

1 ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney
2 MARY CILE GLOVER-ROGERS
California State Bar No. 321254
3 ERIN M. DIMBLEBY
California State Bar No. 323359
4 Assistant U.S. Attorneys
Office of the U.S. Attorney
5 880 Front Street, Room 6293
San Diego, CA 92101-8893
6 Telephone: (619) 546-7609/6987
Facsimile: (619) 546-7751
7 Email: mary.glover-rogers@usdoj.gov
Email: erin.dimbleby@usdoj.gov

8 Attorneys for Respondents

9
10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 GONZALO MIGUEL
12 BAUTISTA-SANTIAGO,
13
14 Petitioner,

14 v.

15 KRISTI NOEM, in her official capacity as
Secretary of Homeland Security, *et al.*,
16
17 Respondents.

Case No.: 25-cv-03209-DMS-DDL
**RESPONDENTS' RETURN TO
HABEAS PETITION**

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **I. Introduction and Summary of Argument**

2 Petitioner has filed a habeas petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Petitioner is
3 currently in removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a and is charged with
4 inadmissibility under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i), as an alien present in the United
5 States who has not been admitted or paroled. *See* Exhibit 1 (Notice to Appear). As an
6 applicant for admission, Petitioner is mandatorily detained in Immigration and Customs
7 Enforcement (ICE) custody pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). Based on the arguments
8 below, the Court should deny any requests for relief and dismiss the petition.

9 **II. Statutory Background**

10 **A. Individuals Seeking Admission to the United States**

11 For over a century, this country’s immigration laws have authorized immigration
12 officials to charge noncitizens as removable from the country, arrest those subject to
13 removal, and detain them during removal proceedings. *See Abel v. United States*, 362
14 U.S. 217, 232–37 (1960). “The rule has been clear for decades: ‘[d]etention during
15 deportation proceedings [i]s ... constitutionally valid.’” *Banyee v. Garland*, 115 F.4th
16 928 (8th Cir. 2024) (quoting *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 523 (2003)), *rehearing by*
17 *panel and en banc denied*, *Banyee v. Bondi*, No. 22-2252, 2025 WL 837914 (8th Cir.
18 Mar. 18, 2025); *see Carlson v. Landon*, 342 U.S. 524, 538 (1952) (“Detention is
19 necessarily a part of this deportation procedure.”); *Demore*, 538 U.S. at 523 n.7 (“In fact,
20 prior to 1907 there was no provision permitting bail for *any* aliens during the pendency
21 of their deportation proceedings.”) (emphasis in original). The Supreme Court even
22 recognized that removal proceedings “would be [in] vain if those accused could not be
23 held in custody pending the inquiry into their true character.” *Demore*, 538 U.S. at
24 523 (quoting *Wong Wing v. United States*, 163 U.S. 228, 235 (1896)). Over the century,
25 Congress has enacted a multi-layered statutory scheme for the civil detention of aliens
26 pending a decision on removal, during the administrative and judicial review of removal
27 orders, and in preparation for removal. *See generally* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225, 1226, 1231. It
28 is the interplay between these statutes that is at issue here.

1 **B. Detention Under 8 U.S.C. § 1225**

2 “To implement its immigration policy, the Government must be able to decide
3 (1) who may enter the country and (2) who may stay here after entering.” *Jennings v.*
4 *Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 286 (2018). Section 1225 governs inspection, the initial step
5 in this process, *id.*, stating that all “applicants for admission . . . shall be inspected by
6 immigration officers.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3). The statute—in a provision entitled
7 “ALIENS TREATED AS APPLICANTS FOR ADMISSION”—dictates who “shall be
8 deemed for purposes of this chapter an applicant for admission,” defining that term to
9 encompass *both* an alien “present in the United States who has not been admitted *or*
10 [one] who arrives in the United States . . .” *Id.* § 1225(a)(1) (emphasis added). Section
11 1225(b) governs the inspection procedures applicable to all applicants for admission.
12 They “fall into one of two categories, those covered by § 1225(b)(1) and those covered
13 by § 1225(b)(2).” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287.

