



3. Mr. Cruz Valera was initially put in immigration removal proceedings after a 2015 conviction for Reckless Endangering, a misdemeanor, in violation of Wyoming Statute §6-2-504(a). He was issued a Notice to Appear dated June 1, 2016.
4. On July 5, 2016, the Immigration Judge granted Mr. Cruz Valera a \$15,000 bond pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). He was subsequently released from immigration custody on bond. *See Exhibit 2*, Copy of Department of Homeland Security U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Immigration Bond granted to Petitioner.
5. On or about October of 2017, Mr. Cruz Valera sought relief in the form of Cancellation of Removal for Nonpermanent Residents; Asylum, and Withholding of Removal under INA § 241(b)(3); and withholding of Removal under the Convention Against Torture.
6. On about 2017, Mr. Cruz Valera, timely filed Form I-589, Application for Asylum, Withholding of Removal under INA § 241(b)(3) and Withholding of Removal under the Convention Against Torture with the Immigration Court. He was subsequently issued a work authorization document and a social security number in connection with his application.
7. On June of 2023 the Immigration judge denied Mr. Cruz Valera's application for Withholding of Removal under INA § 241(b)(3), and withholding of Removal under the Convention Against Torture. Mr. Cruz Varela withdrew his Cancellation of Removal for Nonpermanent Residents and for Asylum.
8. On July 13, 2023, Mr. Cruz Varela timely appealed the Immigration Judge's decision denying his Application for Withholding of Removal and Protection under Article 3 of the Convention Against Torture. The appeal is still pending, and no scheduled briefing date has been given to Petitioner. *See Exhibit 3*, Notice of Appeal from a Decision of an

Immigration Judge *and Exhibit 4, EOIR Automated Case Information.*

9. On October 5, 2025, a sheriff arrived at the Petitioner's residence. Upon inquiring about the reason for the visit, the Petitioner was informed that an immigration officer wished to speak with him. The Petitioner voluntarily agreed to accompany the sheriff and was subsequently detained.
10. Mr. Cruz Valera has no further hearings scheduled.
11. Petitioner is currently detained at the GEO Contract Detention Facility in Aurora, Colorado. *See Exhibit 5, ICE Detainee Locator Results.*
12. Petitioner's appeal is currently pending. He has received a new Employment Authorization document. *See Exhibit 6, Form I-797, Notice of Action & Exhibit 4, EOIR Case Information.*
13. On July 8, 2025, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") issued a new policy memorandum to all employees of ICE stating that "this message serves as notice that DHS, in coordination with the Department of Justice ("DOJ"), has revisited its legal position on detention and release authorities. DHS has determined that section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA"), rather than section 236, is the applicable immigration detention authority for all applicants for admission. The following interim guidance is intended to ensure immediate and consistent application of the Department's legal interpretation while additional operational guidance is developed." Memorandum, U.S. Immigration & Customs Enforcement, Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applications for Admission (July 8, 2025), <https://www.aila.org/ice-memo-interim-guidance-regarding-detention-authority-for-applications-for-admission> (last visited on November 15, 2025). *See Exhibit 7, ICE Memo: Interim Guidance Regarding Detention*

Authority for Applications for Admission.

14. On September 5, 2025, the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) issued a precedential decision that unlawfully reinterpreted the INA. *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). *Attached hereto as Exhibit 8*. Prior to this decision, noncitizens like Mr. Cruz Valera who had lived in the U.S. for many years, and were apprehended by ICE in the interior of the country, were detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and eligible to seek bond hearings before Immigration Judges (“IJs”). Instead, in conflict with nearly thirty years of legal precedent, Petitioner is now considered subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and has no opportunity for release on bond while his removal proceedings are pending.
15. On October 5, 2025, Mr. Cruz Valera was unlawfully detained by ICE.
16. Petitioner’s detention pursuant to § 1225(b)(2)(A) violates the plain language of the INA and its implementing regulations. Petitioner, who has resided in the U.S. and who was apprehended in the interior of the U.S., should not be considered an “applicant for admission” who is “seeking admission.” Rather, he should be detained pursuant 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), which allows for release on conditional parole or bond.
17. Through this petition, Mr. Cruz Valera asks this Court to find that Respondents have unlawfully detained him under § 1225(b)(2)(A), that his detention, if any, is inappropriate under §1226(a). Further Mr. Cruz Valeroa requests that this Court reinstate DHS’s initial custody determination made in 2015, and immediately release Mr. Cruz Valera from custody. *See Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 687-88 (2001).

