

1 MURRAY D. HILTS, ESQ. (CA Bar No. 169690)  
2 LAW OFFICES OF MURRAY D. HILTS  
3 3020 MEADE AVE.  
4 SAN DIEGO, CA 92116  
5 TEL: (619) 688-1174  
6 FAX: (619) 285-1977  
7 *Attorney for Petitioner*

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN DIEGO DIVISION**

9 JAIME SILVESTRE-MENDOZA, )

'25CV3206 RBM DDL

10           Petitioner, )

11 v. )

**PETITION FOR WRIT  
OF HABEAS CORPUS**

12 Kristi NOEM, in her official capacity as Secretary )  
13 of Homeland Security, Christopher J. LAROSE, )  
14 in his official capacity as Warden of Otay Mesa )  
15 Detention Center, Gregory J. ARCHAMBEAULT, )  
16 in his official capacity as San Diego Field Office )  
17 Director, ICE Enforcement Removal Operations; )  
18 Todd LYONS, in his official capacity as Acting Director )  
19 of ICE; and Pamela BONDI, U.S. )  
20 Attorney General; IMMIGRATION AND )  
21 CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT; DEPARTMENT OF )  
22 HOMELAND SECURITY, )



23           Respondents. )

24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1.     Petitioner JAIME SILVESTRE-MENDOZA (“Petitioner”) is a 31-  
year-old Guatemalan national who last entered the United States in 2018. He  
has resided in San Diego County for multiple years

2.     On September 25, 2025, Petitioner was detained by Respondents at  
the Otay Mesa Detention Center.



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

### III. PARTIES

8. Petitioner is a 31-year-old Guatemalan national who resides in San Diego, California. He is currently detained by Respondents at the Otay Mesa Detention Center in San Diego, California, pending removal proceedings.

9. Respondent Christopher J. LaRose is the Warden of Otay Mesa Detention Center. Respondent La Rose is responsible for the operation of the Detention Center where Petitioner is detained. As such, Respondent LaRose has immediate physical custody of the Petitioner. He is being sued in his official capacity.

10. Respondent Gregory J. Archambeault is the San Diego Field Office Director (“FOD”) for ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations. Respondent Archambeault is responsible for the oversight of ICE operations at the Otay Mesa Detention Center. Respondent Archambeault is being sued in his official capacity.

11. Respondent Todd Lyons is the Acting Director of ICE. Respondent Lyons is responsible for the administration of ICE and the implementation and enforcement of the immigration laws, including immigrant detention. As such, Respondent Lyons is a legal custodian of Petitioner and is being sued in his official capacity.

12. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”). As Secretary of DHS, Secretary Noem is responsible for the general administration and enforcement of the immigration

1 laws of the United States. Respondent Secretary Noem is being sued in her  
2 official capacity.


3  
4  
5 **IV. EXHAUSTION OF REMEDIES**

6 13. No statutory exhaustion requirement applies. *See* 8 § U.S.C. 2241;  
7 *Laing v. Ashcroft*, 370 F.3d 994, 998 (9th Cir. 2004). Therefore, exhaustion is not  
8 jurisdictionally required.

9 14. Additionally, further agency steps will be futile. Recently, the BIA  
10 published *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 28 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). In its decision,  
11 the BIA adopted DHS' reading of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), finding individuals  
12 similarly situated to Petitioner ineligible for release on bond.  
13

14 15. In Petitioner's case, any request for custody redetermination will be  
15 dismissed by the Immigration Court for lack of jurisdiction and any appeal to  
16 the BIA will be dismissed. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* currently controls in  
17 Petitioner's case and any attempt to request agency evaluation of his detention  
18 will be futile.  
19  
20

21 **V. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

22 16. Petitioner is a Guatemalan national born on  He first  
23 entered the United States in 2018.  
24

25 17. On or about September 25, 2025, Petitioner was apprehended by ICE  
26 agents who were conducting an investigation into a different person.  
27  
28

1 18. Petitioner has remained in Respondents' custody since that time.

2 19. Petitioner's individual merits hearing is scheduled for March 9, 2026,  
3 at 1:00 p.m. before Immigration Judge Guy G. Grande at 7488 Calzada de la  
4 Fuente, San Diego, California.

