, he was driving when an officer stopped his car. The passenger of the car allegedly had drugs in her purse, and Petitioner was arrested along with her.

26. Pursuant to Respondents' new policy, discussed *infra*, Petitioner remains in mandatory detention. Absent relief from this Court, he faces the prospect of months, or even years, in immigration custody, separated from his family and community without ever receiving an individualized hearing justifying his detention in violation of the INA and Due Process.

EXHAUSTION OF REMEDIES

27. No statutory requirement of administrative exhaustion applies to Petitioner's case. Moreover, the judicially created "general rule that parties exhaust prescribed administrative remedies before seeking relief from the federal courts" does not apply to Petitioner's present

challenge, as there are no prescribed administrative remedies to which he could resort. *McCarthy v. Madigan*, 503 U.S. 140, 144–45 (1992), *superseded by statute on other grounds as recognized in Woodford v. Ngo*, 548 U.S. 81 (2006).

28. In particular, DHS has taken the position that a noncitizen like Petitioner, who entered without inspection, is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. section 1225, and the Executive Office for Immigration Review has affirmed that view. In a published decision, the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) recently held that “Immigration Judges lack authority to hear bond requests or to grant bond to [noncitizens] who are present in the United States without admission.” *Matter of Jonathan Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). Under the BIA’s interpretation, Petitioner is ineligible for bond as a noncitizen who entered the United States without inspection. Accordingly, there are no administrative remedies that he could exhaust before seeking habeas relief. *See Singh v. Lewis*, Civil Action No. 4:25-CV-96-RGJ, 2025 WL 2699219, at *2 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 22, 2025) (“[t]he United States has made clear their position on Section 1225, and it is being applied at all levels within the DHS. Therefore, it is unlikely that any administrative review would lead to the United States changing its position and precluding judicial review”); *Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft*, Case No. 2:25-CV-12486, 2025 WL 2496379, at *5 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025) (“Because exhaustion would be futile and unable to provide Lopez-Campos with the relief he requests in a timely manner, the Court waives administrative exhaustion and will address the merits of the habeas petition.”).

29. Further, neither an immigration judge nor the Board of Immigration Appeals can rule on a petitioner’s constitutional claims. *See Matter of R-A-V-P-*, 27 I&N Dec. 803, 804 n.2 (BIA. 2020) (holding that Immigration Judges and the BIA lack any authority to consider the constitutionality of the statutes or regulations governing immigration detention that they

administer and are bound to follow); *Matter of C-*, 20 I&N Dec. 529, 532 (BIA 1992) (“[I]t is settled that the immigration judge and this Board lack jurisdiction to rule upon the constitutionality of the Act and the regulations.”); *see also Gonzalez v. O’Connell*, 355 F.3d 1010, 1017 (7th Cir. 2004) (noting that “the BIA has no jurisdiction to adjudicate constitutional issues”).

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

I. Detention Authority and Respondent’s Efforts to Expand Mandatory Detention

30. The INA prescribes three basic forms of detention for the vast majority of noncitizens in removal proceedings.

31. First, 8 U.S.C. section 1226 authorizes the detention of noncitizens “already in the country.” *See Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 289 (2018). Section 1226(a) “sets out the default rule: The Attorney General may issue a warrant for the arrest and detention of a [noncitizen] ‘pending a decision on whether the [noncitizen] is to be removed from the United States.’” *Id.* at 288 (quoting § 1226(a)). Individuals in section 1226(a) detention are generally entitled to a bond hearing at the outset of their detention. *See* § 1226(a)(2); 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19(a), 1236.1(c)(8), (d)(1); *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239, 1247 (W.D. Wash. 2025) (“those detained under Section 1226(a) are entitled to a bond hearing before an [immigration judge] at any time before entry of a final removal order.”).

