

Eric Mark  
Law Office of Eric M. Mark  
96 Summer Ave  
Newark, NJ 07104  
Tel: (973) 306-4246  
Email: EricM@ericmarklaw.com

Attorney for Petitioner

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

**FLOR LISBETH PORTILLO  
QUINTANILLA,**

Petitioner

vs.

**TODD LYONS**, Acting Director,  
Immigration and Customs  
Enforcement, **KRISTI NOEM**,  
Secretary of United States  
Department of Homeland Security,  
**RUBEN PEREZ**, Immigration and  
Customs Enforcement, Newark  
Field Office Director, **LUIS SOTO**,  
Director, Delaney Hall Detention  
Facility, **PAMELA BONDI**, United  
States Attorney General,

Respondents

) **CASE NO.**

)  
) **PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS  
CORPUS UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 2241 AND  
COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE  
AND DECLARATORY RELIEF**

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

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. Petitioner Flor Lisbeth Portillo Quintanilla (“Mr. Quintanilla”) or (“Petitioner”) is in the physical custody of Respondents at the Delaney Hall Detention Center. She now faces unlawful detention because the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) and the Executive Office of Immigration Review (“EOIR”) have wrongfully concluded Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention merely because she entered without inspection.
2. Petitioner entered the United States on or about April 12, 2008. Subsequently thereafter, Respondents commenced removal proceedings against Petitioner in immigration court, entitling Petitioner to present an asylum claim with the due process rights under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a.
3. Petitioner is charged with, inter alia, having entered the United States without admission or inspection. *See* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) and 1182(a)(7)(A)(i)(I).
4. Based on this allegation in Petitioner’s removal proceedings, DHS denied Petitioner release from immigration custody, consistent with a new DHS policy issued on July 8, 2025, instructing all Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) employees to consider anyone inadmissible under § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i)—i.e., those who entered the United States without admission or inspection—to be subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond.
5. Similarly, on September 5, 2025, the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA or Board”) issued a precedent decision, binding on all immigration judges, holding that an immigration judge has no authority to consider bond requests for any person who entered the United States without admission. *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). The Board determined that such individuals are subject to

1 detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on  
2 bond.

- 3 6. Petitioner’s detention on this basis violates the plain language of the Immigration and  
4 Nationality Act. Section 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to individuals like Petitioner  
5 who previously entered and are now residing in the United States. Instead, such  
6 individuals are subject to a different statute, § 1226(a), that allows for release on  
7 conditional parole or bond. That statute expressly applies to people who, like  
8 Petitioner, are charged as inadmissible for having entered the United States without  
9 inspection.  
10
- 11 7. Respondents’ new legal interpretation is plainly contrary to the statutory framework  
12 and contrary to decades of agency practice applying § 1226(a) to people like  
13 Petitioner.  
14
- 15 8. Accordingly, Petitioner seeks a writ of habeas corpus requiring that she be released  
16 on the same conditions as she was previously released without any additional  
17 condition or that Respondents provide a bond hearing under § 1226(a).  
18
- 19 9. Petitioner asks this Court to find that Respondents’ detention and transfer of  
20 Petitioner are arbitrary and capricious and in violation of the law, and to immediately  
21 issue an order preventing Petitioner’s transfer out of this district.

## 22 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 23 10. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(5) (habeas corpus), 28 U.S.C. §  
24 1331 (federal question), and Article I, section 9, clause 2 of the United States  
25 Constitution (the Suspension Clause).

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

3 12. Venue is proper in the District of New Jersey because Petitioner is currently detained  
4 at the Delaney Hall Detention Center in Newark, New Jersey under color of the  
5 authority of the United States, in violation of the Constitution, laws or treaties thereof.  
6 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391, 2241.

7 13. Venue is further proper because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving  
8 rise to Petitioner’s claims occurred in this District, where Petitioner is now in  
9 Respondent’s custody. 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e).

10  
11 **III. REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243**

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

17 15. Habeas corpus is “perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law . .  
18 . . . affording as it does a swift and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or  
19 confinement.” *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963) (emphasis added). “The  
20 application for the writ usurps the attention and displaces the calendar of the judge or  
21 justice who entertains it and receives prompt action from him within the four corners  
22 of the application.” *Yong v. I.N.S.*, 208 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation  
23 omitted).  
24  
25

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

**IV. PARTIES**

16. Petitioner Flor Lisbeth Portillo Quintanilla was detained by ERO on October 29, 2025 in Avenel, New Jersey. She remains in immigration custody at the Delaney Hall Detention Center in Newark, New Jersey.

