ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney
ROBBIN O. LEE
New York Bar No. 5738067
ERIN M. DIMBLEBY
California Bar No. 323359
Assistant U.S. Attorneys
Office of the U.S. Attorney
880 Front Street, Room 6293
San Diego, CA 92101-8893
Telephone: (619) 546-7462
Facsimile: (619) 546-7751
Email: robbin.lee@usdoj.gov
Email: erin.dimbleby@usdoj.gov
Attorneys for Respondents

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

RAMUDIN MOHAMMADI,

Petitioner,

v.

CHRISTOPHER LAROSE, et al.,

Respondents.

Case No. 3:25-cv-03450-JES-BJW

**RESPONDENTS' RETURN TO HABEAS PETITION**

## I. Introduction and Summary of Argument

Petitioner is currently detained in Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) custody pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). Petitioner's habeas petition seeks release. Through multiple provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1252, Congress has stripped federal courts of jurisdiction over challenges to the commencement of removal proceedings, including the consequent detention pending removal proceedings. Moreover, Petitioner's detention is mandated by statute. The Court should deny and dismiss the petition.

## II. Factual Background[1]

Petitioner is a citizen and national of Afghanistan. On August 28, 2021, Petitioner was granted parole, under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5), valid until August 28, 2025. *See* Ex. 1 at 1. On November 28, 2025, Petitioner was apprehended and detained by ICE/Enforcement Removal Operations. At the time of re-detention, DHS issued and served on Petitioner, a Notice to Appear (NTA), which commended removal proceedings against Petitioner. *See* Ex 2 at 4. On December 9, 2025, DHS filed a Form I-261, correctly charging Petitioner as inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(7)(A)(i)(I), as an alien not in possession of an unexpired immigrant visa, reentry permit, border crossing card, or other valid entry document required by the Immigration and Nationality. *See* Ex. 1 at 2. Petitioner remains detained at the Otay Mesa Detention Center and is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).

## III. Statutory Background

### A. Individuals Seeking Admission to the United States

For over a century, this country's immigration laws have authorized immigration officials to charge noncitizens as removable from the country, arrest those subject to removal, and detain them during removal proceedings. *See Abel v. United States*, 362 U.S. 217, 232–37 (1960). "The rule has been clear for decades: '[d]etention during

[1] The attached exhibits are true copies, with redactions of information, of documents obtained from agency counsel.

deportation proceedings [i]s ... constitutionally valid.'" *Banyee v. Garland*, 115 F.4th 928 (8th Cir. 2024) (quoting *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 523 (2003)), *rehearing by panel and en banc denied*, *Banyee v. Bondi*, No. 22-2252, 2025 WL 837914 (8th Cir. Mar. 18, 2025); *see Carlson v. Landon*, 342 U.S. 524, 538 (1952) ("Detention is necessarily a part of this deportation procedure."); *Demore*, 538 U.S. at 523 n.7 ("In fact, prior to 1907 there was no provision permitting bail for *any* aliens during the pendency of their deportation proceedings.") (emphasis in original). The Supreme Court even recognized that removal proceedings "'would be [in] vain if those accused could not be held in custody pending the inquiry into their true character.'" *Demore*, 538 U.S. at 523 (quoting *Wong Wing v. United States*, 163 U.S. 228, 235 (1896)). Over the century, Congress has enacted a multi-layered statutory scheme for the civil detention of aliens pending a decision on removal, during the administrative and judicial review of removal orders, and in preparation for removal. *See generally* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225, 1226, 1231. It is the interplay between these statutes that is at issue here.

**B. Detention Under 8 U.S.C. § 1225**

"To implement its immigration policy, the Government must be able to decide (1) who may enter the country and (2) who may stay here after entering." *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 286 (2018). Section 1225 governs inspection, the initial step in this process, *id.*, stating that all "applicants for admission . . . shall be inspected by immigration officers." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3). The statute—in a provision entitled "ALIENS TREATED AS APPLICANTS FOR ADMISSION"—dictates who "shall be deemed for purposes of this chapter an applicant for admission," defining that term to encompass *both* an alien "present in the United States who has not been admitted *or* [one] who arrives in the United States . . . ." *Id.* § 1225(a)(1) (emphasis added). Section 1225(b) governs the inspection procedures applicable to all applicants for admission. They "fall into one of two categories, those covered by § 1225(b)(1) and those covered by § 1225(b)(2)." *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287.

