

INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Ana Mora Perez, is in the physical custody of Respondents at the Karnes County Immigration Processing Center. She now faces unlawful detention because the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Executive Office of Immigration Review (EOIR) have concluded Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention.

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).

Based on this allegation in Petitioner's removal proceedings, DHS re-detained Petitioner when she presented herself at a scheduled check-in placing her in immigration custody which is 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.

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

Because of the BIA's decision, no Immigration Judge has jurisdiction to even consider a bond. Petitioner challenges her detention on the basis that it violates the plain language of the

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), §1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to individuals like Petitioner who previously entered and are now residing in the United States. Instead, such individuals are subject to a different detention statute, §1226(a), that allows for release on conditional parole or bond. That statute expressly applies to people who, like Petitioner, are charged as inadmissible for having entered the United States without inspection.

Respondents' new legal interpretation is plainly contrary to the statutory framework and to decades of agency practice applying §1226(a) to people like Petitioner.

Accordingly, Petitioner seeks a writ of habeas corpus requiring that she be released.

CUSTODY

1. Petitioner is in the physical custody of Defendant-Respondent MIGUEL VERGARA, Field Office Director for Detention and Removal, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE"), DHS, and Respondent ROSE THOMPSON, Facility Administrator of Karnes County Immigration Processing Center in Karnes City, Texas. At the time of the filing of this petition, Plaintiff-Petitioner is detained at the Karnes County Immigration Processing Center in Karnes City, Texas. The Geo Group contracts with the DHS to detain noncitizens such as Plaintiff-Petitioner. Plaintiff-Petitioner is under the direct control of Defendants-Respondents and their agents.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over this case under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 5 U.S.C. § 702 as Plaintiff-Petitioner suffered a legal wrong from agency action. The Court

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

also has jurisdiction over this petition under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241(c)(1) and (c)(3), Art. I, § 9, Cl. 2 of the United States Constitution (“Suspension Clause”). This Court has further remedial authority pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 et. seq.

3. Venue properly lies within the Western District of Texas because all of the events or omissions giving rise to this action occurred in the district. 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).
4. No petition for habeas corpus has previously been filed in any court to review Plaintiff-Petitioner’s case.

PARTIES

5. The Petitioner is a national and citizen of Venezuela. She is currently detained at the Karnes County Immigration Processing Center located at 409 FM 1144. Karnes City, TX 78118.
6. Defendant-Respondent PAMELA JO BONDI is the Attorney General of the United States and the most senior official in the United States Department of Justice (“DOJ”). She has the authority to interpret immigration laws and adjudicate removal cases. 8 U.S.C. § 1103(g). The Attorney General delegates this responsibility to the Executive Office for Immigration Review (“EOIR”), which administrates the immigration courts and the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA” or “Board”), Defendant-Respondent is named in her official capacity. Respondent’s address is 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530.
7. Defendant-Respondent KRISTI LYNN NOEM is the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”), an agency of the United States. Defendant-Respondent is responsible for the administration of immigration laws pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1103(a). The

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

Secretary is a legal custodian of the Plaintiff Petitioner. Defendant-Respondent is named in her official capacity. Her address is Department of Homeland Security, Washington, D.C.20528.

8. Defendant-Respondent TODD M. LYONS is the acting Director of the ICE within DHS, a sub-agency of the DHS. He is responsible for the administration and enforcement of immigration laws. He is named in her official capacity, and her address is 500 12th Street SW, Mail Stop 5900 Washington, D.C. 20536.
9. Defendant-Respondent MIGUEL VERGARA is the Field Office Director for Detention and Removal, ICE, DHS. He is a custodial official acting within the boundaries of the judicial district of the United States Court for the Western District of Texas. Pursuant to Defendant-Respondent's orders, Plaintiff-Petitioner remains detained. Defendant Respondent is sued in her official capacity. His address is 1777 NE Loop 410 Floor 15, San Antonio, Texas, 78217.
10. Defendant-Respondent ROSE THOMPSON is the Facility Administrator of the Karnes County Immigration Processing Center in Karnes City, Texas. She is Petitioner's immediate custodian and resides in the judicial district of the United States Court for the Western District of Texas, San Antonio Division. Respondent is named in her official capacity. Respondent's address is 409 FM 1144. Karnes City, TX 78118.

