

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Juan Humberto Castillo Cortez,

**Case No. 25-4435**

Petitioner,

v.

Pamela Bondi, Attorney General,

Kristi Noem, Secretary, U.S. Department of  
Homeland Security,

Department of Homeland Security,

Todd M. Lyons, Acting Director of  
Immigration and Customs Enforcement,

Immigration and Customs Enforcement,

David Easterwood, Acting Director, St. Paul  
Field Office Immigration and Customs  
Enforcement,

and,

Eric Tollefson, Sheriff of Kandiyohi  
County.

Respondents.

**AMENDED VERIFIED  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
HABEAS CORPUS**

## INTRODUCTION

1. Respondents are detaining Petitioner, Mr. Juan Humberto Castillo Cortez (“Petitioner”) without bond in violation of law.
2. Respondents are detaining Petitioner, despite having previously posted a \$15,000 bond, and further improperly denying him access to a bond hearing to which he is entitled under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).
3. The continued detention of Petitioner, absent a bond hearing, serves no legitimate purpose.
4. To remedy this unlawful detention, Petitioner seeks declaratory relief and a writ of habeas corpus in the form of immediate release or an order to hold a bond hearing pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within three days.
5. Pending the adjudication of his petition, Petitioner seeks an order restraining the Respondents from transferring him to a location where he cannot reasonably consult with counsel, such a location to be construed as any location outside of the geographic jurisdiction of the day-to-day operations of U.S. Customs and Immigration’s (“ICE”) Fort Snelling, Minnesota of the Office of Enforcement and Removal Operations in the State of Minnesota.
6. Pending the adjudication of this Petition, Petitioners also respectfully request that Respondents be ordered to provide seventy-two (72) hour notice of any movement of Petitioner.

7. Petitioner requests the same opportunity to be heard in a meaningful manner, at a meaningful time, and thus requests 72-hours-notice prior to any removal or movement of him away from the State of Minnesota.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

8. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), § 1361 (federal employee mandamus action), § 1651 (All Writs Act), and § 2241 (habeas corpus); Art. I, § 9, cl. 2 of the U.S. Constitution (“Suspension Clause”); 5 U.S.C. § 702 (Administrative Procedure Act); and 28 U.S.C. § 2201 (Declaratory Judgment Act). This action further arises under the Constitution of the United States and the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”), specifically, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2) and 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).
9. Because Petitioner seeks to challenge his custody as a violation of the Constitution and laws of the United States, jurisdiction is proper in this court.
10. Federal district courts have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 to hear habeas petitions by noncitizens challenging the lawfulness or constitutionality of their detention by DHS. *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 516–17 (2003); *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 138 S. Ct. 830, 839–41 (2018);

*Nielsen v. Preap*, 139 S. Ct. 954, 961–63 (2019); *Sopo v. U.S. Attorney Gen.*, 825 F.3d 1199, 1209-12 (11th Cir. 2016).

11. Federal district courts have jurisdiction to enforce 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2). This statute, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2), entitles Petitioner to a bond hearing in which an immigration judge may determine his eligibility for release from custody.
12. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 USC §§ 1391(b), (e)(1)(B), and 2241(d) because Petitioner is detained within this District. He is currently detained at the Kandiyohi County jail, in Willmar, Minnesota. Venue is also proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e)(1)(A) because Respondents are operating in this district.

#### **PARTIES**

13. Petitioner Castillo Cortez is a citizen of Mexico and a resident of Jackson County, Wisconsin. He is not an arriving alien, nor is he seeking admission.
14. Petitioner Castillo Cortez is currently in Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) custody at the Kandiyohi County jail, in Willmar, Minnesota.
15. Respondent Pamela Bondi is being sued in her official capacity as the Attorney General of the United States and the head of the Department of Justice, which encompasses the BIA and the immigration judges through the

Executive Office for Immigration Review. Attorney General Bondi shares responsibility for implementation and enforcement of the immigration detention statutes, along with Respondent Noem. Attorney General Bondi is a legal custodian of Petitioner.

16. Respondent Kristi Noem is being sued in her official capacity as the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. In this capacity, Secretary Noem is responsible for the administration of the immigration laws pursuant to § 103(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”), 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a), routinely transacts business in the District of Minnesota, supervises the Fort Snelling ICE Field Office, and is legally responsible for pursuing Petitioner’s detention and removal. As such, Respondent Noem is a legal custodian of Petitioner.
17. Respondent Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is the federal agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA, including the detention and removal of noncitizens.
18. Respondent Todd M. Lyons is the Acting Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and is sued in his official capacity. Defendant Lyons is responsible for Petitioner’s detention.
19. Respondent Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) is the subagency within the Department of Homeland Security responsible for implementing

and enforcing the Immigration & Nationality Act, including the detention of noncitizens.

