

1 CRAIG H. MISSAKIAN (CABN 125202)
United States Attorney
2 PAMELA T. JOHANN (CABN 145558)
Chief, Civil Division
3 WILLIAM SKEWES-COX (DCBN 1780431)
Special Assistant United States Attorney

4 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
5 San Francisco, California 94102-3495
Telephone: (415) 436-7066
6 Fax: (415) 436-6748
william.skewes-cox@usdoj.gov

7 Attorneys for Federal Respondents

8
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12 NESTOR ANDRES ARRIETA PATERNINA,)

13 Petitioner)

14 v.)

15 SERGIO ALBARRAN, et al.,)

16 Respondents)
17)

No. 4:25-cv-10378-YGR

) **RESPONDENTS' RESPONSE TO ORDER**
) **TO SHOW CAUSE**

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 The legal issues presented in this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus concern the statutory
3 authority for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement’s (“ICE”) detention of Petitioner, whether
4 Petitioner is entitled to a bond hearing, and whether that bond hearing must be held before Petitioner is
5 detained. While reserving all rights, including the right to appeal, Respondents submit this abbreviated
6 response in lieu of an exhaustive responsive memorandum to preserve the legal issues and to conserve
7 judicial and party resources.¹ Should the Court prefer to receive a more exhaustive and fulsome
8 opposition brief, Respondents will do so upon the Court’s request.

9 Respondents acknowledge that this Court’s prior rulings concerning similar challenges to the
10 government’s practice and legal arguments in this case would control the result here if the Court adheres
11 to its legal reasoning in those prior decisions. *See, e.g., Jimenez-Garcia v. Kaiser*, 4:25-cv-06916-YGR,
12 2025 WL 3500767 (N.D. Cal. Aug 29, 2025). While Respondents respectfully disagree with those
13 decisions, in the interest of judicial economy, and to expedite the Court’s consideration of this matter,
14 Respondents hereby rely upon and incorporate by reference the legal arguments regarding the
15 petitioners’ likelihood of success on the merits that it presented in *Jimenez-Garcia* and other similar
16 cases in this District. *See, e.g., Ayra Leandro v. Albarran, et al.*, No. 25-cv-10042-JD, Dkt. No. 10
17 (November 25, 2025).

18 Should the Court decide that Petitioner is subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), the
19 appropriate remedy is to order a bond hearing, not to order immediate release, and for Petitioner to bear
20 the burden to demonstrate flight risk or danger to the community.

21 **II. BACKGROUND**

22 Petitioner is a citizen of Colombia. Pet. for Writ of Habeas Corpus ¶ 31, ECF No. 1. He most
23 likely entered the United States in early 2024. ECF No. 6 at 1. The Department of Homeland Security
24

25 ¹ In addition to the arguments raised in this response, Respondents also move for all Respondents
26 other than Petitioner’s immediate custodian to be dismissed from this case. *See Doe v. Garland*, 109
27 F.4th 1188 (9th Cir. 2024) (emphasizing the “clear rule requiring core habeas petitioners challenging
28 their present physical confinement to name their immediate custodian, the warden of the facility where
they are detained, as the respondent to their petition” (citing *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 435
(2004)); *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 434-36 (2004) (noting that for habeas petitions challenging
detention, “the default rule is that the proper respondent is the warden of the facility where the prisoner
is being held, not the Attorney General or some other remote supervisory official”).

1 apprehended Petitioner upon entry, detained him, and then released him on his own recognizance. ECF
2 No. 1 ¶ 31. On January 27, 2024, Petitioner filed an application for asylum with the San Francisco
3 Immigration Court. *Id.* On December 3, 2025, ICE officers detained Petitioner. *Id.* ¶ 4.