**CUSTODY**

18. Petitioner is currently in the custody of ICE at the GEO Aurora Contract Detention Facility. *See* ICE Detainee Locator Results, *Exhibit 5*. He is therefore in “custody” of the Department of Homeland Security, ICE, within the meaning of the habeas corpus statute.” *Jones v. Cunningham*, 371 U.S. 236, 243 (1963).

**JURISDICTION**

19. This court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), Article I, § 9, cl. 2 of the United States Constitution (Suspension Clause), and the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”), 8 U.S.C. § 1101 *et. seq.*
20. This Court may grant relief under the habeas corpus statutes, 28 U.S.C. § 2241 *et. seq.*, the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et. seq.*, the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651, and the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(e)(2).
21. Federal district courts have jurisdiction to hear habeas claims by non-citizens challenging both the lawfulness and the constitutionality of their detention. *See Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 687 (2001).

**REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241, 2243**

22. The Court must grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus or issue an order to show cause (“OSC”) to Respondents “forthwith,” unless Petitioner is not entitled to relief. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If an OSC is issued, the Court must require Respondents to file a return “within three days unless for good cause additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is allowed.” *Id.*
23. Petitioner is “in custody” for the purpose of § 2241 because he was arrested and remains detained by Respondents.

**VENUE**

24. Venue is properly before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because Respondents are employees or officers of the United States acting in their official capacity and because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in the District of Colorado. Petitioner is under the jurisdiction of ICE's Denver Field Office, and he is currently detained in Aurora, Colorado, at the GEO Aurora Contract Detention Facility. *See Exhibit 5*, ICE Detainee Locator Results for Petitioner.

**EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES**

25. Administrative exhaustion is unnecessary as it would be futile. *See, e.g., Aguilar v. Lewis*, 50 F. Supp. 2d 539, 542–43 (E.D. Va. 1999).
26. It would be futile for Petitioner to seek a custody redetermination hearing before an IJ because of the BIA recent decision holding that anyone who has entered the U.S. without inspection is now considered an “applicant for admission” who is “seeking admission” and therefore subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025); *see also Zaragoza Mosqueda v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2591530, at \*7 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2025) (noting that BIA’s decision in *Yajure Hurtado* renders exhaustion futile). *Attached hereto as Exhibit 8*.
27. Additionally, the agency does not have jurisdiction to review Petitioner’s claim of unlawful custody in violation of his due process rights, and it would therefore be futile for him to pursue administrative remedies. *Reno v. Amer.-Arab Anti-Discrim. Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 119 S.Ct. 936, 142 L.Ed.2d 940 (1999) (finding exhaustion to be a “futile exercise because the agency does not have jurisdiction to review” constitutional claims).

**PARTIES**

28. Petitioner is from Mexico and has resided in the U.S. since at least 2004. He is currently detained in the Aurora Contract Detention Facility in Aurora, Colorado. *See Exhibit 5*, ICE Detainee Locator Results.
29. Respondent Juan Baltazar is sued in his official capacity as Warden of the Aurora Processing Center. In his official capacity, Respondent Juan Baltazar is Petitioner's immediate custodian.
30. Respondent Robert Hagan is sued in his official capacity as Field Office Director, Denver Field Office, Enforcement and Removal Operations, ICE. In his official capacity, Respondent Robert Hagan is the legal custodian of Petitioner.
31. Respondent Todd M. Lyons is sued in his official capacity as Acting Director of ICE. As the Acting Director of ICE, Respondent Lyons is a legal custodian of Petitioner.
32. Respondent Kristi Noem is sued in her official capacity as Secretary of Homeland Security. As the head of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the agency tasked with enforcing immigration laws, Secretary Noem is Petitioner's ultimate legal custodian.
33. Respondent Pamela Jo Bondi is sued in her official capacity as the Attorney General of the United States. As Attorney General, she has authority over the Department of Justice and is charged with faithfully administering the immigration laws of the United States.

**LEGAL BACKGROUND AND ARGUMENT**

34. The INA prescribes basic forms of detention for noncitizens in removal proceedings.
35. First, individuals detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) are generally entitled to a bond hearing, unless they have been arrested, charged with, or convicted of certain crimes and are subject to mandatory detention. *See* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1226(a), 1226(c) (listing grounds for

mandatory detention); *see also* 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19(a) (immigration judges may review custody determinations made by DHS), 1236.1(d) (same).