20. Respondent David Easterwood is being sued in his official capacity as the Acting Field Office Director for the Fort Snelling Field Office for ICE within DHS. In that capacity, Field Director Olson has supervisory authority over the ICE agents responsible for detaining Petitioner. The address for the Fort Snelling Field Office is 1 Federal Drive, Fort Snelling, Minnesota 55111.
21. Respondent Sheriff Eric Tollefson is being sued in his official capacity as the Sheriff responsible for the Kandiyohi County Jail. Because Petitioner is detained in the Kandiyohi County Jail, Respondent has immediate day-to-day control over Petitioner.

### **EXHAUSTION**

22. ICE asserts authority to detain Petitioner pursuant to the mandatory detention provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(a). No statutory requirement of exhaustion applies to Petitioner's challenge to the lawfulness of his detention. *See, e.g., Araujo-Cortes v. Shanahan*, 35 F. Supp. 3d 533, 538 (S.D.N.Y. 2014) ("There is no statutory requirement that a habeas petitioner exhaust his administrative remedies before challenging his immigration detention."); *Rodriguez v. Bostock*, No. 3:25-CV-05240-TMC, 2025 WL

1193850, at \*11 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 24, 2025) (citing *Marroquin Ambriz v. Barr*, 420 F. Supp. 3d 953, 962 (N.D. Cal. 2019) (“this Court ‘follows the vast majority of other cases which have waived exhaustion based on irreparable injury when an individual has been detained for months without a bond hearing, and where several additional months may pass before the BIA renders a decision on a pending appeal.’”); *Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11571-JEK, 2025 WL 1869299, at \*5 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025) ((citing *Portela-Gonzalez v. Sec’y of the Navy*, 109 F.3d 74, 77 (1st Cir. 1997) (quoting *McCarthy v. Madigan*, 503 U.S. 140, 146 (1992))).

23. Prudential exhaustion is not required when to do so would be futile or “the administrative body . . . has . . . predetermined the issue before it.” *McCarthy*, 503 U.S. at 148, *superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Woodford v. Ngo*, 548 U.S. 81 (2006).
24. Any bond request is futile. The Board of Immigration Appeals’ published decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), binds the immigration court and erroneously denies Petitioner access to a bond hearing.
25. Prudential exhaustion is also not required in cases where “a particular plaintiff may suffer irreparable harm if unable to secure immediate judicial consideration of his claim.” *McCarthy*, 503 U.S. at 147. Every day that


Petitioner is unlawfully detained causes him and his family irreparable harm. *Jarpa v. Mumford*, 211 F. Supp. 3d 706, 711 (D. Md. 2016) (“Here, continued loss of liberty without any individualized bail determination constitutes the kind of irreparable harm which forgives exhaustion.”); *Matacua v. Frank*, 308 F. Supp. 3d 1019, 1025 (D. Minn. 2018) (explaining that “a loss of liberty” is “perhaps the best example of irreparable harm”); *Hamama v. Adducci*, 349 F. Supp. 3d 665, 701 (E.D. Mich. 2018) (holding that “detention has inflicted grave” and “irreparable harm” and describing the impact of prolonged detention on individuals and their families).

26. Prudential exhaustion is additionally not required in cases where the agency “lacks the institutional competence to resolve the particular type of issue presented, such as the constitutionality of a statute.” *McCarthy*, 503 U.S. at 147–48.
27. Immigration agencies have no jurisdiction over constitutional challenges of the kind Petitioner raises here. *See, e.g., Matter of C-*, 20 I. & N. Dec. 529, 532 (BIA 1992) (“[I]t is settled that the immigration judge and this Board lack jurisdiction to rule upon the constitutionality of the Act and the regulations.”); *Matter of Akram*, 25 I. & N. Dec. 874, 880 (BIA 2012); *Matter of Valdovinos*, 18 I. & N. Dec. 343, 345 (BIA 1982); *Matter of*

*Fuentes-Campos*, 21 I. & N. Dec. 905, 912 (BIA 1997); *Matter of U-M-*, 20 I. & N. Dec. 327 (BIA 1991).