FACTS

11. On or about October 12, 2021, Ms. Mora Perez, a citizen of Venezuela, arrived in the United States without being admitted or paroled. Exh. A. She was accompanied by her husband, who is also a citizen of Venezuela.

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

12. Following their entry into the United States, DHS arrested the couple near San Luis, AZ.

The immigration officer executed the arrest under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).

13. On October 13, 2021, DHS issued the Petitioner a Notice to Appear (NTA) requiring her appearance at an immigration court hearing set for March 29, 2022 in San Antonio, TX.

Exh. B. According to the NTA, Mrs. Mora Perez was placed in removal proceedings under section 240 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 8 U.S.C. § 1229a.

14. On the following date, October 14, 2021, DHS released the Petitioner and her spouse on their own recognizance. The order of release states that “[i]n accordance with section 236 of the Immigration and Nationality Act and the applicable provisions of Title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations, you are being released on your own recognizance provided you comply with the following conditions....” Exh. C (emphasis added).

15. Subsequently, with the assistance of a *notario*, the Petitioner’s spouse filed an asylum application around May of 2022 where she was listed as a derivative on the application.¹ This is significant in that the immigration court recognizes derivative applicants may only qualify for relief if the lead applicant (the spouse) is granted asylum. They were not advised of the need to file separate applications.

16. On August 25, 2025, at her regularly scheduled check-in, ICE detained the Petitioner but did not detain her spouse. No reason was given for her sudden detainment, and the spouse was threatened with detention if he interfered.

¹ In Latin American countries, a *notario* is an attorney. *Notarios* in the United States are Notary Publics, but the term is also used to describe persons involved in the unauthorized practice of immigration law.

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

17. Since her detention at Karnes, the Petitioner has not been provided with her medication even though she has requested it. Exh. D. She suffers from herniated discs and suffers from debilitating pain when unmedicated. By denying her pain relief, Mrs. Mora Perez is strategically being tortured daily so she may give up her asylum claim.
18. As of October 15, 2025, the Petitioner has remained detained and has filed her own asylum application.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

19. The Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause applies to "all persons" within the United States, including noncitizens. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001). "Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that the Clause protects." *Id.* at 690. In the immigration context, detention is constitutionally justified only to prevent flight or protect the community. *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 528 (2003).
20. The INA prescribes three basic forms of detention for the vast majority of noncitizens in removal proceedings. First, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 authorizes the detention of noncitizens in standard removal proceedings before an IJ. See 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. Individuals in § 1226(a) detention are generally entitled to a bond hearing before an immigration judge at the outset of their detention to review ICE custody determinations, see 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19(a), 1236.1(d). These bond hearings are separate and apart, and form no part of, the removal proceedings themselves. A statutory exception to this eligibility for an immigration judge

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

bond hearing exists for noncitizens who have been arrested, charged with, or convicted of certain crimes, for whom detention is generally mandatory under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c).

21. Second, the INA provides for so-called “mandatory” detention of recently arriving noncitizens subject to expedited removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1), and for other recent arrivals seeking admission under § 1225(b)(2).²

22. Last, the INA also provides for detention of noncitizens who have been ordered removed, including individuals in “withholding-only” proceedings (proceedings to determine whether removal to a particular country should be withheld due to a likelihood of persecution), *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)-(b).

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

24. The detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) were enacted as part of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IRIRA) of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104—208, Div. C, §§ 302-03, 110 Stat. 3009-546, 3009-582 to 3009-583, 3009-585. Section 1226(a) was most recently amended earlier this year by the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No. 119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025).

25. Following the enactment of the IIRIRA, 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*

² Although the term “mandatory detention” is often used to describe detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), the term is a misnomer because, as courts have acknowledged, DHS agencies may release such individuals through parole for “urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit.” 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A); 8 C.F.R. § 212.5; *see Flores v. Barr*, 934 F.3d 910, 917 (9th Cir. 2019) (“The INA provides that, even for noncitizens in expedited removal, ‘the Attorney General may ... in her discretion parole into the United States temporarily’ any noncitizen applying for admission ‘under such conditions as he may prescribe.’”). Thus, it is more accurate to say individuals detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) are detained without statutory eligibility for a bond hearing.

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

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.”)(parenthetical in original).