14 Section 1225(b)(1) applies to arriving aliens and “certain other” aliens “initially
15 determined to be inadmissible due to fraud, misrepresentation, or lack of valid
16 documentation.” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287; 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i), (iii). These
17 aliens are generally subject to expedited removal proceedings. *See* 8 U.S.C. §
18 1225(b)(1)(A)(i). But if the alien “indicates an intention to apply for asylum . . . or a
19 fear of persecution,” immigration officers will refer the alien for a credible fear
20 interview. *Id.* § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii). An alien “with a credible fear of persecution” is
21 “detained for further consideration of the application for asylum.” *Id.*
22 § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii). If the alien does not indicate an intent to apply for asylum, express
23 a fear of persecution, or is “found not to have such a fear,” they are detained until
24 removed from the United States. *Id.* §§ 1225(b)(1)(A)(i), (B)(iii)(IV).

25 Section 1225(b)(2) is “broader” and “serves as a catchall provision.” *Jennings*,
26 583 U.S. at 287. It “applies to all applicants for admission not covered by § 1225(b)(1).”
27 *Id.* Under § 1225(b)(2), an alien “who is an applicant for admission” shall be detained
28 for a removal proceeding “if the examining immigration officer determines that [the]

1 alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted.”
2 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A); *see Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216, 220 (BIA
3 2025) (“[A]liens who are present in the United States without admission are applicants
4 for admission as defined under section 235(b)(2)(A) of the INA, 8 U.S.C.
5 § 1225(b)(2)(A), and must be detained for the duration of their removal proceedings.”);
6 *Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. 66, 68 (BIA 2025) (“for aliens arriving in and seeking
7 admission into the United States who are placed directly in full removal proceedings,
8 section 235(b)(2)(A) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), mandates detention ‘until
9 removal proceedings have concluded.’”) (citing *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 299). However,
10 DHS has the sole discretionary authority to temporarily release on parole “any alien
11 applying for admission to the United States” on a “case-by-case basis for urgent
12 humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit.” *Id.* § 1182(d)(5)(A); *see Biden v.*
13 *Texas*, 597 U.S. 785, 806 (2022).

14 **C. Detention Under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)**

15 Section 1226 provides for arrest and detention “pending a decision on whether
16 the alien is to be removed from the United States.” 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). Under § 1226(a),
17 the government may detain an alien during his removal proceedings, release him on
18 bond, or release him on conditional parole. By regulation, immigration officers can
19 release an alien who demonstrates that he “would not pose a danger to property or
20 persons” and “is likely to appear for any future proceeding.” 8 C.F.R. § 236.1(c)(8). An
21 alien can also request a custody redetermination (i.e., a bond hearing) by an IJ at any
22 time before a final order of removal is issued. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a); 8 C.F.R. §§
23 236.1(d)(1), 1236.1(d)(1), 1003.19.

24 At a custody redetermination, the IJ may continue detention or release the alien
25 on bond or conditional parole. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a); 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(d)(1). IJs have
26 broad discretion in deciding whether to release an alien on bond. *In re Guerra*, 24 I&N
27 Dec. 37, 39-40 (BIA 2006) (listing nine factors for IJs to consider). But regardless of
28

1 the factors IJs consider, an alien “who presents a danger to persons or property should
2 not be released during the pendency of removal proceedings.” *Id.* at 38.

3 Section 1226(a) does not grant “any *right* to release on bond.” *Matter of D-J-*, 23
4 I&N Dec. at 575 (citing *Carlson v. Landon*, 342 U.S. 524, 534 (1952) (emphasis in
5 original). Nor does it address the applicable burden of proof or particular factors that
6 must be considered. *See generally* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). Rather, it grants DHS and the
7 Attorney General broad discretionary authority to determine, after arrest, whether to
8 detain or release an alien during his or her removal proceedings. *See id.* If, after the bond
9 hearing, either party disagrees with the decision of the IJ, that party may appeal the
10 decision to the BIA. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1(d)(3), 1003.19(f), 1003.38, 1236.1(d)(3).

11 Included within the Attorney General and DHS’s discretionary authority are
12 limits on the delegation to the immigration court. Under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(h)(2)(i)(B),
13 the IJ does not have authority to redetermine the conditions of custody imposed by DHS
14 for any arriving alien. The regulations also include a provision that allows DHS to
15 invoke an automatic stay of any decision by an IJ to release an individual on bond when
16 DHS files an appeal of the custody redetermination. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(i)(2) (“The
17 decision whether or not to file [an automatic stay] is subject to the discretion of the
18 Secretary.”).