Section 1225(b)(1) applies to arriving aliens and "certain other" aliens "initially determined to be inadmissible due to fraud, misrepresentation, or lack of valid documentation." *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287; 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i), (iii). These aliens are generally subject to expedited removal proceedings. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i). But if the alien "indicates an intention to apply for asylum . . . or a fear of persecution," immigration officers will refer the alien for a credible fear interview. *Id.* § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii). An alien "with a credible fear of persecution" is "detained for further consideration of the application for asylum." *Id.* § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii). If the alien does not indicate an intent to apply for asylum, express a fear of persecution, or is "found not to have such a fear," they are detained until removed from the United States. *Id.* §§ 1225(b)(1)(A)(i), (B)(iii)(IV).

Section 1225(b)(2) is "broader" and "serves as a catchall provision." *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287. It "applies to all applicants for admission not covered by § 1225(b)(1)." *Id.* Under § 1225(b)(2), an alien "who is an applicant for admission" shall be detained for a removal proceeding "if the examining immigration officer determines that [the] alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A); *see Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216, 220 (BIA 2025) ("[A]liens who are present in the United States without admission are applicants for admission as defined under section 235(b)(2)(A) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), and must be detained for the duration of their removal proceedings."); *Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. 66, 68 (BIA 2025) ("for aliens arriving in and seeking admission into the United States who are placed directly in full removal proceedings, section 235(b)(2)(A) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), mandates detention 'until removal proceedings have concluded.'") (citing *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 299). However, DHS has the sole discretionary authority to temporarily release on parole "any alien applying for admission to the United States" on a "case-by-case basis for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit." *Id.* § 1182(d)(5)(A); *see Biden v. Texas*, 597 U.S. 785, 806 (2022).

**C. Detention Under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)**

Section 1226 provides for arrest and detention "pending a decision on whether the alien is to be removed from the United States." 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). Under § 1226(a), the government may detain an alien during his removal proceedings, release him on bond, or release him on conditional parole. By regulation, immigration officers can release an alien who demonstrates that he "would not pose a danger to property or persons" and "is likely to appear for any future proceeding." 8 C.F.R. § 236.1(c)(8). An alien can also request a custody redetermination (i.e., a bond hearing) by an IJ at any time before a final order of removal is issued. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a); 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1(d)(1), 1236.1(d)(1), 1003.19.

At a custody redetermination, the IJ may continue detention or release the alien on bond or conditional parole. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a); 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(d)(1). IJs have broad discretion in deciding whether to release an alien on bond. *In re Guerra*, 24 I&N Dec. 37, 39-40 (BIA 2006) (listing nine factors for IJs to consider). But regardless of the factors IJs consider, an alien "who presents a danger to persons or property should not be released during the pendency of removal proceedings." *Id.* at 38.

Section 1226(a) does not grant "any *right* to release on bond." *Matter of D-J-*, 23 I&N Dec. at 575 (citing *Carlson v. Landon*, 342 U.S. 524, 534 (1952) (emphasis in original). Nor does it address the applicable burden of proof or particular factors that must be considered. *See generally* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). Rather, it grants DHS and the Attorney General broad discretionary authority to determine, after arrest, whether to detain or release an alien during his or her removal proceedings. *See id.* If, after the bond hearing, either party disagrees with the decision of the IJ, that party may appeal the decision to the BIA. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1(d)(3), 1003.19(f), 1003.38, 1236.1(d)(3).

Included within the Attorney General and DHS's discretionary authority are limits on the delegation to the immigration court. Under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(h)(2)(i)(B), the IJ does not have authority to redetermine the conditions of custody imposed by DHS for any arriving alien. The regulations also include a provision that allows DHS to

invoke an automatic stay of any decision by an IJ to release an individual on bond when DHS files an appeal of the custody redetermination. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(i)(2) ("The decision whether or not to file [an automatic stay] is subject to the discretion of the Secretary.").

**D. Review Before the Board of Immigration Appeals**

The BIA is an appellate body within the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) and possesses delegated authority from the Attorney General. 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.1(a)(1), (d)(1). The BIA is "charged with the review of those administrative adjudications under the [INA] that the Attorney General may by regulation assign to it," including IJ custody determinations. 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.1(d)(1), 236.1, 1236.1. The BIA not only resolves particular disputes before it, but is also directed to, "through precedent decisions, [] provide clear and uniform guidance to DHS, the immigration judges, and the general public on the proper interpretation and administration of the [INA] and its implementing regulations." *Id.* § 1003.1(d)(1). Decisions rendered by the BIA are final, except for those reviewed by the Attorney General. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(d)(7).