28. Because requiring Petitioner to exhaust administrative remedies would be futile, would cause him irreparable harm, and the immigration agencies lack jurisdiction over the constitutional claims, this Court should not require exhaustion as a prudential matter.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS & PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

29. Petitioner Castillo Cortez is a native and citizen of Mexico.
30. Petitioner Castillo Cortez entered the United States without inspection on or about March of 2000, meaning he has been here more than 25 years.
31. On September 3, 2019, Petitioner Castillo Cortez's then girlfriend, now wife, Rebecca Lynn Zinn, gave birth to the couple's child, a United States citizen by the name of .
32. On around May 17, 2020, Petitioner Castillo Cortez was detained "pursuant to sections 237 and 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act" pursuant to a "warrant of arrest" served on him by Respondents.
33. On May 18, 2020, Respondents initiated removal proceedings against Petitioner Castillo Cortez by serving him with a Notice to Appear and filing that document with the immigration court in Chicago, Illinois.

34. The Notice to Appear charged Petitioner Castillo Cortez with inadmissibility under INA “212(a)(6)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, in that that [he was] an alien present in the United States without being admitted or paroled, or who arrived in the United States at any time or place other than as designated by the Attorney General.”
35. That same day, on May 18, 2020, Petitioner Castillo Cortez was released on a bond of \$15,000 “pursuant to the authority contained in section 236 of the immigration and Nationality Act.”
36. Petitioner Castillo Cortez posted that bond of \$15,000 and Respondents are still in possession of that money.
37. Respondents did not charge Petitioner Castillo Cortez as an arriving alien.
38. On June 26, 2020, Petitioner Castillo Cortez married Rebecca Lynn Zinn, a citizen of the United States, in Chippewa County, Wisconsin.
39. Petitioner Castillo Cortez has filed an application for Cancellation of Removal based on the prospective hardship to his wife and child, which remains pending before the Immigration Court.
40. On July 14, 2020, Petitioner Castillo Cortez’s wife filed an I-130 petition on his behalf.
41. On September 5, 2025, Respondents, through the Board of Immigration Appeals, issued a precedential decision, binding on lower immigration

courts, finding that “Immigration Judges lack authority to hear bond requests or to grant bond to aliens who are present in the United States without admission.” *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).

42. On November 14, 2025, Petitioner Castillo Cortez and his wife, Rebecca Lynn Zinn, interviewed in support of her I-130 petition.
43. At the end of the I-130 interview, ICE officers entered the room, detained Petitioner Castillo Cortez, and took him into custody.
44. The only criminal history for Petitioner Castillo Cortez between his release in May of 2020, and his re-detention in November of 2025, was a violation for possession of fish outside the slot limit.
45. Petitioner Castillo Cortez was transported to the Kandiyohi County Jail.
46. On November 14, 2025, the same day he was apprehended, USCIS approved the I-130 filed by Rebecca Lynn Zinn on Petitioner Castillo Cortez’s behalf.
47. Respondents have held Petitioner Castillo Cortez in custody since November 14, 2025.
48. Petitioner Castillo Cortez is presently held at the Kandiyohi County jail, in Willmar, Minnesota.
49. Petitioner Castillo Cortez has an immigration case pending with the court in Chicago, Illinois, but his case is pending and does not have a hearing date scheduled.

### LEGAL FRAMEWORK

50. Removal proceedings are governed under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a, which provides that “[a]n immigration judge shall conduct proceedings for deciding the inadmissibility or deportability of an alien,” 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(a)(1) and that “[u]nless otherwise specified in this chapter, a proceeding under this section shall be the sole and exclusive procedure for determining whether an alien may be admitted to the United States.” 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(a)(3).
51. To initiate removal proceedings, “written notice (in this section referred to as a ‘notice to appear’) shall be given in person to the alien (or, if personal service is not practicable, through service by mail to the alien or to the alien’s counsel of record, if any).” 8 U.S.C. § 1229(a)(1).
52. The “[a]pprehension and detention of aliens” is governed under 8 U.S.C. § 1226, which provides that:

On a warrant issued by the Attorney General, an alien may be arrested and detained pending a decision on whether the alien is to be removed from the United States. Except as provided in subsection (c) and pending such decision, **the Attorney General ... may release the alien on bond of at least \$1,500 with security approved by, and containing conditions prescribed by, the Attorney General.**

8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2)(A) (emphasis added).

53. The regulations provide that, to detain a person under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), the Department must issue an I-200 to take a person into custody; and that such a person is subject to release on bond. The regulation states:

(b) Warrant of arrest—

(1) In general. **At the time of issuance of the notice to appear, or at any time thereafter** and up to the time removal proceedings are completed, the respondent may be arrested and taken into custody under the authority of Form I-200, Warrant of Arrest. A warrant of arrest may be issued only by those immigration officers listed in § 287.5(e)(2) of this chapter and may be served only by those immigration officers listed in § 287.5(e)(3) of this chapter.

(2) If, after the issuance of a warrant of arrest, a determination is made not to serve it, any officer authorized to issue such warrant may authorize its cancellation.