19 **D. Review Before the Board of Immigration Appeals**

20 The BIA is an appellate body within the Executive Office for Immigration
21 Review (EOIR) and possesses delegated authority from the Attorney General. 8 C.F.R.
22 §§ 1003.1(a)(1), (d)(1). The BIA is “charged with the review of those administrative
23 adjudications under the [INA] that the Attorney General may by regulation assign to
24 it,” including IJ custody determinations. 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.1(d)(1), 236.1, 1236.1. The
25 BIA not only resolves particular disputes before it, but is also directed to, “through
26 precedent decisions, [] provide clear and uniform guidance to DHS, the immigration
27 judges, and the general public on the proper interpretation and administration of the
28 [INA] and its implementing regulations.” *Id.* § 1003.1(d)(1). Decisions rendered by the

1 BIA are final, except for those reviewed by the Attorney General. 8 C.F.R. §
2 1003.1(d)(7).

3 If an automatic stay of a custody decision is invoked by DHS, regulations require
4 the BIA to track the progress of the custody appeal “to avoid unnecessary delays in
5 completing the record for decision.” 8 C.F.R. § 1003.6(c)(3). The stay lapses in 90 days,
6 unless the detainee seeks an extension of time to brief the custody appeal, 8 C.F.R.
7 § 1003.6(c)(4), or unless DHS seeks, and the BIA grants, a discretionary stay. 8 C.F.R.
8 § 1003.6(c)(5).

9 If the BIA denies DHS’s custody appeal, the automatic stay remains in effect for
10 five business days. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.6(d). DHS may, during that five-day period, refer
11 the case to the Attorney General under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(h)(1) for consideration. *Id.*
12 Upon referral to the Attorney General, the release is stayed for 15 business days while
13 the case is considered. The Attorney General may extend the stay of release upon
14 motion by DHS. *Id.*

15 III. Argument

16 A. Claims and Requested Relief Jurisdictionally Barred

17 Petitioner bears the burden of establishing that this Court has subject matter
18 jurisdiction over asserted claims. *See Ass’n of Am. Med. Coll. v. United States*, 217 F.3d
19 770, 778-79 (9th Cir. 2000); *Finley v. United States*, 490 U.S. 545, 547-48 (1989).

20 In general, courts lack jurisdiction to review a decision to commence or
21 adjudicate removal proceedings or execute removal orders. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g)
22 (“[N]o court shall have jurisdiction to hear any cause or claim by or on behalf of any
23 alien arising from the decision or action by the Attorney General to commence
24 proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders.”); *Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-*
25 *Discrimination Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 483 (1999) (“There was good reason for
26 Congress to focus special attention upon, and make special provision for, judicial
27 review of the Attorney General’s discrete acts of ‘commenc[ing] proceedings,
28 adjudicat[ing] cases, [and] execut[ing] removal orders’—which represent the initiation

1 or prosecution of various stages in the deportation process.”); *Limpin v. United States*,
2 828 Fed. App’x 429 (9th Cir. 2020) (holding district court properly dismissed under 8
3 U.S.C. § 1252(g) “because claims stemming from the decision to arrest and detain an
4 alien at the commencement of removal proceedings are not within any court’s
5 jurisdiction”). In other words, § 1252(g) removes district court jurisdiction over “three
6 discrete actions that the Attorney General may take: her ‘decision or action’ to
7 ‘commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders.’” *Reno*, 525 U.S.
8 at 482 (emphasis removed). Congress has explicitly foreclosed district court jurisdiction
9 over claims that necessarily arise “from the decision or action by the Attorney General
10 to commence proceedings [and] adjudicate cases” 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g).

11 Section 1252(g) also bars district courts from hearing challenges to the method
12 by which the government chooses to commence removal proceedings, including the
13 decision to detain an alien pending removal. *See Alvarez v. ICE*, 818 F.3d 1194, 1203
14 (11th Cir. 2016) (“By its plain terms, [§ 1252(g)] bars us from questioning ICE’s
15 discretionary decisions to commence removal” and bars review of “ICE’s decision to
16 take [plaintiff] into custody and to detain him during his removal proceedings”).

17 Other courts have held, “[f]or the purposes of § 1252, the Attorney General
18 commences proceedings against an alien when the alien is issued a Notice to Appear
19 before an immigration court.” *Herrera-Correra v. United States*, No. 08-2941 DSF
20 (JCx), 2008 WL 11336833, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2008). “The Attorney General
21 may arrest the alien against whom proceedings are commenced and detain that
22 individual until the conclusion of those proceedings.” *Id.* at *3. “Thus, an alien’s
23 detention throughout this process arises from the Attorney General’s decision to
24 commence proceedings” and review of claims arising from such detention is barred
25 under § 1252(g). *Id.* (citing *Sissoko v. Rocha*, 509 F.3d 947, 949 (9th Cir. 2007)); *Wang*,
26 2010 WL 11463156, at *6; 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g).