17. Respondent Todd Lyons is the Acting Director of Immigration and Customs Enforcement. He is named in his official capacity.

18. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of Homeland Security and is Petitioner's ultimate legal custodian. She is sued in her official capacity.

19. Respondent Ruben Perez is the Field Office Director for Enforcement and Removal Operations in ERO's Newark Field Office. He is one of Petitioner's legal custodians, and is sued in his official capacity.

20. Respondent Luis Soto is employed as the Director of the Delaney Hall Detention Center, where Petitioner is detained. He has immediate physical custody of Petitioner. He is sued in his official capacity.

21. Respondent Pamela Bondi is sued in her official capacity as the Attorney General of the Department of Justice. She is one of Petitioner's legal custodians.

**V. LEGAL FRAMEWORK**

22. Immigration detention should not be used as a punishment and should only be used when, under an individualized determination, a noncitizen is a flight risk because they are unlikely to appear for immigration court or a danger to the community. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).

23. Noncitizens in immigration proceedings are entitled to Due Process under the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. *Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 306 (1993).

1 24. The Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) establishes various procedures through  
2 which individuals may be detained pending a decision on whether the noncitizen is to  
3 be removed. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).

4 25. Removal proceedings described in section 240 of the INA are used to determine  
5 whether individuals, such as Petitioner, should be removed from the United States.  
6 *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a.

7 26. The Refugee Act of 1980, the cornerstone of the U.S. asylum system, provides a right  
8 to apply for asylum to individuals seeking safe haven in the United States. The  
9 purpose of the Refugee Act is to enforce the “historic policy of the United States to  
10 respond to the urgent needs of persons subject to persecution in their homelands.”  
11 Refugee Act of 1980, § 101(a), Pub.L. No. 96-212, 94 Stat. 102 (1980).

12 27. The “motivation for the enactment of the Refugee Act” was the United Nations  
13 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, “to which the United States had been  
14 bound since 1968.” *INS v. Cardoza-Fonseca*, 480 U.S. 421, 424, 432-33 (1987). The  
15 Refugee Act reflects a legislative purpose “to give ‘statutory meaning to our national  
16 commitment to human rights and humanitarian concerns.’” *Duran v. INS*, 756 F.2d  
17 1338, 1340 n.2 (9th Cir. 1985).

18 28. The Refugee Act established the right to apply for asylum in the United States and  
19 defines the standards for granting asylum. It is codified in various sections of the  
20 INA.

21 29. The INA gives the Attorney General or the Secretary of Homeland Security discretion  
22 to grant asylum to noncitizens who satisfy the definition of “refugee.” Under that  
23 definition, individuals generally are eligible for asylum if they have experienced past  
24  
25

1 persecution or have a well-founded fear of future persecution on account of race,  
2 religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion and  
3 if they are unable or unwilling to return to and avail themselves of the protection of  
4 their homeland because of that persecution or fear. 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(42)(A).

5 30. Although a grant of asylum may be discretionary, the right to apply for asylum is not.

6 The Refugee Act broadly affords a right to apply for asylum to any noncitizen “who  
7 is physically present in the United States or who arrives in the United States[.]” 8  
8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1).

9 31. Immigration detention is a form of civil confinement that “constitutes a significant  
10 deprivation of liberty that requires due process protection.” *Addington v. Texas*, 441  
11 U.S. 418, 4253 (1979).

12 32. Custody determinations for individuals in 1229a removal proceedings are governed  
13 by 8 U.S.C. § 1226. Under § 1226(a), an individual may be released if he does not  
14 present a danger to persons or property and is not a flight risk. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533  
15 U.S. 678, 690 (2001); *Matter of Guerra*, 24 I&N Dec. 37 (BIA 2006).

16 33. Custody determinations under § 1226(a) are individualized and based on the facts  
17 presented in those cases. Unlike § 1226(c), which can provide for categorical  
18 determinations for detention regardless of flight risk or safety risks, § 1226(a)  
19 requires a case-by-case review of the facts and circumstances.  
20

21  
22  
23 34. Once a determination to release an individual from custody is made, the release order  
24 may be revisited when the facts or circumstances warrant revocation or  
25 reconsideration. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(b). For an individual who was once in custody, the

1 Attorney General may take that individual back into custody by revoking the  
2 individual's release when the facts and circumstances warrant it.