(c) Custody issues and release procedures—

(1) In general.

(i) After the expiration of the Transition Period Custody Rules (TPCR) set forth in section 303(b)(3) of Div. C of Pub.L. 104-208, no alien described in section 236(c)(1) **of the Act may be released from custody during removal proceedings except pursuant to section 236(c)(2) of the Act.**

8 C.F.R. § 236.1(b).

54. 8 U.S.C. 1226(a) is the default detention authority, and it applies to anyone who is detained “pending a decision on whether the [noncitizen] is to be removed from the United States.” 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).
55. 8 U.S.C. 1226(a) applies to those who are “already in the country” and are detained “pending the outcome of removal proceedings.” *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 289 (2018).
56. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) applies not just to persons who are deportable, but also to noncitizens who are inadmissible. Specifically, while § 1226(a) provides the general right to seek release, § 1226(c) carves out discrete categories of noncitizens from being released—including certain categories of inadmissible noncitizens—and subjects those limited classes of inadmissible aliens instead to mandatory detention. *See, e.g.*, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(A), (C).
57. The Laken Riley Act (LRA) added language to § 1226 that directly references people who have entered without inspection or who are present without authorization. *See* LAKEN RILEY ACT, PL 119-1, January 29, 2025, 139 Stat 3. Pursuant to these amendments, people charged as inadmissible under § 1182(a)(6)(A) (the inadmissibility ground for entry without inspection) or (a)(7)(A) (the inadmissibility ground for lacking valid documentation to enter the United States) and who have been arrested,

charged with, or convicted of certain crimes are subject to § 1226(c)'s mandatory detention provisions. See 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E).

58. By including such individuals under § 1226(c), Congress reaffirmed that § 1226 covers persons charged under § 1182(a)(6)(A) or (a)(7). Generally speaking, grounds of deportability (found in 8 U.S.C. § 1227) apply to people like lawful permanent residents, who have been lawfully admitted and continue to have lawful status, while grounds of inadmissibility (found in § 1182) apply to those who have not yet been admitted to the United States. *See, e.g., Barton v. Barr*, 590 U.S. 222, 234 (2020) (“specific exceptions’ to a statute’s applicability, it ‘proves’ that absent those exceptions, the statute generally applies.”) (quoting *Shady Grove Orthopedic Assocs., P.A. v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 559 U.S. 393, 400 (2010)).
59. The [i]nspection by immigration officers [and] expedited removal of inadmissible arriving aliens, [and] referral for hearing” is governed under 8 U.S.C. § 1225, which provides that “[a]n alien present in the United States who has not been admitted or who arrives in the United States (whether or not at a designated port of arrival and including an alien who is brought to the United States after having been interdicted in international or United States waters) shall be deemed for purposes of this chapter an applicant for admission.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1).

60. “All aliens (including alien crewmen) who are applicants for admission or otherwise seeking admission or readmission to or transit through the United States shall be inspected by immigration officers.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3).
61. “If an immigration officer determines that an alien ... who **is arriving in the United States** ... is inadmissible under section 1182(a)(6)(C) or 1182(a)(7) of this title, the officer shall order the alien removed from the United States without further hearing or review unless the alien indicates either an intention to apply for asylum.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i) (emphasis added).
62. “If the officer determines at the time of the interview that an alien has a credible fear of persecution ... the alien shall be detained for further consideration of the application for asylum.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii).
63. This mandatory detention provision may also be applied to “an alien ... who has not been admitted or paroled into the United States, **and who has not affirmatively shown, to the satisfaction of an immigration officer, that the alien has been physically present in the United States continuously for the 2-year period immediately prior to the date of the determination of inadmissibility** under this subparagraph.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(iii)(II).

64. “[I]n the case of an alien who is an applicant for admission, if the examining immigration officer determines that an alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, the alien shall be detained for a proceeding under section 1229a of this title.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) (emphasis added).
65. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)’s mandatory detention scheme applies “at the Nation’s borders and ports of entry, where the Government must determine whether an alien seeking to enter the country is admissible.” *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287 (2018).
66. “Read most naturally, §§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2) mandate detention of applicants for admission until certain proceedings have concluded. Until that point, nothing in the statutory text imposes a limit on the length of detention, and neither provision says anything about bond hearings.” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 282.
67. By regulation, “[a]rriving alien means an applicant for admission coming or attempting to come into the United States at a port-of-entry, or an alien seeking transit through the United States at a port-of-entry, or an alien interdicted in international or United States waters and brought into the United States by any means, whether or not to a designated port-of-entry, and regardless of the means of transport. An arriving alien remains an

arriving alien even if paroled pursuant to section 212(d)(5) of the Act, and even after any such parole is terminated or revoked.” 8 C.F.R. § 1.2.