36. Second, the INA provides for mandatory detention of noncitizens subject to expedited removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) as well as other recent arrivals deemed to be “seeking admission” under § 1225(b)(2).
37. Third, the INA authorizes detention of noncitizens who have received a final order of removal, including those in withholding-only proceedings. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1231 (a)-(b).
38. The detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) were enacted as part 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, 300-582 to 3009-583, 3009-585. Section 1226 was most recently amended earlier this year by the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No. 119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025).
39. Following the enactment of the IIRIRA, the U.S. Department of Justice’s Executive Office of Immigration Review (“EOIR”) drafted new regulations explaining that, in general, people who entered the country without inspection were not considered detained under § 1225 and that they were instead detained under § 1226(a). *See* Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum Procedures, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997) (“Despite being applicants for admission, aliens who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as aliens who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination”).
40. Thus, in the decades that followed, most people who entered without inspection and were thereafter detained and placed in standard removal proceedings were considered for

release on bond and also received bond hearings before an Immigration Judge, unless their criminal history rendered them ineligible. That practice was consistent with many more decades of prior practice, in which noncitizens who had entered the United States, even if without inspection, were entitled to a custody hearing before an IJ or other hearing officer. In contrast, those who were stopped at the border were only entitled to release on parole. See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a) (1994); *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 220 (1996) (noting that § 1226(a) simply “restates” the detention authority previously found at § 1252(a)).

41. For decades, long-term residents of the U.S. who entered without inspection and were subsequently apprehended by ICE in the interior of the country have been detained pursuant to § 1226 and entitled to bond hearings before an IJ, unless barred from doing so due to their criminal history.
42. In July 2025, however, ICE began asserting that all individuals who entered without inspection should be considered “seeking admission” and therefore subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).
43. On September 5, 2025, the BIA issued a precedential decision adopting this interpretation, departing from the INA’s text, federal precedent, and existing regulations. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). *attached hereto as Exhibit 8.*
44. Defendants’ new legal interpretation is plainly contrary to the statutory framework and its implementing regulations. Indeed, for decades, Defendants had applied § 1226(a) to people like the Petitioner. Defendants’ new policies are thus not only contrary to law, but are arbitrary and capricious in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”). They were also adopted without complying with the procedural requirements of the APA.

45. Numerous federal courts have rejected this interpretation and instead have consistently found that § 1226, not § 1225(b)(2), authorizes detention of noncitizens who entered without inspection and were later apprehended in the interior of the country. *See e.g., Sampiao v. Hyde*, 2025 WL 2607924 (D. Mass. Sept. 9, 2025) (noting court’s disagreement with BIA’s analysis in *Yajure Hurtado*) attached hereto as Exhibit 8; *Leal-Hernandez v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2430025 (D. Md. Aug. 24, 2025); *Lopez Benitez v. Francis*, 2025 WL 2371588 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2025); *Jimenez v. FCI Berlin, Warden*, No. 25-cv-326-LM-AJ (D.N.H. Sept. 8, 2025); *Kostak v. Trump*, 2025 WL 2472136 (W.D. La. Aug. 27, 2025); *Cuevas Guzman v. Andrews*, 2025 WL 2617256, at \*3 n.4 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025); *see also Lepe v. Andrews*, No. 1:25-cv-01163-KES-SKO (HC) (E.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2025), attached hereto as Exhibit 9, *Lopez v. Hardin*, No. 2:25-cv-830-KCD-NPM (M.D. Fla. Sept. 25, 2025), attached hereto as Exhibit 10., and *Chafila v. Scott*, No. 2:25-cv-00437-SDN (D. Maine Sept. 21, 2025), attached hereto as Exhibit 11.
46. Under the Supreme Court’s recent decision in *Loper Bright v. Raimondo*, this Court should independently interpret the statute and give the BIA’s expansive interpretation of § 1225(b)(2) no weight, as it conflicts with the statute, regulations, and precedent. 603 U.S. 369 (2024).
47. The detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) were enacted as part 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. Following IIRIRA, the Executive Office for Immigration Review (“EOIR”) issued regulations clarifying that individuals who entered the country without inspection were not considered detained under § 1225, but rather under § 1226(a). *See Inspection and*

*Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum Procedures*, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997) (“Despite being applicants for admission, aliens who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as aliens who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination”).