3 35. Revocation and return to custody is authorized only based on the individualized facts  
4 and circumstances. 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(c)(9). By regulation, revocation decisions are  
5 limited in nature and may only be made by certain authorized officials. 8 C.F.R. §  
6 1236.1(c)(9).

7  
8 36. The INA prescribes three basic forms of detention for the vast majority of noncitizens  
9 in removal proceedings.

10 37. First, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 authorizes the detention of noncitizens in standard removal  
11 proceedings before an IJ. See 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. Individuals in § 1226(a) detention are  
12 generally entitled to a bond hearing at the outset of their detention, see 8 C.F.R. §§  
13 1003.19(a), 1236.1(d), while noncitizens who have been arrested, charged with, or  
14 convicted of certain crimes are subject to mandatory detention, see 8 U.S.C. §  
15 1226(c).

16 38. Second, the INA provides for mandatory detention of noncitizens subject to expedited  
17 removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and for other recent arrivals seeking admission  
18 referred to under § 1225(b)(2).

19 39. Last, the INA also provides for detention of noncitizens who have been ordered  
20 removed, including individuals in withholding-only proceedings, see 8 U.S.C. §  
21 1231(a)-(b).

22  
23 40. This case concerns the detention provisions at §§ 1226(a) and 1225(b)(2).

24 41. The detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) were enacted as part of the  
25 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996,

1 Pub. L. No. 104—208, Div. C, §§ 302–03, 110 Stat. 3009-546, 3009–582 to 3009–  
2 583, 3009–585. Section 1226(a) was most recently amended earlier this year by the  
3 Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No.119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025).

4 42. Following the enactment of the IIRIRA, EOIR drafted new regulations explaining  
5 that, in general, people who entered the country without inspection were not  
6 considered detained under § 1225 and that they were instead detained under §  
7 1226(a). See Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of  
8 Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum Procedures, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312,  
9 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997).

10  
11 43. Thus, in the decades that followed, most people who entered without inspection and  
12 were placed in standard removal proceedings received bond hearings, unless their  
13 criminal history rendered them ineligible pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c). That  
14 practice was consistent with many more decades of prior practice, in which  
15 noncitizens who were not deemed “arriving” were entitled to a custody hearing before  
16 an IJ or other hearing officer. See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a) (1994); see also H.R. Rep. No.  
17 104-469, pt. 1, at 229 (1996) (noting that § 1226(a) simply “restates” the detention  
18 authority previously found at § 1252(a)).

19  
20 44. On July 8, 2025, ICE, “in coordination with” DOJ, announced a new policy that  
21 rejected well-established understanding of the statutory framework and reversed  
22 decades of practice.

1 45. The new policy, entitled “Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for  
2 Applicants for Admission,”<sup>1</sup> claims that all persons who entered the United States  
3 without inspection shall now be subject to mandatory detention provision under §  
4 1225(b)(2)(A). *See* Ex. 1. The policy applies regardless of when a person is  
5 apprehended, and affects those who have resided in the United States for months,  
6 years, and even decades.

7 46. On September 5, 2025, the Board adopted this same position in a published decision,  
8 *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*. There, the Board held that all noncitizens who entered the  
9 United States without admission or parole are subject to detention under §  
10 1225(b)(2)(A) and are ineligible for IJ bond hearings.

11 47. Since Respondents adopted their new policies, dozens of federal courts have rejected  
12 their new interpretation of the INA’s detention authorities. Courts have likewise  
13 rejected *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, which adopts the same reading of the statute as  
14 ICE.

15 48. Even before ICE or the Board introduced these nationwide policies, IJs in the  
16 Tacoma, Washington, immigration court stopped providing bond hearings for persons  
17 who entered the United States without inspection and who have since resided here.  
18 There, the U.S. District Court in the Western District of Washington found that such a  
19 reading of the INA is likely unlawful and that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to  
20 noncitizens who are not apprehended upon arrival to the *United States*. *Rodriguez*  
21 *Vazquez v. Bostock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239 (W.D. Wash. 2025).  
22  
23  
24

25  

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at <https://www.aila.org/library/ice-memo-interim-guidance-regarding-detention-authority-for-applications-for-admission>.