32. Section 1226(c) “carves out a statutory category” of noncitizens from section 1226(a) for whom detention is mandatory, comprised of individuals who have committed certain “enumerated ... criminal offenses [or] terrorist activities.” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 289 (citing § 1226(c)(1)). Among the individuals carved out and subject to mandatory detention are certain categories of “inadmissible” noncitizens. § 1226(c)(1)(A), (D), (E). Reference to such

inadmissible noncitizens makes clear that, by default, people who are applicants for admission but encountered in the interior are afforded a bond hearing under subsection 1226(a). Courts have recently confirmed this understanding of section 1226. *See Rodriguez Vazquez*, 779 F. Supp. 3d at 1257 (citing *Shady Grove Orthopedic Assocs., P.A. v. Allstate Ins.*, 559 U.S. 393, 400 (2010)) (“When Congress creates ‘specific exceptions’ to a statute’s applicability, it ‘proves’ that absent those exceptions, the statute generally applies.”); *see also, e.g., Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11571-JEK, 2025 WL 1869299, at *6 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025) (“inadmissibility on one of the three grounds specified in Section 1226(c)(1)(E)(i) is not by itself sufficient to except [a noncitizen] from Section 1226(a)’s discretionary detention framework”).

33. Second, the INA provides for mandatory detention of certain categories of noncitizens “seeking entry into the United States” under 8 U.S.C. section 1225(b). *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 297; *see* § 1225(b) (“Inspection of applicants for admission”).

34. In *Jennings*, the Supreme Court explained that this mandatory scheme applies “at the Nation’s borders and ports of entry, where the Government must determine whether a [noncitizen] *seeking to enter* the country is admissible.” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287 (emphasis added). Noncitizens subject to mandatory detention under section 1225 may not be released except “for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit” under the parole authority provided by 8 U.S.C. section 1182(d)(5)(A). *See id.* at 300.

35. Section 1225 is split into two categories. Section 1225(b)(1) provides for mandatory detention of noncitizens charged with enumerated grounds of inadmissibility *and* placed in expedited removal proceedings. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i). Meanwhile, section 1225(b)(2) applies only to recently arrived noncitizens seeking entry at a border or port of entry.

36. Last, the INA also provides for detention of noncitizens who have been ordered removed, including individuals in withholding-only proceedings, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)–(b).

37. This case concerns the detention provisions in sections 1226(a) and 1225(b)(2).

38. Respondents have recently taken various steps seeking to expand their use of mandatory detention under section 1225(b)(2) beyond its plain language.

39. On July 8, 2025, ICE, “in coordination with” DOJ, announced a new policy that rejected well-established understanding of the statutory framework and reversed decades of practice. *See* U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE MEMO: Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission (July 8, 2025), <https://www.aila.org/ice-memo-interim-guidance-regarding-detention-authority-for-applications-for-admission>.

40. The new policy claims that all persons who entered the United States without inspection shall now be deemed “applicants for admission” under 8 U.S.C. section 1225 and therefore are subject to mandatory detention under section 1225(b)(2)(A). The policy applies regardless of when a person is apprehended and affects those who have resided in the United States for months, years, and even decades.

41. On September 5, 2025, the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) issued a published decision adopting this same position. *See Matter of Johnathan Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). That decision holds that all noncitizens who entered the United States without admission or parole are considered applicants for admission and are ineligible for immigration judge bond hearings.

II. Respondent's Policy on Section 1225(b)(2) Is Incorrect

42. Respondent's policy, that all undocumented noncitizens who entered without inspection are considered applicants for admission and subject to mandatory detention under section 1225(b)(2)(A), is incorrect. Instead, the statutory text, the statutory framework, Congressional intent, the longstanding practice of the agency, and the decisions of many federal courts across the nation – including this one – limit section 1225(b)(2)'s scope to recently arrived noncitizens seeking admission at a border or port of entry.

a. Statutory Text

43. The text of Section 1225, along with its placement in the overall detention scheme of the INA, make clear that the terms “applicant for admission” and “seeking admission” in section 1225(b)(2) do not include individuals who have entered without inspection and are apprehended when already inside the United States.