68. “[A]n immigration judge may not redetermine conditions of custody imposed by the Service with respect to ... [a]rriving aliens in removal proceedings, including aliens paroled after arrival pursuant to section 212(d)(5) of the Act.” 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(h)(2)(i)(B).
69. As such, arriving aliens are not entitled to bond, nor, arguably, are aliens falling within the confines of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b).
70. Congress did not intend to subject all people present in the United States after an unlawful entry to mandatory detention if arrested. Prior to Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act (“IIRIRA”), which codified both 8 U.S.C. § 1225 and 8 U.S.C. § 1226, aliens present without admission were not necessarily subject to mandatory detention. See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(1) (1994) (authorizing Attorney General to arrest noncitizens for deportability proceedings, which applied to all persons within the United States).
71. In articulating the impact of IIRIRA, Congress noted that the new § 1226(a) merely “restates the current provisions in section 242(a)(1) regarding the authority of the Attorney General to arrest, detain, and release on bond a [noncitizen] who is not lawfully in the United States.” H.R. Rep. No. 104-

469, pt. 1, at 229 (emphasis added). See also H.R. Rep. No. 104-828, at 210 (same).

72. Respondents' longstanding practice of considering people like Petitioner as detained under § 1226(a) further supports reading the statute to apply to them. Typically, DHS issues a person Form I-286, Notice of Custody Determination, or Form I-200, Warrant for Arrest of Alien, stating that the person is detained under § 1226(a) (§ 236 of the INA).
73. As these arrest documents demonstrate, DHS has long acknowledged that § 1226(a) applies to individuals who entered the United States unlawfully, but who were later apprehended within the country's borders long after their entry. Such a longstanding and consistent interpretation "is powerful evidence that interpreting the Act in [this] way is natural and reasonable." *Abramski v. United States*, 573 U.S. 169, 203 (2014) (Scalia, J., dissenting); *See also Bankamerica Corp. v. United States*, 462 U.S. 122, 130 (1983) (relying in part on "over 60 years" of government's interpretation and practice to reject its new proposed interpretation of the law at issue).
74. EOIR regulations have long recognized that Petitioner are subject to detention under § 1226(a). Nothing in 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19—the regulatory basis for the immigration court's jurisdiction—provides otherwise.

75. In fact, EOIR confirmed that § 1226(a) applies to Petitioner when it promulgated the regulations governing immigration courts and implementing § 1226 decades ago. At that time, EOIR 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.” Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum Procedures, 62 FR 10312, 10323, 62 FR 10312-01, 10323.
76. Almost every court that considered these questions has ruled contrary to Respondents’ interpretation of the law. *See, e.g., Belsai v. Bondi*, 2025 WL 2802947 (D. Minn. Oct. 1, 2025); *A.A. v. Olson*, 2025 WL 2886729 (D. Minn. Oct. 8, 2025); *J.O.E. v. Bondi*, 2025 WL 2466670 (D. Minn. Aug. 27, 2025); *Maldonado v. Olson*, 2025 WL 2374411 (D. Minn. Aug. 15, 2025); *Ferrera Bejarano v. Bondi*, 25-cv-03236 (D. Minn. Aug 18, 2025); *Aguilar Vazquez v. Bondi*, 25-cv-03162 (D. Minn. Aug 19, 2025); *Tiburcio Garcia v. Bondi*, 25-CV-03219 (D. Minn. Aug. 29, 2025); *Herrera Avila v. Bondi*, 25-cv-03741 (D. Minn. Oct. 21, 2025); *Carmona-Lorenzo v. Trump*, 2025 WL 2531521 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025); *Cortes Fernandez v. Lyons*, 2025 WL 2531539 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025); *Palma Perez v. Berg*, 2025 WL 2531566