27 Moreover, under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9), “[j]udicial review of all questions of law
28 and fact . . . arising from any action taken or proceeding brought to remove an alien

1 *from the United States* under this subchapter shall be available only in judicial review
2 of a final order under this section.” (emphasis added). Further, judicial review of a final
3 order is available only through “a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of
4 appeals.” 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(5). The Supreme Court has made clear that § 1252(b)(9)
5 is “the unmistakable ‘zipper’ clause,” channeling “judicial review of all” “decisions and
6 actions leading up to or consequent upon final orders of deportation,” including “non-
7 final order[s],” into proceedings before a court of appeals. *Reno*, 525 U.S. at 483, 485;
8 *see J.E.F.M. v. Lynch*, 837 F.3d 1026, 1031 (9th Cir. 2016) (noting § 1252(b)(9) is
9 “breathtaking in scope and vise-like in grip and therefore swallows up virtually all
10 claims that are tied to removal proceedings”). “Taken together, § 1252(a)(5) and
11 § 1252(b)(9) mean that *any* issue—whether legal or factual—arising from *any* removal-
12 related activity can be reviewed *only* through the [petition for review] PFR process.”
13 *J.E.F.M.*, 837 F.3d at 1031 (emphasis in original) (“[W]hile these sections limit *how*
14 immigrants can challenge their removal proceedings, they are not jurisdiction-stripping
15 statutes that, by their terms, foreclose *all* judicial review of agency actions. Instead, the
16 provisions channel judicial review over final orders of removal to the courts of appeal.”)
17 (emphasis in original); *see id.* at 1035 (“§§ 1252(a)(5) and [(b)(9)] channel review of
18 all claims, including policies-and-practices challenges . . . whenever they ‘arise from’
19 removal proceedings”).

20 Critically, “1252(b)(9) is a judicial channeling provision, not a claim-barring
21 one.” *Aguilar v. ICE*, 510 F.3d 1, 11 (1st Cir. 2007). Indeed, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(D)
22 provides that “[n]othing . . . in any other provision of this chapter . . . shall be construed
23 as precluding review of constitutional claims or questions of law raised upon a petition
24 for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals in accordance with this section.”
25 *See also Ajlani v. Chertoff*, 545 F.3d 229, 235 (2d Cir. 2008) (“[J]urisdiction to review
26 such claims is vested exclusively in the courts of appeals[.]”). The petition-for-review
27 process before the court of appeals ensures that noncitizens have a proper forum for
28 claims arising from their immigration proceedings and “receive their day in court.”

1 *J.E.F.M.*, 837 F.3d at 1031–32 (internal quotations omitted); *see also Rosario v. Holder*,
2 627 F.3d 58, 61 (2d Cir. 2010) (“The REAL ID Act of 2005 amended the [INA] to
3 obviate . . . Suspension Clause concerns” by permitting judicial review of
4 “nondiscretionary” BIA determinations and “all constitutional claims or questions of
5 law.”). These provisions divest district courts of jurisdiction to review both direct and
6 indirect challenges to removal orders, including decisions to detain for purposes of
7 removal or for proceedings. *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 294–95 (section 1252(b)(9)
8 includes challenges to the “decision to detain [an alien] in the first place or to seek
9 removal”).

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

26 Accordingly, this Court lacks jurisdiction over this petition under 8 U.S.C.
27 § 1252. *See Acxel S.Q.D.C. v. Bondi*, No. 25-3348 (PAM/DLM), 2025 U.S. Dist.
28 LEXIS 175957 (D. Minn. Sept. 9, 2025).

1 **B. Petitioner is Lawfully Detained**

2 Petitioner’s claims for alleged statutory and constitutional violations fail because
3 Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225.

4 Based on the plain language of the statute, Petitioner’s detention is governed by
5 § 1225. Section 1225(b)(2)(A) requires mandatory detention of “an alien who is *an*
6 *applicant for admission*, if the examining immigration officer determines that an alien
7 seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted[.]” *Chavez*
8 *v. Noem*, No. 3:25-cv-02325, 2025 WL 2730228, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2025)
9 (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)) (emphasis in original). Section 1225(a)(1)
10 “expressly defines that ‘[a]n alien present in the United States who has not been
11 admitted ... shall be deemed for purposes of this Act *an applicant for admission*.” *Id.*
12 (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1)) (emphasis in original). Here, Petitioner is an “alien
13 present in the United States who has not been admitted.” Thus, as found by the district
14 court in *Chavez v. Noem* and as mandated by the plain language of the statute, Petitioner
15 is an “applicant for admission” and subject to the mandatory detention provisions of
16 § 1225(b)(2).