26. Thus, in the decades that followed, most people who entered without inspection and were placed in standard removal proceedings received bond hearings, unless their criminal history rendered them ineligible pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c). That practice was consistent with many more decades of prior practice, in which noncitizens who were not deemed “arriving” were entitled to a custody hearing before an IJ or other hearing officer. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a) (1994); *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 229 (1996) (noting that § 1226(a) simply “restates” the detention authority previously found at § 1252(a)).
27. On July 8, 2025, ICE, “in coordination with” DOJ, announced a new policy that rejected this well-established understanding of the statutory framework and reversed decades of practice.
28. The new policy, entitled “Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission,”³ claims that all persons who entered the United States without inspection shall now be subject to the detention provision under § 1225(b)(2)(A) and thus ineligible for release on bond. The policy applies regardless of when a person is apprehended by

³ Available at <https://www.aila.org/library/ice-memo-interim-guidance-regarding-detention-authority-for-applications-for-admission>

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

DHS and affects those who have resided in the United States for months, years, and even decades.

29. On September 5, 2025, the BIA adopted this same position in a published decision, *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*. There, the Board held that all noncitizens who entered the United States without admission or parole are subject to detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A) and are ineligible for IJ bond hearings.
30. Since Respondents adopted their new policies, dozens of federal courts have rejected their new interpretation of the INA's detention authorities. Courts have likewise rejected *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, which adopts the same reading of the statute as ICE.
31. Even before ICE or the BIA introduced these nationwide policies, Us in the Tacoma, Washington, immigration court stopped providing bond hearings for persons who entered the United States without inspection and who have since resided here. There, the U.S. District Court in the Western District of Washington found that such a reading of the INA is likely unlawful and that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to noncitizens who are not apprehended upon arrival to the United States. *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239 (W.D. Wash. 2025).
32. Subsequently, court after court has adopted the same reading of the INA's detention authorities and rejected ICE and EOIR's new interpretation. *See, e.g., Kostak v. Trump*, No. 3:25-cv-01093-JE-KDM, 2025 WL 2472136 (W.D. La. Aug. 27, 2025); *Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11571-JEK, 2025 WL 1869299 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025); *Diaz Martinez v. Hyde*, No. CV 25-11613-BEM, — F. Supp. 3d — 2025 WL 2084238 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025); *Rosado v Figueroa*, No. CV 25-02157 PHX DLR (CDB), 2025 WL 2337099 (D. Ariz. Aug. 11, 2025),

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

report and recommendation adopted, No. CV-25-02157-PHX-DLR (CDB), 2025 WL 2349133 (D. Ariz. Aug. 13, 2025); *Lopez Benitez v. Francis*, No. 25 CIV. 5937 (DEH), 2025 WL 2371588 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2025); *Maldonado v. Olson*, No. 0:25-cv-03142-SRN-SGE, 2025 WL 2374411 (D. Minn. Aug. 15, 2025); *Arrazola-Gonzalez v. Noem*, No. 5:25-cv-01789-ODW (DFMx), 2025 WL 2379285 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2025); *Romero v. Hyde*, No. 25-11631-BEM, 2025 WL 2403827 (D. Mass. Aug. 19, 2025); *Samb v. Joyce*, No. 25 CIV. 6373 (DEH), 2025 WL 2398831 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 19, 2025); *Ramirez Clavijo v. Kaiser*, No. 25-CV-06248-BLF, 2025 WL 2419263 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2025); *Leal-Hernandez v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-02428-JRR, 2025 WL 2430025 (D. Md. Aug. 24, 2025); *Jose J.O.E. v. Bondi*, No. 25-CV-3051 (ECT/DJF), — F. Supp. 3d — 2025 WL 2466670 (D. Minn. Aug. 27, 2025) *Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft*, No. 2:25-cv-12486-BRM-EAS, 2025 WL 2496379 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025); *Vasquez Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02180-DMS-MM, 2025 WL 2549431 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025); *Zaragoza Mosqueda v. Noem*, No. 5:25-CV-02304 CAS (BFM), 2025 WL 2591530 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2025); *Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft*, No. 25-CV-12546, 2025 WL 2609425 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9, 2025); *Sampiao v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11981-JEK, 2025 WL 2607924 (D. Mass. Sept. 9, 2025); *see also, e.g., Palma Perez v. Berg*, No. 8:25CV494, 2025 WL 2531566, at *2 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025) (noting that “[t]he Court tends to agree” that § 1226(a) and not §1225(b)(2) authorizes detention); *Jacinto v. Trump*, No. 4:25-cv-03161-JFB-RCC, 2025 WL 2402271 at *3 (D. Neb. Aug. 19, 2025) (same); *Anicasio v. Kramer*, No. 4:25-cv-03158-JFB-RCC, 2025 WL 2374224 at *2 (D. Neb. Aug. 14, 2025) (same).