44. Section 1225 is titled: “Inspection by immigration officers; expedited removal of inadmissible *arriving* aliens; referral for hearing.” (emphasis added). As courts have recognized, “[t]he added word of ‘arriving’ indicates that the statute governs ‘arriving’ noncitizens, not those present already.” *Barrera v. Tindall*, Civil Action No. 3:25-CV-541-RGJ, 2025 WL 2690565, at *4 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 19, 2025) (citing *Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft*, Case No. 25-CV-12546, 2025 WL 2609425, at *5 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9, 2025)). This limitation is particularly clear when compared to section 1226's general title: “Apprehension and detention of aliens.”

45. Further, section 1225(b)(2)'s specific subheading, “Inspection of Other Aliens,” subsection 1225(b)(2)(B)'s mention of “crew[m]e[n]” and “stowaway[s],” and subsection

1225(b)(2)(C)'s use of the active language "arriving," reinforce the limited scope of section 1225(b)(2)'s applicability to those who have recently arrived at a border or port of entry.

46. Finally, the term "seeking" in "seeking admission" "implies action – something that is currently occurring, and in this instance, would most logically occur at the border upon inspection." *Lopez-Campos*, 2025 WL 2496379, at *6; *see also Barrera*, 2025 WL 2690565, at *4. Noncitizens who are present in the country for years are not "seeking admission." *Lopez-Campos*, at *6; *Barrera*, at *4.

b. Statutory Framework

47. The statutory framework further supports that section 1225(b)(2) does not apply to noncitizens, like Petitioner, who have lived in the United States for years and who were apprehended while residing within the United States.

48. The INA's entire framework is premised on section 1225 governing detention of "[noncitizens] who arrive[] in the United States" while section 1226 "applies to [noncitizens] already present in the United States." *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287, 303; *see also Lopez Benitez v. Francis*, No. 25 CIV. 5937 (DEH), 2025 WL 2371588, at *8 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2025) ("[T]he line historically drawn between sections 1225 and 1226, which makes sense of their text and the overall statutory scheme, is that section 1225 governs detention of non-citizens 'seeking admission into the country,' whereas section 1226 governs detention of non-citizens 'already in the country.')" (cleaned up) (citing *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 288-89); *Martinez v. Hyde*, Civil Action No. 25-11613-BEM, 2025 WL 2084238, at *8 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025) ("The idea that a different detention scheme would apply to non-citizens 'already in the country,' as compared to those 'seeking admission into the country,' is consonant with the core logic of our immigration system ") (cleaned up) (citing *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 289).

49. A fundamental principle of statutory construction is that courts must interpret statutes to give meaning to all provisions and avoid reading out or rendering superfluous any single provision. *Corley v. United States*, 556 U.S. 303, 314 (2009) (“one of the most basic interpretive canons . . . [a] statute should be construed so that effect is given to all its provisions, so that no part will be inoperative or superfluous, void or insignificant[.]”) (cleaned up). The government’s current reading of Section 1225(b)(2) violates this principle.

50. Section 1226(c) includes carve-outs for certain categories of inadmissible noncitizens, who would otherwise fall under section 1226(a), that are instead subject to mandatory detention. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(A), (D), (E). The inclusion of these carve-outs in Section 1226(c) indicates that, contrary to Respondents’ interpretation, there are noncitizens who have not been admitted and that are not governed by section 1225’s mandatory detention scheme. Indeed, if the government’s interpretation were correct, it would render these portions of section 1226(c) superfluous since those same individuals would already be subject to mandatory detention under section 1225(b)(2).