1 49. Subsequently, court after court has adopted the same reading of the INA's detention  
2 authorities and rejected ICE and EOIR's new interpretation. *See, e.g., Gomes v. Hyde*,  
3 No. 1:25-CV-11571-JEK, 2025 WL 1869299 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025); *Diaz Martinez*  
4 *v. Hyde*, No. CV 25-11613-BEM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 2084238 (D. Mass.  
5 July 24, 2025); *Rosado v. Figueroa*, No. CV 25-02157 PHX DLR (CDB), 2025 WL  
6 2337099 (D. Ariz. Aug. 11, 2025), report and recommendation adopted, No. CV-25-  
7 02157-PHX-DLR (CDB), 2025 WL 2349133 (D. Ariz. Aug. 13, 2025); *Lopez Benitez*  
8 *v. Francis*, No. 25 CIV. 5937 (DEH), 2025 WL 2371588 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2025);  
9 *Maldonado v. Olson*, No. 0:25-cv-03142-SRN-SGE, 2025 WL 2374411 (D. Minn.  
10 Aug. 15, 2025); *Arrazola-Gonzalez v. Noem*, No. 5:25-cv-01789-ODW (DFMx),  
11 2025 WL 2379285 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2025); *Romero v. Hyde*, No. 25-11631-BEM,  
12 2025 WL 2403827 (D. Mass. Aug. 19, 2025); *Samb v. Joyce*, No. 25 CIV. 6373  
13 (DEH), 2025 WL 2398831 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 19, 2025); *Ramirez Clavijo v. Kaiser*, No.  
14 25-CV-06248-BLF, 2025 WL 2419263 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2025); *Leal-Hernandez v.*  
15 *Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-02428-JRR, 2025 WL 2430025 (D. Md. Aug. 24, 2025); *Kostak*  
16 *v. Trump*, No. 3:25-cv-01093-JE-KDM, 2025 WL 2472136 (W.D. La. Aug. 27,  
17 2025); *Jose J.O.E. v. Bondi*, No. 25-CV-3051 (ECT/DJF), --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025  
18 WL 2466670 (D. Minn. Aug. 27, 2025); *Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft*, No. 2:25-cv-  
19 12486-BRM-EAS, 2025 WL 2496379 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025); *Vasquez Garcia*  
20 *v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02180-DMS-MM, 2025 WL 2549431 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025);  
21 *Zaragoza Mosqueda v. Noem*, No. 5:25-CV-02304 CAS (BFM), 2025 WL 2591530  
22 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2025); *Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft*, No. 25-CV-12546, 2025 WL  
23 2609425 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9, 2025); *Sampiao v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11981-JEK,  
24  
25

1 2025 WL 2607924 (D. Mass. Sept. 9, 2025); *see also, e.g., Palma Perez v. Berg*, No.  
2 8:25CV494, 2025 WL 2531566, at \*2 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025) (noting that “[t]he  
3 Court tends to agree” that § 1226(a) and not § 1225(b)(2) authorizes detention);  
4 *Jacinto v. Trump*, No. 4:25-cv-03161-JFB-RCC, 2025 WL 2402271 at \*3 (D. Neb.  
5 Aug. 19, 2025) (same); *Anicasio v. Kramer*, No. 4:25-cv-03158-JFB-RCC, 2025 WL  
6 2374224 at \*2 (D. Neb. Aug. 14, 2025) (same).

7  
8 50. Courts have uniformly rejected DHS’s and EOIR’s new interpretation because it  
9 defies the INA. As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court and others have explained, the plain  
10 text of the statutory provisions demonstrates that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to  
11 people like Petitioner.

12 51. Section 1226(a) applies by default to all persons “pending a decision on whether the  
13 [noncitizen] is to be removed from the United States.” These removal hearings are  
14 held under § 1229a, to “decid[e] the inadmissibility or deportability of a[]  
15 [noncitizen].”

16 52. The text of § 1226 also explicitly applies to people charged as being inadmissible,  
17 including those who entered without inspection. See 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E).  
18 Subparagraph (E)’s reference to such people makes clear that, by default, such people  
19 are afforded a bond hearing under subsection (a). As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court  
20 explained, “[w]hen Congress creates ‘specific exceptions’ to a statute’s applicability,  
21 it ‘proves’ that absent those exceptions, the statute generally applies.” *Rodriguez*  
22 *Vazquez*, 779 F. Supp. 3d at 1257 (citing *Shady Grove Orthopedic Assocs., P.A. v.*  
23 *Allstate Ins. Co.*, 559 U.S. 393, 400 (2010)); *see also* *Gomes*, 2025 WL 1869299, at  
24 \*7.  
25

1 53. Section 1226 therefore leaves no doubt that it applies to people who face charges of  
2 being inadmissible to the United States, including those who are present without  
3 admission or parole.

