

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
COLUMBUS DIVISION

Heiner Mauricio MENDEZ QUIRAMA,

Petitioner,

v.

Jason STREEVAL, Warden of Stewart
Detention Center, in his official capacity,
et al.,

Respondents.

Case No.: 4:25-cv-00397-CDL-AGH

REPLY TO RESPONDENTS' ABBREVIATED RESPONSE TO PETITION
AND RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Petitioner rests on the allegations and legal positions presented in his Habeas Petition as the weight of authority—including authority from this Court—on the relevant legal issues is so clearly in his favor that no substantive reply is necessary. *See, e.g., J.A.M. v. Streeval*, No. 25-cv-342, 2025 WL 3050094 (M.D. Ga. Nov. 1, 2025) (Land, J.) (granting habeas petition based on identical legal issues). In their Abbreviated Response, Respondents merely repeat their legal arguments concerning mandatory detention and eligibility for a bond hearing that they have repeated countless times in this Court and in courts nationwide. *See generally id.* (addressing and analyzing arguments).

In further support of Petitioner's Habeas Petition, a district court in the Central District of California has certified a class of which Petitioner is a member:

Bond Eligible Class: All noncitizens in the United States without lawful status who (1) have entered or will enter the United States without inspection; (2) were not or

will not be apprehended upon arrival; and (3) are not or will not be subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231 at the time the Department of Homeland Security makes an initial custody determination.

Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz Jr et al., No. 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM, ECF No. 82 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2025) (granting petitioner’s motion for class certification). The *Maldonado Bautista* court also held unlawful the Department of Homeland Security’s (“DHS”)¹ policy treating all inadmissible noncitizens arrested inside the United States as “applicants for admission” subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz Jr et al.*, No. 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM, ECF No. 81 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2025) (granting petitioner’s motion for partial summary judgment). Because the *Maldonado Bautista* court certified a nationwide class of which Petitioner is a member, this Court must grant Petitioner’s habeas petition and order Respondents to consider him detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and eligible for a bond hearing immediately.

¹ It is for this reason also that all the DHS and Department of Justice (“DOJ”) Respondents must remain parties to this case. It is DHS and DOJ who must act in coordination with the Warden to implement this Court’s orders and provide the bond hearing, make Petitioner available for the bond hearing, and execute any immigration judge order granting bond and release. See 8 C.F.R. § 236 et seq. (DHS custody and bond regulations); 8 C.F.R. § 1236 et seq. (DOJ custody redetermination hearing regulations). While *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 434-35 (2004) may set forth a “default rule” for the proper respondent in habeas proceedings, such rule is not applicable in these proceedings in which this Court’s decision in *J.A.M.* governs and requires action by DHS and DOJ Respondents. ECF No. 6 at 1 n.1, Respondents’ Abbreviated Response. Thus, Petitioner objects to Respondents’ footnote 1 in their Abbreviated Response in which they argue that the only proper Respondent is the Warden.

Dated: December 3, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Thomas Evans
KUCK BAXTER LLC
P.O. Box 501359
Atlanta, Georgia 31150
Phone: 404-949-8176
tevens@immigration.net
GA Bar No. 305649