33. Courts have uniformly rejected DBS’s and EOIR’s new interpretation because it defies the INA. As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court and others have explained, the plain text of the

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

statutory provisions demonstrates that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to people like Petitioner.

34. Section 1226(a) applies by default to all persons “pending a decision on whether the [noncitizen] is to be removed from the United States.” These removal hearings are held under § 1229a, to “decid[e] the inadmissibility or deportability of a[] [noncitizen].”
35. The text of § 1226 also explicitly applies to people charged as being inadmissible, including those who entered without inspection. See 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E). Subparagraph (E)’s reference to such people makes clear that, by default, such people are afforded a bond hearing under subsection (a). As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court explained, “[w]hen Congress creates ‘specific exceptions’ to a statute’s applicability, it ‘proves’ that absent those exceptions, the statute generally applies.” *Rodriguez Vazquez*, 119 F. Supp. 3d at 1257 (citing *Shady Grove Orthopedic Assocs., P.A. v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 559 U.S. 393, 400 (2010)); see also *Gomes*, 2025 WL 1869299, at *7.
36. Section 1226 therefore leaves no doubt that it applies to people who face charges of being inadmissible to the United States, including those who are present without admission or parole.
37. By contrast, § 1225(b) applies to people arriving at U.S. ports of entry or who recently entered the United States. The statute’s entire framework is premised on inspections at the border of people who are “seeking admission” to the United States. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Indeed, the Supreme Court has explained that section 1225(b)’s mandatory detention scheme applies “at the Nation’s borders and ports of entry, where the

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

Government must determine whether a[] [noncitizen] seeking to enter the country is admissible.” *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281,287 (2018).

38. Accordingly, the mandatory detention provision of § 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to people like Petitioner, who have already entered and were residing in the United States at the time they were apprehended.

**CLAIMS FOR RELIEF
FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
Violation of the Due Process Clause
of the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution**

39. Petitioner repeats and incorporates by reference all allegations above as though set forth fully herein.
40. The Due Process Clause asks whether the government’s deprivation of a person’s life, liberty, or property is justified by a sufficient purpose. Here, there is no question that the government has deprived Petitioner of her liberty.
41. Mrs. Mora Perez’ continued detention violates her right to substantive and procedural due process guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.
42. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides that “[n]o person shall...be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.” As a noncitizen who shows well over “two years” physical presence in the United States (indeed she has four years), Mrs. Mora Perez is entitled to Due Process Clause protections against deprivation of liberty and property. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 693 (“[T]he Due Process Clause applies to all ‘persons’ within the United States, including aliens, whether their presence here is lawful, unlawful, temporary, or permanent.”). Any deprivation of

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

this fundamental liberty interest must be accompanied not only by adequate procedural protections, but also by a “sufficiently strong special justification” to outweigh the significant deprivation of liberty. *Id.* at 690.

43. Respondents have deprived Mrs. Mora Perez of her liberty interest protected by the Fifth Amendment by detaining her since August 25, 2025.

44. Mrs. Mora Perez’ detention is improper because she has been deprived of a bond hearing. A hearing is if anything a right to be heard, and here she has been barred from even filing for bond, without considering the law or entertaining her counsel’s arguments. Like the accused in criminal cases, habeas is proper. *See Moore v. Dempsey*, 261 U.S. 86 (1923); *Johnson v. Zerbst*, 304 U.S. 458 (1938); *Burns v. Wilson*, 346 U.S. 137, 154 (1953).

45. Respondents’ actions in detaining the Petitioner without any legal justification violate the Fifth Amendment.

46. The government’s detention of Petitioner is unjustified. Respondents have not demonstrated that Petitioner needs to be detained. *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690 (finding immigration detention must further the twin goals of (1) ensuring the noncitizen’s appearance during removal proceedings and (2) preventing danger to the community). There is no credible argument that Petitioner cannot be safely released back to her community and spouse.