(D. Neb. Sept 3, 2025); *Jacinto v. Trump*, 2025 WL 2402271 (D. Neb. Aug. 19, 2025); *Garcia Jimenez v. Kramer*, 2025 WL 2374223 (D. Neb. Aug. 14, 2025); *Anicasio v. Kramer*, 2025 WL 2374224 (D. Neb. Aug. 14, 2025); *Arce v. Trump*, 2025 WL 2675934 (D. Neb. Sept. 18, 2025); *Giron Reyes v. Lyons*, 2025 WL 2712427 (N.D. Iowa Sept. 23, 2025); *Hernandez Marcelo v. Trump*, 2025 WL 2741230 (S.D. Iowa Sept. 10, 2025); *Sampiao v. Hyde*, 2025 WL 2607924 (D. Mass. Sept. 9, 2025); *Jimenez v. FCI Berlin*, No. 25-cv-326-LM-AJ (D.N.H. Sept. 8, 2025); *Doe v. Moniz*, 2025 WL 2576819 (D. Mass. Sept. 5, 2025); *Romero v. Hyde*, 2025 WL 2403827 (D. Mass. Aug. 19, 2025); *Martinez v. Hyde*, 2025 WL 2084238 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025); *dos Santos v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2370988 (D. Mass. Aug. 14, 2025); *Gomes v. Hyde*, 2025 WL 1869299 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025); *Chogllo Chafla v. Scott*, 2025 WL 2688541 (D. Me. Sept. 22, 2025); *Chiliquinga Yumbillo v. Stamper*, 2025 WL 2688160 (D. Me. Sept. 19, 2025); *Chang Barrios v. Shepley*, 2025 WL 2772579 (D. Me. Sept. 29, 2025); *Chiliquinga Yumbillo v. Stamper*, 2025 WL 2783642 (D. Me. Sept. 30, 2025); *Chanaguano Caiza v. Scott*, 2025 WL 2806416 (D. Me. Oct. 2, 2025); *Ayala Casun v. Hyde*, 2025 WL 2806769 (D.R.I. Oct. 2, 2025); *Lopez Benitez v. Francis*, 2025 WL 2371588 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2025); *Samb v. Joyce*, 2025 WL 2398831 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 19, 2025); *Zumba v. Bondi*, 2025 WL 2753496 (D.N.J. Sept.

26, 2025); *Leal-Hernandez v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2430025 (D. Md. Aug. 24, 2025); *Kostak v. Trump*, 2025 WL 2472136 (W.D. La. Aug. 27, 2025); *Lopez-Arevelo v. Ripa*, 2025 WL 2691828 (W.D. Tex. Sept. 22, 2025); *Padron Covarubias, v. Vergara*, 2025 WL 2950097 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 8, 2025); *Hasan v. Crawford*, 2025 WL 2682255 (E.D. Va. Sept. 19, 2025); *Luna Quispe v. Crawford*, 2025 WL 2783799 (E.D. Va. Sept. 29, 2025); *Quispe-Ardiles v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2783800 (E.D. Va. Sept. 30, 2025); *S.D.B.B. v. Johnson*, WL 2845170 (M.D.N.C. Oct. 7, 2025); *Beltran Barrera v. Tindall*, 2025 WL 2690565 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 19, 2025); *Singh v. Lewis*, 2025 WL 2699219 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 22, 2025); *Sanchez Ballestros v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2880831 (W.D. Ky. Oct. 9, 2025); *Mejia v. Woosley*, 2025 WL 2933852 (W.D. Ky. Oct. 15, 2025); *Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft*, 2025 WL 2609425 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9, 2025); *Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft*, 2025 WL 2496379 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025); *Contreras-Cervantes, v. Raycraft*, 2025 WL 2952796 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 17, 2025); *Morales Chavez v. Director of Detroit Field Office*, 2025 WL 2959617 (N.D. Ohio Oct. 20, 2025); *Sanchez Alvarez v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2942648 (W.D. Mich. Oct. 17, 2025); *Alejandro v. Olson*, 2025 WL 2896348 (S.D. Ind. Oct. 11, 2025); *B.D.V.S. v. Forestal*, 2025 WL 2855743 (S.D. Ind. Oct. 8, 2025); *Ochoa Ochoa v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2938779 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 16, 2025); *Rodriguez Vazquez v.*

*Bostock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239 (W.D. Wash. 2025); *Cuevas Guzman v. Andrews*, 2025 WL 2617256 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025); *Caicedo Hinestroza v. Kaiser*, 2025 WL 2606983 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025); *Zaragoza Mosqueda v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2591530 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2025); *Hernandez Nieves v. Kaiser*, 2025 WL 2533110 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025); *Vasquez Garcia et al. v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2549431 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025); *Arrazola-Gonzalez v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2379285 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2025); *Lepe v. Andrews*, 2025 WL 2716910 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2025); *Jabara Oliveros v. Kaiser*, 2025 WL 2677125 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 18, 2025); *Castellanos v. Kaiser*, 2025 WL 2689853 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 18, 2025); *Leon Espinoza v. Kaiser*, 2025 WL 2675785 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 18, 2025); *Cordero Pelico v. Kaiser*, 2025 WL 2822876 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2025); *Ortiz Donis v. Chestnut*, 2025 WL 2879514 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 9, 2025); *Sabi Polo v. Chestnut*, 2025 WL 2959346 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2025); *Alvarez Chavez v. Kaiser*, 2025 WL 2909526 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 9, 2025); *Cerritos Echevarria v. Bondi*, 2025 WL 2821282 (D. Ariz. Oct. 3, 2025); *Cardin Alvarez v. Rivas*, 2025 WL 2898389 (D. Ariz. Oct. 7, 2025); *Rosado v. Figueroa*, 2025 WL 2337099 (D. Ariz. Aug. 11, 2025); *Mendoza Guitierrez v. Baltasar*, 2025 WL 2962908 (D. Colo. Oct. 17, 2025); *Aguilar Merino v. Ripa*, 2025 WL 2941609 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 15, 2025).