5 20. Petitioner now seeks habeas relief because continuing his detention  
6 exceeds statutory authority and violates the Fifth Amendment.  
7

8  
9 **VI. LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR RELIEF SOUGHT**

10 21. Habeas corpus relief extends to a person "in custody under or by color  
11 of the authority of the United States" if the person can show he is "in custody  
12 in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28  
13 U.S.C. § 2241 (c)(1), (c)(3); see also *Antonelli v. Warden, U.S.P. Atlanta*, 542  
14 F.3d 1348, 1352 (11th Cir. 2008) (holding a petitioner's claims are proper under  
15 28 U.S.C. section 2241 if they concern the continuation or execution of  
16 confinement).  
17

18 22. "[H]abeas corpus is, at its core, an equitable remedy," *Schlup v.*  
19 *Delo*, 513 U.S. 298, 319 (1995), that "[t]he court shall ... dispose of [] as law  
20 and justice require," 28 U.S.C. § 2243. "[T]he court's role was most extensive  
21 in cases of pretrial and noncriminal detention." *Boumediene v. Bush*, 553  
22 U.S. 723, 779–80 (2008). "[W]hen the judicial power to issue habeas corpus  
23 properly is invoked the judicial officer must have adequate authority to make  
24 a determination in light of the relevant law and facts and to formulate and  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 issue appropriate orders for relief, including, if necessary, an order directing  
2 the prisoner’s release.” *Id.* at 787.

3  
4  
5 **VII. CAUSES OF ACTION**

6 **COUNT ONE**

7 **8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), NOT 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), APPLIES TO PETITIONER**

8 23. Petitioner incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 as if fully set out  
9 herein.

10 24. Recently, Respondents began arguing that those in situations similar  
11 to Petitioner are detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), which mandates  
12 the detention of an “applicant for admission” throughout the entirety of  
13 removal proceedings.

14 25. Respondents’ newly formulated definition of “applicant for  
15 admission,” which would include any noncitizen who has not been formally  
16 admitted regardless of years of residence in the United States, directly  
17 contradicts both the plain text of the statute and controlling Ninth Circuit  
18 precedent.

19 26. As the Ninth Circuit explained in interpreting the phrase “applicant  
20 for admission” under § 1225(b)(1), “*an immigrant submits an ‘application for*  
21 *admission’ at a distinct point in time,*” and stretching that phrase to apply  
22 “*potentially for years or decades ... would push the statutory text beyond its*  
23 *breaking point.*” *United States v. Gambino-Ruiz*, 91 F.4th 981, 988–89 (9th Cir.  
24 2024) (citing *Torres v. Barr*, 976 F.3d 918, 922–26 (9th Cir. 2020) (en banc)).  
25  
26  
27  
28



1 allowing the prosecuting agency—after losing at the bond hearing—to veto the  
2 Immigration Judge’s order with a one-page notice that requires no showing of  
3 danger, flight risk, or likelihood of success on appeal.  
4

5 33. Applying the *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976), test,  
6 Petitioner’s liberty interest is paramount; the risk of erroneous deprivation is  
7 extreme considering the Immigration Judge’s determination that Petitioner is  
8 not subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c) and does not pose  
9 a danger to the community. Likewise, the risk of erroneous deprivation of  
10 liberty is great due to the lack of a non-independent adjudicator. *Marcello v.*  
11 *Bonds*, 39 U.S. 302, 305-306 (1955). In filing Form EOIR-43, ICE is acting as  
12 both the prosecutor as well as the adjudicator.  
13

14 34. While the government has discretion to detain individuals under 8  
15 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and to revoke custody decisions under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(b), this  
16 discretion is not “unlimited” and must comport with constitutional due process.  
17 *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 698.  
18  
19

20 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

- 22
- 23 1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
  - 24 2) Grant Petitioner a writ of habeas corpus directing the Respondents to  
25 immediately release him from custody, under reasonable conditions of  
26 supervision;  
27

- 1 3) Order Respondents to refrain from transferring Petitioner out of the
- 2 jurisdiction of this court during the pendency of these proceedings and while
- 3 the Petitioner remains in Respondents' custody;
- 4
- 5 4) Order Respondents to file a response within 3 business days of the filing of
- 6 this petition;
- 7
- 8 5) Award attorneys' fees to Petitioner; and
- 9 6) Grant any other and further relief which this Court deems just and proper.

10 I affirm, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct.

11 Respectfully submitted this 18th day of November, 2025.

12  
13 /s/ Murray D. Hilts

14 The Law Offices of Murray D. Hilts

15 3020 Meade Ave.

16 San Diego, CA 92116

17 CA Bar # 2169690

18 *Attorney for Petitioner*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN DIEGO DIVISION**

---

JAIME SILVESTRE-MENDOZA,

Agency No. ,

*Petitioner,*

v.

KRISTI NOEM, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, et. al.,

*Respondents.*

---

**PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS**

Murray D. Hilts  
Law Offices of Murray D. Hilts  
3020 Meade Ave.  
San Diego, CA 92116  
(619) 688-1174 (office)  
(619) 285-1977 (fax)  
murrayhiltslaw@hotmail.com

Attorneys for Petitioner,

JAIME SILVESTRE-MENDOZA