4 On December 3, 2025, Petitioner filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and an *Ex Parte*
5 Motion for Temporary Restraining Order against Respondents. ECF Nos. 1, 4. That same day, this Court
6 issued an order granting Petitioner’s temporary restraining order. ECF No. 6. The Court ordered
7 Respondents to immediately release Petitioner from Respondents’ custody and enjoined and restrained
8 Respondents from re-detaining Petitioner without notice and a pre-deprivation hearing before a neutral
9 decisionmaker, and from removing Petitioner from the United States. *Id.*

10 **III. ARGUMENT**

11 **A. Petitioner Is Subject to Mandatory Detention Under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).**

12 Petitioner claims, inter alia, that his detention violates his procedural due process rights under
13 the Fifth Amendment. ECF No. 6 at 3. Petitioner argues that he has a substantial interest in remaining
14 out of custody, and the Due Process Clause entitles him to a bond hearing before an immigration judge
15 prior to any arrest or detention. *Id.*

16 Respondents contend that, based on the plain text of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), Petitioner is subject
17 to mandatory detention for the duration of his removal proceedings because Petitioner is an “applicant
18 for admission” and is “seeking admission.” In addition, as a non-citizen physically present in the United
19 States without having been admitted, Petitioner is treated for constitutional purposes as if stopped at the
20 border. *See Dep’t of Homeland Sec. v. Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 139-140 (2020).

21 Respondents acknowledge this Court’s statement that its order granting Petitioner’s temporary
22 restraining order “accords with many other recent grants of temporary relief in similar circumstances.”
23 ECF No. 6 at 5. However, Respondents wish to highlight that several courts in other districts in the
24 Ninth Circuit have recently denied TRO motions or preliminary injunctive relief for individuals, like
25 Petitioner, detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) following conditional parole. These courts have upheld,
26 at least preliminarily, mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2).² *See Altamirano Ramos v. Lyons*, No.

27 _____
28 ² Moreover, a growing number of courts in districts under other circuits have also reached the
same conclusion. *See, e.g., Suarez v. Noem*, 2025 WL 3312168, *1-2 (E.D. Mo. Nov. 28, 2025);
Tenemasa-Lema v. Hyde, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2025 WL 3280555, *1-4 (D. Mass. 2025); *Cabanas v.*
RESPONDENT’S RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

1 25-cv-09785, 2025 WL 3199872, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2025) (acknowledging that the court had
2 previously rejected the government’s interpretation of § 1225(b)(2), but “after additional research and
3 analysis, the court has concluded that Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(a),
4 and that Petitioner is not eligible for a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)”; *Sixtos Chavez v. Noem*,
5 No. 25-cv-02325, 2025 WL 2730228 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2025), *appeal docketed*, No. 25-7077 (9th Cir.
6 Nov. 7, 2025); *Valencia v. Chestnut*, No. 25-cv-01550, 2025 WL 3205133 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2025);
7 *Alonzo v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-01519, 2025 WL 3208284 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2025).

8 Respondents additionally rely upon the analysis and holding in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I &
9 N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). There, the BIA examined the plain language of § 1225, the INA’s statutory
10 scheme, Supreme Court and BIA precedent, the legislative history of the INA and the Illegal
11 Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (“IIRIRA”), Pub L. No. 104-208, and
12 DHS’s prior practices. After doing so, the BIA held that “under a plain language reading of section
13 235(b)(2)(A) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), Immigration Judges lack authority to hear bond
14 requests or to grant bond to aliens, like the respondent, who are present in the United States without
15 admission.” 29 I & N Dec. at 225.

16 Respondents thus request that the Court follow the BIA and the district courts, both in the Ninth
17 Circuit and around the country, that have found that the mandatory detention provision contained in §
18 1225(b)(2) applies to non-citizens like Petitioner.