77. To the extent that they are consistent with Congressional statutes and properly promulgated regulations, “decisions of the Board, and decisions of the Attorney General, shall be binding on all officers and employees of the Department of Homeland Security or immigration judges in the administration of the immigration laws of the United States.” 8 C.F.R. § 103.10(b).
78. “[W]here a previous bond determination has been made by an immigration judge, no change should be made by a District Director absent a change of circumstance.” *Matter of Sugay*, 17 I. & N. Dec. 637, 640 (BIA 1981).

#### **REMEDY**

79. Respondents’ detention of Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) violates the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution. Petitioner’s ongoing detention violates the Fifth Amendment’s guarantee that “[n]o person shall be . . . deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.” U.S. Const., Amend. 5.
80. Due Process requires that detention “bear [] a reasonable relation to the purpose for which the individual [was] committed.” *Zadvydas, v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001) (citing *Jackson v. Indiana*, 406 U.S. 715, 738 (1972)).
81. Petitioner seeks immediate release to the extent that Respondents justify his detention on 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), which plainly does not apply to him.

82. Although neither the Constitution nor the federal habeas statutes delineate the necessary content of habeas relief, *I.N.S. v. St. Cyr*, 533 U.S. 289, 337 (2001) (Scalia, J., dissenting) (“A straightforward reading of [the Suspension Clause] discloses that it does not guarantee any content to . . . the writ of habeas corpus”), implicit in habeas jurisdiction is the power to order release. *Boumediene v. Bush*, 553 U.S. 723, 779 (2008) (“[T]he habeas court must have the power to order the conditional release of an individual unlawfully detained.”).
83. The Supreme Court has noted that the typical remedy for unlawful detention is release from detention. *See, e.g., Munaf v. Geren*, 553 U.S. 674 (2008) (“The typical remedy for [unlawful executive detention] is, of course, release.”); *see also Wajda v. US*, 64 F.3d 385, 389 (8th Cir. 1995) (stating the function of habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 “is to obtain release from the duration or fact of present custody.”).
84. That courts with habeas jurisdiction have the power to order outright release is justified by the fact that, “habeas corpus is, at its core, an equitable remedy,” *Schlup v. Delo*, 513 U.S. 298, 319 (1995), and that as an equitable remedy, federal courts “[have] broad discretion in conditioning a judgment granting habeas relief [and are] authorized . . . to dispose of habeas corpus matters ‘as law and justice require.’” *Hilton v. Braunskill*, 481 U.S. 770, 775

(1987), quoting 28 U.S.C. § 2243. An order of release falls under court's broad discretion to fashion relief. *See, e.g., Jimenez v. Cronen*, 317 F. Supp. 3d 626, 636 (D. Mass. 2018) ("Habeas corpus is an equitable remedy. The court has the discretion to fashion relief that is fair in the circumstances, including to order an alien's release.").

85. Alternatively, Petitioner requests release pursuant to the \$15,000 bond posted in May of 2020, pursuant to *Matter of Sugay*, 17 I. & N. Dec. 637, 640 (BIA 1981), given that this decision binds administrative actors. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.10(b).
86. Alternatively, Petitioner requests a constitutionally adequate custody redetermination hearing in which he is not erroneously treated as detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) and is instead treated as a detainee under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within three calendar days.

**CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**COUNT ONE: DECLARATORY RELIEF**

87. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
88. Petitioner requests a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201 that Petitioner is not subject to detention under to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) and must be released unless Respondents assert authority to detain him under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).

89. In the event Respondents assert that Petitioner is detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), Petitioner requests a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201 that Petitioner is eligible for release from Respondents' custody pursuant to a bond as set forth at 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(1) and should be released on the \$15,000 posted in 2020 pursuant to *Matter of Sugay*, 17 I. & N. Dec. 637, 640 (BIA 1981).

**COUNT TWO: VIOLATION OF THE IMMIGRATION & NATIONALITY  
ACT – 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)**

90. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
91. Section 1225 of Title 8 of the U.S. Code governs aliens arriving at the border and seeking admission from outside the country. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225.
92. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), specifically, cannot apply as it only applies to those “applicants for admission” who are “seeking admission” at the time of detention and Petitioner was not “seeking admission” at the time he was detained, nor is he doing so now. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).
93. As Respondents assert authority to detain Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), and no such authority exists under that provision, he requests that he be immediately released within three days.