51. The recent amendment to section 1226(c) confirms this statutory framework. Just this year, Congress passed the Laken Riley Act, which added additional categories of Section 1226(a) carve-outs that are now subject to mandatory detention under section 1226(c). Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No. 119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025); 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E). Specifically, the Laken Riley Act mandates the detention of noncitizens who are inadmissible under sections 1182(a)(6)(A) (noncitizens “present in the United States without being admitted or paroled”), 1182(a)(6)(C) (misrepresentation), or 1182(a)(7) (lacking valid documentation) and who have been arrested for, charged with, or convicted of certain crimes. *Id.* Again, if Section 1225(b)(2) were already meant to subject these groups of inadmissible noncitizens to mandatory

detention, it would render this portion of the Laken Riley Act redundant. *See Barrera*, 2025 WL 2690565, at *4; *Lopez-Campos*, 2025 WL 2496379, at *8.

c. Congressional Intent and Longstanding Agency Practice

52. Congressional intent and longstanding historical practice underscore Petitioner's reading of the statute.

53. The current detention system has been in place since the passage of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104–208, Div. C, §§ 302–03, 110 Stat. 3009-546, 3009–582 to 3009–583, 3009–585.

54. Following the enactment of the IIRIRA, the Executive Office for Immigration Review drafted new regulations explaining that, in general, people who entered the country without inspection were not considered detained under section 1225 and that they were instead detained under section 1226(a) and eligible for bond and bond redetermination. *See* 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997).

55. In the decades that followed, most people who entered without inspection and were apprehended inside the United States were detained under section 1226(a) and received bond hearings, unless their criminal history rendered them ineligible. That practice was consistent with many more decades of prior practice, in which noncitizens who were not deemed “arriving” were entitled to a custody hearing before an immigration judge or other hearing officer. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a) (1994); *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 229 (1996) (noting that Section 1226(a) simply “restates” the detention authority previously found at Section 1252(a)).

d. Recent Federal Court Decisions Confirming Petitioner's Position

56. Numerous federal courts have reached conclusions consistent with Petitioner's position. For example, after immigration judges in the Tacoma, Washington, stopped providing bond hearings for persons who entered the United States without inspection, the U.S. District Court in the Western District of Washington found that such a reading of the INA is likely unlawful, and that section 1226(a), not section 1225(b), applies to noncitizens who are not apprehended upon arrival to the United States. *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239. Other courts have reached the same conclusion, rejecting Respondent's erroneous interpretation of the INA both prior to and since ICE implemented its July 8, 2025, interim guidance. *See, e.g., Bethancourt Soto v. Soto*, No. 25-CV-16200, 2025 WL 2976572 (D.N.J. Oct. 22, 2025); *Gomes*, 2025 WL 1869299, at *8; *Martinez*, 2025 WL 2084238; *Lopez Benitez*, 2025 WL 2371588; *Garcia Jimenez v. Kramer*, No. 4:25-cv-03162, 2025 WL 2374223 (D. Neb. Aug. 14, 2025); *Maldonado v. Olson*, No. 25-CV-3142 (SRN/SGE), 2025 WL 2374411 (D. Minn. Aug. 15, 2025); *Arrazola-Gonzalez v Noem*, Case No. 5:25-cv-01789-ODW-DFMx, 2025 WL 2379285 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2025); *Jacinto v. Trump*, 4:25-cv-03161, 2025 WL 2402271 (D. Neb. August 19, 2025); *Leal-Hernandez v. Noem*, Civil No. 1:25-cv-02428-JRR, 2025 WL 2430025 (D. Md. Aug. 24, 2025); *Lopez-Campos*, 2025 WL 2496379; *Herrera Torralba v. Knight*, Case No. 2:25-cv-03166-RFB-DJA, 2025 WL 2581792 (D. Nev. Sept. 5, 2025).

57. The BIA's decision in *Yajure Hurtado* has not slowed the steady flow of decisions rejecting Respondents' position. *See, e.g., Singh v. Lewis*, 2025 WL 2699219, at *3 (disagreeing with BIA's analysis and according no deference under *Loper Bright Enters. v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369, 413 (2024)); *Barrera*, 2025 WL 2690565, at *5 (same); *Pizarro Reyes*, 2025 WL 2609425, at *6-8 (same); *Sampiao v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-cv-11981-JEK, 2025 WL

2607924, at *8 n.11 (D. Mass. Sept. 9, 2025) (same); *Aceros v. Kaiser*, Case No. 25-CV-06924-EMC (EMC), 2025 WL 2637503, at *9 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 12, 2025) (same).