4 54. By contrast, § 1225(b) applies to people arriving at U.S. ports of entry or who  
5 recently entered the United States. The statute’s entire framework is premised on  
6 inspections at the border of people who are “seeking admission” to the United States.  
7 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Indeed, the Supreme Court has explained that this  
8 mandatory detention scheme applies “at the Nation’s borders and ports of entry,  
9 where the Government must determine whether a[] [noncitizen] seeking to enter the  
10 country is admissible.” *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287 (2018).

11  
12 **VI. FACTS**

13 55. Petitioner has resided in the United States since April 12, 2008 and lives in  
14 Elizabethport, New Jersey.

15 56. DHS placed Petitioner in removal proceedings before the Newark Immigration Court  
16 pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. ICE has charged Petitioner with, inter alia, being  
17 inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) as someone who entered the United  
18 States without inspection.

19 57. Petitioner’s next Immigration Court master hearing is scheduled for December 3,  
20 2025 at 8:30 a.m.

21 58. On October 29, 2025, Petitioner was arrested by ICE ERO officers during a targeted  
22 regulatory customs inspection at Fashion Distribution Services at 34 Engelhard  
23 Avenue, Avenel, NJ 07001. Petitioner is now detained at the Delaney Hall Detention  
24 Center.  
25

1 59. Petitioner has two United States citizen children. Petitioner’s mother is a lawful  
2 permanent resident and her father is a United States citizen.

3 60. Pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, the immigration judge is unable to consider  
4 Petitioner’s bond request.

5 61. As a result, Petitioner remains in detention. Without relief from this court, she faces  
6 the prospect of months, or even years, in immigration custody, separated from her  
7 family and community.

8  
9 **VII. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

10 **COUNT I**  
11 **Violation of the INA**

12 62. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in the preceding  
13 paragraphs.

14 63. The mandatory detention provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to all  
15 noncitizens residing in the United States who are subject to the grounds of  
16 inadmissibility. As relevant here, it does not apply to those who previously entered  
17 the country and have been residing in the United States prior to being apprehended  
18 and placed in removal proceedings by Respondents. Such noncitizens are detained  
19 under § 1226(a), unless they are subject to § 1225(b)(1), § 1226(c), or § 1231.

20 64. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates her continued  
21 detention and violates the INA.

22 **COUNT II**  
23 **Violation of Due Process**

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

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

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

6 68. The government’s detention of Petitioner without a bond redetermination hearing to  
7 determine whether she is a flight risk or danger to others violates her right to due  
8 process.  
9

10 **VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

11 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court to:

- 12 a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- 13 b. Order that Petitioner shall not be transferred outside of New Jersey while  
14 this habeas petition is pending;
- 15 c. Issue an Order to Show Cause ordering Respondents to show cause why  
16 this Petition should not be granted within three days;
- 17 d. Declare that Petitioner’s detention without an individualized determination  
18 violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment;
- 19 e. Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus requiring that Respondents release  
20 Petitioner without conditions, such as GPS monitoring, that would  
21 constitute de facto custody, or, in the alternative, provide Petitioner with a  
22 bond hearing pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a);
- 23 f. Declare that Petitioner’s detention is unlawful;  
24  
25

- 1 g. Award Petitioner attorney’s fees and costs under the Equal Access to
- 2 Justice Act (“EAJA”), as amended, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and on any other
- 3 basis justified under law; and
- 4 h. Grant any other and further relief that this Court deems just and proper.

5 Respectfully submitted,

6  
7 Date: November 18, 2025

8 By: /s/ Eric M. Mark  
9 Eric M. Mark  
10 Attorney for Petitioner

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, the undersigned, declare that my office is in Newark, New Jersey. I am over the age of eighteen (18) years and not a party to the action within. My business address is 96 Summer Ave Newark, NJ 07104. On November 18, 2025, I served the following documents: **PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 2241 AND COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF** by placing a true and correct copy in a sealed envelope, each addressed as follows:

Kristi Noem  
U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
9707 Martin Luther King Jr Ave SE  
Washington, D.C. 20528

Todd Lyons  
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement is:  
500 12th Street SW  
Washington, DC 20536

Ruben Perez  
Enforcement and Removal Operations  
Newark Field Office  
970 Broad St. 11th Floor  
Newark, NJ 07102

Luis Soto  
Delaney Hall Detention Facility  
451 Doremus Avenue  
Newark, New Jersey 07105

Pamela Bondi  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Civil Process Clerk  
U.S. Attorney's Office  
970 Broad Street, 7th Floor  
Newark, NJ 07102