19 Respondents acknowledge that questions of law in this case substantially overlap with those at
20 issue in *Jimenez-Garcia* and other cases in this District that have concluded that § 1225(b) is not
21 applicable to individuals who were conditionally released in the past under § 1226(a). Accordingly, while
22 preserving all rights, Respondents incorporate by reference the legal arguments it presented in those
23 cases. Should the Court apply the same reasoning it did in *Jimenez-Garcia* to this one, the legal
24 principles espoused in those cases would likely warrant the same conclusion here. Because of this,
25

26

Bondi, 2025 WL 3171331, *1, *3-6 (S.D. Tex. Nov. 13, 2025); *Silva Oliveira v. Patterson*, 2025 WL
27 3095972, *4-7 (W.D. La. Nov. 4, 2025); *Cirrus Rojas v. Olson*, 2025 WL 3033967, *5, *8-9 (E.D. Wis.
28 Oct. 30, 2025); *Garibay-Robledo v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-177, Dkt. No. 9, at 1, 4-9 (N.D. Tex. Oct. 24,
2025); *Vargas Lopez v. Trump*, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2025 WL 2780351, *2, *6-10 (D. Neb. Sept. 30,
2025).

1 Respondents submit that further briefing and oral argument in this case on the legal issues already
2 addressed in those cases would not be a good use of judicial or party resources. If, however, the Court
3 prefers to receive a formal and exhaustive opposition brief in this matter, Respondents will provide such
4 a brief upon the Court's request.

5 **B. To the Extent the Court Considers Petitioner Detained Under § 1226(a), It Should**
6 **Order a Bond Hearing to be Held by an Immigration Judge Rather Than**
7 **Immediate Release.**

8 Should this Court determine that Petitioner's detention is subject to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), as
9 Petitioner contends, the appropriate remedy is to order a bond hearing before an immigration judge
10 ("IJ"), during which the IJ can properly determine in the first instance whether Petitioner is a flight risk
11 or danger to the community. This bond hearing is appropriately held post-detention. Under Section
12 1226(a), individuals are not guaranteed pre-detention review and may instead only seek review of their
13 detention by an ICE official once they are in custody—a process that the Ninth Circuit has found
14 constitutionally sufficient in the prolonged-detention context. *Rodriguez Diaz v. Garland*, 53 F.4th 1189,
15 1196–97 (9th Cir. 2022). Moreover, at any bond hearing under 1226(a), Petitioner must bear the burden of
16 demonstrating that he is not a flight risk or danger to the community. *See id.* at 1197 (citing *Matter of*
17 *Guerra*, 24 I. & N. Dec. 37, 40 (BIA 2006)).

18 This approach to a TRO motion—granting release *unless* an individualized bond hearing is held
19 before an IJ within a specified amount of time—has been followed by some courts in other districts
20 when addressing similar arguments by petitioners. *See, e.g., Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02771, 2025
21 WL 2986672, at *6 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 22, 2025) ("Respondents are enjoined from continuing to detain
22 Petitioner unless they provide him with an individualized bond hearing before an immigration judge
23 under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within ten (10) days of the date of this Order."); *Javier Ceja Gonzalez v.*
24 *Noem*, No. 25-cv-02054, 2025 WL 2633187, at *6 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 2025) (ordering the government
25 to "release Petitioners or, in the alternative, provide each Petitioner with an individualized bond hearing
26 before an immigration judge pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven (7) days of this Order");
27 *Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02180, 2025 WL 2549431, at *8 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025) ("Respondents
28 must provide Petitioners with individualized bond hearings under § 1226(a) within fourteen days of this
Order. Respondents shall not deny Petitioners' bond on the basis that § 1225(b)(2) requires mandatory

1 detention.”); *Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 25-cv-11571, 2025 WL 1869299, at *9 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025) (“the
2 appropriate remedy is to order the Immigration Court to conduct a new hearing at which it considers
3 Gomes’ eligibility for bond under Section 1226(a”). Respondents thus request that this Court adopt this
4 approach if the Court determines that section 1226(a) applies.

5 **IV. Conclusion**

6 Respondents thank the Court for its consideration of this abbreviated submission and respectfully
7 request that the Court deny Petitioner’s requested relief.

8 DATED: December 10, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

9 CRAIG H. MISSAKIAN
United States Attorney

10 /s/ William Skewes-Cox

11 WILLIAM SKEWES-COX
Special Assistant United States Attorney

12 Attorneys for Respondents
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28