48. The statutory context and structure also make clear that § 1226 applies to individuals who have not been admitted and entered without inspection. In 2025, Congress added new mandatory detention grounds to § 1226(c) that apply only to noncitizens who have not been admitted. *See* The Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No. 119-1, § 2, 139 Stat. 3, 3 (2025) (8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E)).
49. By specifically referencing inadmissibility for entry without inspection under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(6)(A), Congress made clear that such individuals are otherwise covered by § 1226(a). Thus, § 1226 plainly applies to noncitizens charged as inadmissible, including those present without admission or parole.
50. The Supreme Court has explained that § 1225(b) is concerned “primarily [with those] seeking entry,” and is generally imposed “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 v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 297, 2987 (2018). In contrast, Section 1226 “authorizes the Government to detain certain aliens *already in the country* pending the outcome of removal proceedings.” *Id.* at 289 (emphases added).
51. Furthermore, § 1225(b)(2) specifically applies only to those “seeking admission,” and the implementing regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 1.2 address noncitizens who are “coming or attempting to come into the United States.” The use of the present progressive tense

would exclude noncitizens like Petitioner who are apprehended in the interior years after they entered, as they are no longer “seeking admission” or “coming [...] into the United States.” *See Martinez v. Hyde*, 2025 WL 2084238 at \*6 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025) (citing the use of present and present progressive tense to support conclusion that INA § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to individuals apprehended in the interior); *see also Al Otro Lado v. McAleenan*, 394 F. Supp. 3d 1168, 1200 (S.D. Cal. 2019) (construing “is arriving” in INA § 235(b)(1)(A)(i) and observing that “[t]he use of the present progressive, like use of the present participle, denotes an ongoing process”).

52. Accordingly, the mandatory detention provision of § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to Petitioner, who had entered the U.S. approximately 21 years before he was apprehended, additionally, Mr. Cruz Valera’s appeal has been pending for approximately two years without a scheduled briefing date, and there is currently no certainty about when he will be able to present his legal arguments. He can be waiting for the schedule brief for years with no certainty, which will be an illegal detention.

53. Further, Petitioner is not a danger to the community, as an immigration Judge has already assessed his case and made an initial custody determination, releasing him on bond. That prior release from custody, “reflects a determination by the government that the noncitizen is not a danger to the community or a flight risk.” *See Saravia v. Sessions*, 280 F. Supp. 3d, 1176 (N.C. Cal. 2017), *aff’d sub nom. Saravia for A.H. v. Session*, 905 F.3d 1137 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2018).

54. Mr. Cruz Varela’s prior release creates a protected liberty interest that has long been recognized in the criminal detention context, and an “implied promise” that the person will not be re-detained unless they fail to live up to their conditions of release. *See*

*Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471, 92 S.Ct. 2593, 33 L.Ed.2d 484 (1972); *see also* *Gagnon v. Scarpelli*, 411 U.S. 778, 782 (1973). This doctrine, although it developed in criminal legal context, has also been applied in the immigration context. *See Ortega v. Bonnar*, 415 F. Supp. 3d 963 (N.D. Cal. 2019); *Pinchi v. Noem*, -F. Supp.3d-, 2025 WL 2084921 (N.D. Cal. July 24, 2025).

55. Petitioner did not violate the terms of his release and has not committed any criminal offenses since his release in 2016. Therefore, his detention is unlawful.

#### **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

56. Petitioner is a citizen of Mexico.

57. Upon information and belief, Petitioner has resided in the U.S. since at least 2004.

58. Petitioner was convicted of Reckless Endangering, a Misdemeanor, in violation of Wyoming Penal Code, Wyoming Revised Statutes Annotated, §6-2-504(a), in 2015, served time in prison and completed his sentence.

59. ICE initially detained Petitioner on June 1, 2016, and released him on or about 7/5/2016, on a \$15,000 bond pursuant to 8 CFR 236.1(c).

60. Petitioner sought relief in the form of Cancellation of Removal, Asylum, and Withholding of Removal.

61. Petitioner later withdrew his applications for Asylum and Cancellation of Removal. Petitioner's application for Withholding of Removal was denied by the Immigration Judge on June 21, 2023.

62. Petitioner has a pending appeal of the Immigration Judge's decision denying his application for Withholding of Removal and Protection under Article 3 of the Convention Against Torture.

63. Petitioner has complied with his terms of release and has not committed any crimes since his custody determination hearing held in 2016.