17 When the plain text of a statute is clear, “that meaning is controlling” and courts
18 “need not examine legislative history.” *Washington v. Chimei Innolux Corp.*, 659 F.3d
19 842, 848 (9th Cir. 2011). But to the extent legislative history is relevant here, nothing
20 “refutes the plain language” of § 1225. *Suzlon Energy Ltd. v. Microsoft Corp.*, 671 F.3d
21 726, 730 (9th Cir. 2011). Congress passed the Illegal Immigration Reform and
22 Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA) to correct “an anomaly whereby
23 immigrants who were attempting to lawfully enter the United States were in a worse
24 position than persons who had crossed the border unlawfully.” *Torres v. Barr*, 976 F.3d
25 918, 928 (9th Cir. 2020) (en banc), *declined to extend by, United States v. Gambino-*
26 *Ruiz*, 91 F.4th 981 (9th Cir. 2024); *see Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 223-
27 34 (citing H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 225 (1996)). It “intended to replace certain
28 aspects of the [then] current ‘entry doctrine,’ under which illegal aliens who have

1 entered the United States without inspection gain equities and privileges in immigration
2 proceedings that are not available to aliens who present themselves for inspection at a
3 port of entry.” *Id.* (quoting H.R. Rep. 104-469, pt. 1, at 225). A contrary interpretation
4 would put aliens who “crossed the border unlawfully” in a better position than those
5 “who present themselves for inspection at a port of entry.” *Id.* Aliens who presented at
6 a port of entry would be subject to mandatory detention under § 1225, but those who
7 crossed illegally would be eligible for a bond under § 1226(a). *See Matter of Yajure*
8 *Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 225 (“The House Judiciary Committee Report makes clear
9 that Congress intended to eliminate the prior statutory scheme that provided aliens who
10 entered the United States without inspection more procedural and substantive rights
11 than those who presented themselves to authorities for inspection.”). The Court should
12 “refuse to interpret the INA in a way that would in effect repeal that statutory fix’
13 intended by Congress in enacting the IIRIRA.” *Chavez*, 2025 WL 2730228, at *4
14 (quoting *Gambino-Ruiz*, 91 F.4th at 990).

15 The plain language of § 1225(b)(2) does not contradict nor render § 1226(a)
16 superfluous. In *Chavez v. Noem*, the district court noted that § 1226(a) “‘generally
17 governs the process of arresting and detaining’ certain aliens, namely ‘aliens who were
18 inadmissible at the time of entry or who have been convicted of certain criminal offenses
19 since admission.’” *Chavez*, 2025 WL 2730228, at *5 (quoting *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at
20 288) (emphasis in original). In turn, individuals who have not been charged with
21 specific crimes listed in § 1226(c) are still subject to the discretionary detention
22 provisions of § 1226(a) *as determined by the Attorney General*. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)
23 (“*On a warrant issued by the Attorney General*, an alien may be arrested and detained
24 pending a decision on whether the alien is to be removed from the United States.”)
25 (emphasis added). Therefore, heeding the plain language of § 1225(b)(2) has no effect
26 on § 1226(a). Similarly, the application of § 1225’s explicit definition of “applicants for
27 admission” does not render the addition of § 1226(c) by the Riley Laken Act
28 superfluous. Once again correctly determined by the district court in *Chavez v. Noem*,

1 the addition of § 1226(c) simply removed the Attorney General’s detention discretion
2 for aliens charged with specific crimes. 2025 WL 2730228, at *5.

3 One of the most basic interpretative canons instructs that a “statute should be
4 construed so that effect is given to all its provisions.” *See Corley v. United States*, 556
5 U.S. 303, 314 (2009) (cleaned up). If Congress did not want § 1225(b)(2)(A) to apply
6 to “applicants for admission,” then it would not have included the phrase “applicants
7 for admission” in the subsection. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A); *see also Corley*, 556
8 U.S. at 314.