III. Petitioner's Detention Violates the INA

58. Petitioner's detention is not authorized under section 1225(b)(2).

59. As discussed above, mandatory detention under section 1225(b)(2) applies only to recently arrived noncitizens seeking admission at a border or port of entry, not individuals who entered without inspection and were later detained inside the country.

60. Here, "[t]here is nothing in the record to suggest that [Petitioner] ever attempted to gain lawful entry." *Lopez-Campos*, 2025 WL 2496379, at *7. Petitioner entered without inspection, never encountered a DHS official, and lived in the United States for three years prior to being detained. As such, Petitioner is not subject to mandatory detention under section 1225(b)(2).

61. Petitioner's detention is not authorized under section 1226(a), either. As discussed above, section 1226(a)'s discretionary detention framework requires a bond hearing to make an individualized custody determination based on Petitioner's risk of flight or dangerousness. Here, Respondents have failed to provide such a hearing. Further, there is no information indicating that Petitioner is a flight risk or danger to the community.

62. Lacking any statutory basis for her detention, Respondent must release Petitioner or, in the alternative, promptly hold a bond hearing to determine whether he should remain in custody.

IV. Due Process Clause

63. Noncitizens are entitled to due process of the law under the Fifth Amendment. *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 523 (2003) (quoting *Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 306 (1993)).

To determine whether civil detention violates a noncitizen's Fifth Amendment due process rights, courts apply the three-part test in *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976).

64. Under *Mathews*, courts weigh the following three factors: 1) "the private interest that will be affected by the official action;" 2) "the risk of an erroneous deprivation of such interest through the procedures used, and the probable value, if any, of additional or substitute procedural safeguards;" and 3) "the Government's interest, including the function involved and the fiscal and administrative burdens that the additional or substitute procedural requirement would entail." 424 U.S. at 335.

a. Private Interest

65. As to the first *Mathews* factor, "the interest in being free from physical detention" is "the most elemental of liberty interests". *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507, 529 (2004). Petitioner has been detained for over approximately a month and a half at several facilities in three states in conditions that are indistinguishable from criminal incarceration. This detention prevents him from seeing his family, going to work to support himself, and deprives him of any privacy and freedom of movement.

b. Risk of Erroneous Deprivation

66. As to the second *Mathews* factor, courts must "assess whether the challenged procedure creates a risk of erroneous deprivation of individuals' private rights and the degree to which alternative procedures could ameliorate these risks." *Gunaydin v. Trump*, File No. 25-CV-01151 (JMB/DLM), 2025 WL 1459154, at *8 (D. Minn. May 21, 2025). The current procedures cause an erroneous deprivation of Petitioner's liberty interest in remaining free from detention.

67. As discussed above, the statutory text, statutory framework, Congressional intent, the longstanding practice of the agency, and the decisions of many federal courts across the

nation leave no doubt that section 1225(b)(2) applies only to recently arrived noncitizens seeking entry at a border or port of entry, not noncitizens who entered without inspection and were detained inside the country.

68. Here, Petitioner was not arriving at a border or port of entry when he was detained, nor was he ever seeking admission to the country. Instead, he entered without inspection, never had any encounter with DHS officials, and lived in the United States for three years before being detained. As such, Petitioner is not subject to mandatory detention under section 1225(b)(2).

69. Therefore, it is clear that the government's current procedure, subjecting Petitioner to mandatory detention under section 1225(b)(2), creates a substantial risk of erroneous deprivation of Petitioner's interest in being free from arbitrary confinement.