64. Petitioner was arrested by ICE in October, 2025 and has been in immigration custody since.

65. He is now detained at the GEO Contract Detention Center in Aurora, CO. *See Exhibit 5, ICE Detainee Locator Results for Petitioner.*

66. An Immigration Judge is currently unable to consider the Petitioner's bond request as the Immigration Court's jurisdiction to grant bond has been effectively stripped under *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). *attached hereto as Exhibit 8.*

67. Without relief from this Court, Petitioner faces continued detention without release.

## COUNT I

### Violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)

#### Unlawful Denial of Release on Bond

68. Petitioner restates and realleges all paragraphs 1-67 as if fully set forth here.

69. Petitioner may be detained, if at all, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).

70. DHS has already made an initial custody determination under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and ordered his release from detention. *See 8 C.F.R. 236.1(d) & 1003.19(a)-(f).*

71. Petitioner has not been, and will not be, provided with a bond hearing as required by law.

72. Petitioner has not been informed of the grounds leading to the arrest since he was arrested on October 5, 2025.

73. Petitioner's continuing detention is therefore unlawful.

**COUNT II**

**Violation of the Bond Regulations, 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1, 1236.1 and 1003.19 Unlawful Denial of Release on Bond**

74. Petitioner restates and realleges paragraphs 1 to 67 as if fully set forth here.
75. In 1997, after Congress amended the INA through IIRIRA, EOIR and the then-Immigration and Naturalization Service issued an interim rule to interpret and apply IIRIRA. Specifically, under the heading of “Apprehension, Custody, and Detention of [Noncitizens],” the agencies explained that “[d]espite being applicants for admission, [noncitizens] who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as [noncitizens] who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination.” 62 Fed. Reg. at 10323. The agencies thus made clear that individuals who had entered without inspection were eligible for consideration for bond and bond hearings before IJs under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and its implementing regulations.
76. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates his continued detention and violates 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1, 1236.1, and 1003.19.

**COUNT III**

**Violation of Fifth Amendment Right to Due Process**

77. Petitioner restates and realleges paragraphs 1 to 67 as if fully set forth here.
78. The Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause prohibits the federal government from depriving any person of “life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.” U.S. Const. Amend. V.
79. The Supreme Court has repeatedly emphasized that the Constitution generally requires a hearing before the government deprives a person of liberty or property. *Zinermon v. Burch*, 494 U.S. 113, 127 (1990).

80. Under the *Mathews v. Eldridge* framework, the balance of interests strongly favors Petitioner's release.
81. Petitioner's private interest in freedom from detention is profound. The interest in being free from physical detention is "the most elemental of liberty interests." *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507, 529 (2004); *see also Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001) ("Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that [the Due Process] Clause protects.").
82. The risk of erroneous deprivation is exceptionally high. Petitioner has and has ties to the community, including his three U.S. Citizen children. One of which has Intellectual Developmental Disorders.
83. The government's interest in detaining Petitioner without due process is minimal. Immigration detention is civil, not punitive, and may only be used to prevent danger to the community or ensure appearance at immigration proceedings. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690.
84. Furthermore, the "fiscal and administrative burdens" of providing Petitioner with a bond hearing are minimal, particularly when weighed against the significant liberty interests at stake. *See Mathews*, 424 U.S. at 334–35.
85. Additionally, the Petitioner was arrested on October 5, 2025, and detained at the GEO Detention Center. To date, he has not been informed of the grounds for his arrest, which underscores the necessity of his release due to the violation of his right to be informed of the reasons for his detention.

86. Petitioner has already had a bond hearing and was granted a bond. His prior release from custody reflects the government's determination that he is not a danger to the community and not a flight risk.

87. Considering these factors, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court order his immediate release from custody or provide him with a bond hearing.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that this Court will:

- (1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- (2) Order that he not be transferred outside of this District;
- (3) Issue an Order to Show Cause ordering Respondents to show cause why his  
Petition should not be granted within three days;
- (4) Declare that his detention is unlawful;
- (5) Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus ordering Respondents to release him from  
custody or provide him with a bond hearing pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) or  
the Due Process Clause within seven days;
- (6) Award him his attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act,  
and on any other basis justified under law; and
- (7) Grant him any further relief this Court deems just and proper.

Date: November 19, 2025

Respectfully Submitted,

*/Maria G. Monclova*  
MARIA G. MONCLOVA  
Colorado Bar No. 40334  
Monclova Law, P.C  
1745 S Federal Blvd  
Denver, CO 80219  
(303)974-5049  
mariam@monclovalaw.com

Attorney for the Petitioner

**VERIFICATION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2242**

I, Maria G. Monclova hereby verify that the factual statements made in the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2242 or under the U.S. Constitution are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated this 19th day of November, 2025.

/s/Maria G. Monclova. Esq.