47. For these reasons, Petitioner’s detention violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
Violation of Immigration and Nationality Act

48. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

49. Petitioner was detained pursuant to “authority contained in section 236” of the INA; section 236 is codified at 8 U.S.C. § 1226. Despite this, DHS finds that she is detained subject to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) and the IJ lacks jurisdiction under *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* on the same basis.
50. The mandatory detention provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to all noncitizens residing in the United States who are subject to the grounds of inadmissibility. Mandatory detention does not apply to those who previously entered the country and have been residing in the United States prior to being apprehended and placed in removal proceedings by Respondents. Such noncitizens are detained under § 1226(a) and are eligible for release on bond, unless they are subject to § 1225(b)(1), § 1226(c), or § 1231.
51. Respondents have wrongfully adopted a policy and practice of arguing all noncitizens, such as Petitioner, are subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2).
52. The unlawful application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner violates the INA.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Fifth Amendment – Due Process

Denial of Opportunity to Contest Mis-Inclusion in Mandatory Category of Detention

53. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.
54. Mrs. Mora Perez has a vested liberty interest in preventing her removal because she is eligible for asylum and is entitled to pursue that relief outside of detention by showing she is neither a danger to the community nor a flight risk under 8 U.S.C. §1226(a).

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

55. For all of the above reasons, Respondents' attempts to detain Petitioner without a meaningful opportunity to be heard violate her Procedural Due Process rights under the Fifth Amendment.

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT**

56. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

57. Respondents' continued efforts to deny her bond violate the INA, Administrative Procedures Act (APA), and the U.S. Constitution.

58. As set forth in Count Two and Three, federal regulations and case law provide the procedure for a respondent in removal proceedings like her to seek a bond redetermination by an IJ.

59. In being denied the opportunity to return to her family and pursue asylum in a non-detained court setting where she is free to gather the necessary evidence, Mrs. Mora Perez would be deprived of the right to freedom to lawfully pursue her rights in her civil matter. The Government's "no-review" provisions are a violation of her procedural and substantive due process and without any statutory authority. There is no time-frame or procedure for requesting DHS to itself review its custody decision, and removal proceedings in this case will proceed during that time while Petitioner remains in custody.

60. The actions by Respondents would improperly alter the substantive rules concerning mandatory custody status without the required notice-and-comment period and would be in violation of the INA and its regulations. These actions by Respondents violate the APA. Under the APA, this Court may hold unlawful and set aside an agency action which is "contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege or immunity." 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(B). The

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

regulations at 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19(h)(1)(B) and 1003.19(h)(2)(B) providing no review of DHS custody decision for arriving aliens in removal proceedings are in violation of substantive and procedural due process as guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution. It is ultra vires because it exceeds the authority granted ICE by Congress at 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). For these reasons, this Honorable Court should hold that Petitioner is detained under § 236(a), not § 235(b), and order her immediate release or, in the alternative, direct the Immigration Court to conduct a custody redetermination hearing under § 236(a) in which Petitioner has a meaningful opportunity to show that she is not a danger or flight risk. Any contrary reliance on *Matter of Yajure-Hurtado* would unlawfully misapply the statute and deprive Petitioner of her rights under the INA, the APA, and the Due Process Clause.

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
STAY OF REMOVAL CLAIM**

61. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.
62. The denial of a bond hearing, followed by removal of Mrs. Mora Perez from the United States would cause her irreversible harm and injury because she is mis-classified by the Government as subject to mandatory detention.
63. The Court should grant the stay of Mrs. Mora Perez' removal to protect her statutory rights under the INA and the APA. In attempting to assert her rights, the Government has railroaded her and deprived her of freedom and liberty to contest her removal while free on bond, or at the very least, of her ability to prove she is not subject to mandatory detention and that she merits release on bond.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