**COUNT THREE: VIOLATION OF THE IMMIGRATION &  
NATIONALITY ACT – 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)**

94. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
95. Section 1226 of Title 8 of the U.S. Code governs the detention of aliens pending a determination of removal from the United States.
96. Such an alien “may [be] release[d] ... on bond of at least \$1,500.” 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2)(A).
97. The denial of Petitioner’s bond eligibility is in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2)(A), which specifically makes him eligible for bond.
98. If Respondents do not release Petitioner without any conditions, he requests that he be afforded the opportunity to present his case for release in a bond hearing pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2)(A) within three days.

**COUNT FOUR: VIOLATION OF BINDING ADMINISTRATIVE  
PRECEDENT - MATTER OF SUGAY, 17 I. & N. DEC. 637, 640 (BIA 1981).**

99. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
100. “[A]n agency’s failure to follow its own binding regulations is a reversible abuse of discretion.” *Carter v. Sullivan*, 909 F.2d 1201, 1202 (8th Cir. 1990).

101. Unless inconsistent with statute or regulation, “decisions of the Board, and decisions of the Attorney General, shall be binding on all officers and employees of the Department of Homeland Security or immigration judges in the administration of the immigration laws of the United States.” 8 C.F.R. § 103.10(b).
102. “[W]here a previous bond determination has been made by an immigration judge, no change should be made by a District Director absent a change of circumstance.” *Matter of Sugay*, 17 I. & N. Dec. 637, 640 (BIA 1981).
103. Petitioner posed a \$15,000 in May of 2020, and a single conviction for possession of fish outside the slot limit is not a relevant change in circumstances justifying a departure from the bond at bond.
104. The Court should order Petitioner released pursuant to the \$15,000 already posted.

**COUNT FIVE: VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT**

105. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
106. The Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause protects against arbitrary detention and requires that detention be reasonably related to its purpose and accompanied by adequate procedures to ensure that detention is serving its legitimate goals.

107. Petitioner is not subject to mandatory custody under the Immigration & Nationality Act and is therefore entitled to a bond hearing in which a neutral arbiter may determine the justification for his continued detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2)(A) within three days, the denial of which constitutes a violation of the Fifth Amendment's guarantee of due process.

**COUNT SIX: VIOLATION OF 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1, 1236.1 AND 1003.19 - UNLAWFUL DENIAL OF RELEASE ON BOND**

108. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
109. 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 (emphasis added).
110. The agencies thus made clear that individuals who had entered without inspection were eligible for consideration for bond and bond hearings before immigration courts under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and its implementing regulations.

111. Nonetheless, DHS has adopted a nationwide policy and practice of applying § 1225(b)(2)(A) to Petitioner and others in the same position.
112. 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.
113. As such, Petitioner requests that the Court order the Respondents afford Petitioner a bond hearing to comport with these regulatory requirements within three days.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Petitioner Castillo Cortez, asks this Court for the following relief:

1. Assume jurisdiction over this matter.
2. Issue an order restraining Respondents from attempting to move Petitioner from the State of Minnesota during the pendency of this Petition.
3. Issue an order requiring Respondents to provide 72-hour notice of any intended movement of Petitioner.
4. Expedite consideration of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1657 because it is an action brought under 28 U.S.C. § 153.
5. Order Petitioner's immediate release, or, alternatively, order Respondents to hold a bond hearing pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within three days.
6. Declare that Respondents' action is arbitrary and capricious.
7. Declare that Respondents failed to adhere to its regulations.

8. Declare that Petitioner's detention absent a bond hearing violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.
9. Grant Petitioner reasonable attorney fees and costs pursuant to the Equal Access to Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(1)(A).
10. Grant all further relief this Court deems just and proper.

DATED: November 24, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Cameron Giebink

Cameron Giebink, Esq.  
MN Attorney #0402670  
3019 Minnehaha Ave  
Minneapolis, MN 55406  
Phone: 612.436.8183  
Email: cgiebink@wilsonlg.com

Attorney for Petitioner

**Verification by Someone Acting on  
Petitioner's Behalf Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2242**

I am submitting this verification on behalf of Petitioner because I am one of Petitioner's attorneys. I have reviewed documents corroborating these events and discussed the events described in this Petition with the parties present at the time of their occurrence. I hereby verify that the statements made in the attached Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, including the statements regarding Petitioner's detention status, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

/s/ Cameron Giebink

Date: November 24, 2025