70. Additionally, there are reasonable alternatives available for Respondent to pursue. As discussed above, section 1226(a) applies to noncitizens facing charges of inadmissibility, including noncitizens like Petitioner who entered without inspection and were later detained while residing inside the country. As such, proper application of the INA's detention scheme allows for the possibility of detaining Petitioner under section 1226(a) but first requires a bond hearing to make an individualized determination of his risk of flight or dangerousness. Such a hearing has not happened. Without it, the risk of erroneous deprivation of Petitioner's freedom is high. *See Singh*, 2025 WL 2699219, at *4 finding that the risk of erroneously depriving the Petitioner of his freedom is high if the Immigration Judge fails to assess his risk of flight or dangerousness.).

c. Government Interest

71. As to the third *Mathews* factor, the government's interest in maintaining the current procedure is minimal here. The new interpretation of section 1225(b)(2) – that people like Petitioner who have resided in the United States for years are now subject to mandatory detention – flies in the face of the statutory text, statutory framework, Congressional intent, almost three decades of prior practice, and the decisions of federal courts across the nation. Any government interest in public safety or ensuring that Petitioner attends future immigration proceedings would be satisfied through proper application of section 1226(a), which requires a bond redetermination hearing where an immigration judge will consider Petitioner's individualized facts and circumstances to determine whether he is a danger to the community or a flight risk.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I

Violation of the INA

72. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

73. The mandatory detention provision at 8 U.S.C. section 1225(b)(2) does not apply to all noncitizens residing in the United States who are subject to the grounds of inadmissibility. As relevant here, it does not apply to those who previously entered the country and have been residing in the United States prior to being detained and placed in removal proceedings by Respondents. Such noncitizens are detained under section 1226(a), unless they are subject to section 1225(b)(1), section 1226(c), or section 1231. But Respondents' actions here violate section 1226(a) too because, to date, Respondents have refused to consider Petitioner for bond.

74. The application of section 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates his continued detention and violates the INA.

COUNT II
Violation of Due Process

75. Petitioner repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

76. The government may not deprive a person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. U.S. Const. amend. V. “Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that the Clause protects.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).

77. Petitioner has a fundamental interest in liberty and being free from official restraint.

78. Petitioner entered the country without inspection, had no contact with any DHS officials, and lived in the United States for three years before being detained. Such an individual may only be subject to discretionary detention under 8 U.S.C. section 1226, which provides for release on bond. Respondents now erroneously detain Petitioner under the mandatory provision in section 1225(b)(2).

79. Respondents’ detention of Petitioner without a bond redetermination hearing to determine whether he is a flight risk or danger to others violates his right to due process.

COUNT III
Violation of the Administrative Procedures Act

80. Petitioner repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

81. The Administrative Procedure Act prohibits federal action that is “in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority or limitations, or short of statutory right,” 5 U.S.C. section 706(2)(C), and “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law,” *id.* section 706(2)(A).

82. Respondents’ application of 8 U.S.C. section 1225(b)(2) to noncitizens residing in the United States for many years is a clearly erroneous interpretation of the statute in violation of the Administrative Procedures Act.

83. Respondents’ application of section 1225(b)(2) is arbitrary and capricious as it conflicts with longstanding practices, congressional intent, and federal case law.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that this Court grant the following relief:

- a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- b. Issue a writ of habeas corpus requiring that Respondents immediately release Petitioner or, in the alternative, provide Petitioner with a bond hearing pursuant to 8 U.S.C. section 1226(a) within 14 days;
- c. Enjoin Respondents from moving Petitioner outside the jurisdiction of this Court pending adjudication of this petition;
- d. Declare that Petitioner’s continued detention violates the INA and the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment;
- e. Declare that Respondents’ policy of detaining non-citizens who have resided in the United States for many years under 8 U.S.C. section 1225(b)(2) violates the Administrative Procedures Act;

- f. Award Petitioner attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA"), as amended, 28 U.S.C. section 2412, and on any other basis justified under law; and
- g. Grant any other and further relief that this Court deems just and proper.

DATED this 14th of November, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Brigid M. Carmichael
Brigid M. Carmichael
Massey & Gail
50 E. Washington, Suite 400
Chicago, Illinois 60602
bcarmichael@masseygail.com
312-283-1590

Attorney for Petitioner

VERIFICATION

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2242 and 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the facts set forth in the foregoing Petition for Habeas Corpus are true and correct.

Executed this 14th of November, 2025.

/s/Brigid M. Carmichael