SUSPENSION CLAUSE CLAIM

64. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.
65. If 8 U.S.C. § 1252 stripped the Court jurisdiction from this matter, it would be unconstitutional as applied because it would deny Mrs. Mora Perez the opportunity for meaningful review of the unlawfulness of her detention and removal.
66. To invoke the Suspension Clause, a petitioner must satisfy a three-factor test: “(1) the citizenship and status of the detainee and the adequacy of the process through which that status determination was made; (2) the nature of the sites where apprehension and then detention took place; and (3) the practical obstacles inherent in resolving the prisoner’s entitlement to the writ.” *Boumediene v. Bush*, 553 U.S. 723, 766 (2008). Mrs. Mora Perez satisfies these three requirements and may invoke the Suspension Clause.
67. First, although Mrs. Mora Perez is not a U.S. citizen or resident, she has lived here for over four years, and she qualifies for asylum, because she is from Venezuela, a country currently under a political repressive dictatorship that has persecuted her spouse as well as herself. Mrs. Mora Perez has significant connections to friends and colleagues from her home country in the United States and has been receiving necessary medical care for her disabilities. All of which establishes a substantial legal relationship with the United States.
68. Mrs. Mora Perez satisfies the second factor because she was apprehended by DHS and remains detained in the United States.
69. Finally, there are no serious, practical obstacles to resolving this present matter. The Court is equipped to decide whether Mrs. Mora Perez is entitled to the writ.

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

70. There is no adequate alternative to a habeas petition. The refusal of the immigration court to even entertain a bond demonstrates she is mis-classified and that she is not subject to mandatory detention, without proper notice or due process, and deprives her of her constitutional rights. The BIA cannot adequately and expeditiously review these issues.

**SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

71. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in the above paragraphs of this Petition.

72. This Court has the discretion to enter a temporary restraining order and a preliminary injunction. *See Haitian Refugee Center v. Nelson*, 872 F.2d 1555, 1561-1562 (11th Cir. 1989). “To be entitled to a preliminary injunction, the applicants must show (1) a substantial likelihood that they will prevail on the merits, (2) a substantial threat that they will suffer irreparable injury if the injunction is not granted, (3) their substantial injury outweighs the threatened harm to the party whom they seek to enjoin, and (4) granting the preliminary injunction will not disserve the public interest.” *Tex. Med. Providers Performing Abortion Servs. v. Lakey*, 667 F.3d 570, 574 (5th Cir. 2012). All four elements must be demonstrated to obtain injunctive relief. *Id.*

73. Respondents’ actions have caused Petitioner harm that warrants immediate relief.

RELIEF SOUGHT

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court:

- 1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

- 2) Declare that ICE's August 25, 2025, apprehension and detention of Mrs. Mora Perez was an unlawful exercise of authority because the ICE officer provided no reason that she presents a danger to the community or is flight risk;
- 3) Issue an order directing Respondents to show cause why the writ should not be granted;
- 4) Order Respondents to file with the Court a complete copy of the administrative file from the Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security;
- 5) Enjoin ICE from transferring Mrs. Mora Perez outside of the Western District of Texas while this matter is pending;
- 6) Grant the writ of habeas corpus ordering Respondents to release Mrs. Mora Perez on her own recognizance, parole, or reasonable conditions of supervision, or order the Respondents to conduct a bond hearing under which it correctly applies the statutes and no longer mis-classifies her as subject to mandatory detention, in the alternative order a hearing under *Matter of Joseph*.
- 7) Award Petitioner reasonable costs and attorney's fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA"), as amended, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2412.; and,
- 8) Grant any other relief that this Court deems just and proper.

PRAYER FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2243, Petitioner respectfully requests expedited consideration. Each day of unlawful detention inflicts irreparable physical and emotional harm on Petitioner and her spouse, as well as depriving her of necessary medical attention. Prompt judicial intervention is necessary to protect Petitioner's constitutional rights and her well-being.

Dated: November 23, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

/s/ Yasmin E. Voglewede

Counsel for Petitioner

New Mexico Bar No. 150633

Elvora Law Firm, PLLC

P. O. Box 830717

San Antonio, TX 78283

Tel: (210) 907-9736

yasminv@elvorlaw.com

5:25-cv-1556 Mora Perez

VERIFICATION OF COUNSEL

I represent Petitioner, Mrs. Ana Mora Perez, and submit this verification on her behalf. I hereby verify that the factual statements made in the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: November 23, 2025

/s/ Yasmin E. Voglewede

Counsel for Petitioner

New Mexico Bar No. 150633

Elvora Law Firm, PLLC

P. O. Box 830717

San Antonio, TX 78283

Tel: (210) 907-9736

yasminv@elvorlaw.com