9 Finally, the phrase “alien seeking admission” does not limit the scope of
10 § 1225(b)(2)(A). The BIA has long recognized that “many people who are not *actually*
11 requesting permission to enter the United States in the ordinary sense are nevertheless
12 deemed to be ‘seeking admission’ under the immigration laws.” *Matter of Lemus-Losa*,
13 25 I&N Dec. 734, 743 (BIA 2012) (emphasis in original). Statutory language “is known
14 by the company it keeps.” *Marquez-Reyes v. Garland*, 36 F.4th 1195, 1202 (9th Cir.
15 2022) (quoting *McDonnell v. United States*, 579 U.S. 550, 569 (2016)). The phrase
16 “seeking admission” in § 1225(b)(2)(A) must be read in the context of the definition of
17 “applicant for admission” in § 1225(a)(1). Applicants for admission are both those
18 individuals present without admission and those who arrive in the United States. *See* 8
19 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1). Both are understood to be “seeking admission” under § 1225(a)(1).
20 *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 221; *Lemus-Losa*, 25 I&N Dec. at 743.
21 Congress made that clear in § 1225(a)(3), which requires all aliens “who are applicants
22 for admission or otherwise seeking admission” to be inspected by immigration officers.
23 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3). The word “or” here “introduce[s] an appositive—a word or phrase
24 that is synonymous with what precedes it (‘Vienna or Wien,’ ‘Batman or the Caped
25 Crusader’).” *United States v. Woods*, 571 U.S. 31, 45 (2013). Further, § 1225(a)(5)
26 provides that “[a]n applicant for admission may be required to state under oath any
27 information sought by an immigration officer regarding the purposes and intentions of
28 the applicant in seeking admission to the United States.” The reasonable import of this

1 particular phrasing is that one who is an applicant for admission is considered to be
2 “seeking admission” under the statute.

3 Because Petitioner is properly detained under § 1225, Petitioner cannot show
4 entitlement to relief.

5 Even if the Court infers a constitutional right against prolonged mandatory
6 detention, Petitioner’s claim still fails. “In general, as detention continues past a year,
7 courts become extremely wary of permitting continued custody absent a bond hearing.”
8 *Sibomana v. LaRose*, No. 22-cv-933-LL-NLS, 2023 WL 3028093, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Apr.
9 20, 2023) (citation omitted); *see also, e.g., Sanchez-Rivera v. Matuszewski*,
10 No. 22-cv-1357-MMA-JLB, 2023 WL 139801, at *6 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2023) (detained
11 for three years); *Durand v. Allen*, No. 3:23-cv-00279-RBM-BGS, 2024 WL 711607, at
12 *5 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 21, 2024) (over two-and-a-half years); *Yagao v. Figueroa*,
13 No. 17-cv-2224-AJB-MDD, 2019 WL 1429582, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 29, 2019) (two
14 years). Petitioner’s detention falls significantly short of the length courts have found to
15 raise due process concerns.

16 Respondents acknowledge that courts in this district have recently rejected
17 similar arguments in other similar habeas matters. Respondents maintain that Petitioner
18 is properly subject to mandatory detention under § 1225 and dismissal is proper. *Cf.*
19 *Vargas Lopez v. Trump*, No. 8:25CV526, 2025 WL 2780351, at *9 (D. Neb. Sept. 30,
20 2025); *Sandoval v. Acuna*, No. 6:25-CV-01467, 2025 WL 3048926, at *5 (W.D. La.
21 Oct. 31, 2025). To the extent the Court finds this Petitioner subject to detention authority
22 under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), Respondents’ position is that the proper remedy would be
23 directing a new bond hearing under § 1226(a). This Court lacks jurisdiction in this
24 matter to order release or the reinstatement of the IJ’s bond order that was vacated by
25 the BIA. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(e) (“No court may set aside any action or decision by the
26 Attorney General under this section regarding the detention of any alien or the
27 revocation or denial of bond or parole.”); *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 295
28 (2018) (“As we have previously explained, § 1226(e) precludes an alien from

1 ‘challeng[ing] a “discretionary judgment” by the Attorney General or a “decision” that
2 the Attorney General has made regarding his detention or release.’ But § 1226(e) does
3 not preclude ‘challenges [to] the statutory framework that permits [the alien’s] detention
4 without bail.’”).

5 **IV. CONCLUSION**

6 For the foregoing reasons, Respondents respectfully request that the Court
7 dismiss this action.

8 DATED: November 24, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

9 ADAM GORDON
10 United States Attorney

11 s/ Mary Cile Glover-Rogers
12 MARY CILE GLOVER-ROGERS
13 Assistant United States Attorney
14 Attorney for Respondents