If an automatic stay of a custody decision is invoked by DHS, regulations require the BIA to track the progress of the custody appeal "to avoid unnecessary delays in completing the record for decision." 8 C.F.R. § 1003.6(c)(3). The stay lapses in 90 days, unless the detainee seeks an extension of time to brief the custody appeal, 8 C.F.R. § 1003.6(c)(4), or unless DHS seeks, and the BIA grants, a discretionary stay. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.6(c)(5).

If the BIA denies DHS's custody appeal, the automatic stay remains in effect for five business days. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.6(d). DHS may, during that five-day period, refer the case to the Attorney General under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(h)(1) for consideration. *Id.* Upon referral to the Attorney General, the release is stayed for 15 business days while the case is considered. The Attorney General may extend the stay of release upon motion by DHS. *Id.*

## IV. Argument

### A. Petitioner Brings Improper Habeas Claims

To the extent Petitioner bases his claims on applications for relief from removal and removal proceedings, such claims are an improper basis for habeas review. An individual may seek habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 if he is "in custody" under federal authority "in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c). But habeas relief is available to challenge only the legality or duration of confinement. *Pinson v. Carvajal*, 69 F.4th 1059, 1067 (9th Cir. 2023); *Crawford v. Bell*, 599 F.2d 890, 891 (9th Cir. 1979); *Dep't of Homeland Security v. Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 117 (2020) (The writ of habeas corpus historically "provide[s] a means of contesting the lawfulness of restraint and securing release."). To determine if a claim sounds in habeas jurisdiction, the court considers "whether, based on the allegations in the petition, release is *legally required* irrespective of the relief requested." *Pinson*, 69 F.4th at 1072 (emphasis in original); *see also Nettles v. Grounds*, 830 F.3d 922, 934 (9th Cir. 2016) (The key inquiry is whether success on the petitioner's claim would "necessarily lead to immediate or speedier release."). Here, a review of such claims would not automatically entitle him to release from detention. *See Guselnikov v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-1971-BTM-KSC, 2025 WL 2300783, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 8, 2025) (finding petitioners' claims did not arise under § 2241 because they were not arguing they were unlawfully in custody and receiving the requested relief would not entitle them to release); *Giron Rodas v. Lyons*, No. 25cv1912-LL-AHG, 2025 WL 2300781, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2025) ("Like in *Pinson*, the Court lacks jurisdiction over Petitioner's § 2241 habeas petition since it cannot be fairly read as attacking 'the legality or duration of confinement.'") (quoting *Pinson*, 69 F.4th at 1065).

While Petitioner correctly acknowledges that he is in removal proceedings, he argues that the commencement of such proceedings deprives him "of the bundle of rights associated with his pending asylum application." ECF No. 1 ¶ 58. However, the commencement of removal proceedings is not subject to judicial review. *See* 8 U.S.C.

§ 1252(g) ("[N]o court shall have jurisdiction to hear any cause or claim by or on behalf of any alien arising from the decision or action by the Attorney General to commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders."). Moreover, the filing of Petitioner's NTA simply transferred jurisdiction over Petitioner's asylum application to an immigration judge. *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 208.2(b) ("Immigration judges shall have exclusive jurisdiction over asylum applications filed by an alien who has been served a . . . Notice to Appear."). Within his removal proceedings under § 1229a, Petitioner may apply for relief from removal with an immigration judge, including asylum under 8 U.S.C. § 1158, withholding of removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(3), and relief under the Convention Against Torture.

Moreover, under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9), "[j]udicial review of all questions of law and fact . . . *arising from any action taken or proceeding brought to remove an alien from the United States* under this subchapter shall be available only in judicial review of a final order under this section." Further, judicial review of a final order is available only through "a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals." 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(5). The Supreme Court has made clear that § 1252(b)(9) is "the unmistakable 'zipper' clause," channeling "judicial review of all" "decisions and actions leading up to or consequent upon final orders of deportation," including "non-final order[s]," into proceedings before a court of appeals. *Reno*, 525 U.S. at 483, 485; *see J.E.F.M. v. Lynch*, 837 F.3d 1026, 1031 (9th Cir. 2016) (noting § 1252(b)(9) is "breathtaking in scope and vise-like in grip and therefore swallows up virtually all claims that are tied to removal proceedings"). "Taken together, § 1252(a)(5) and § 1252(b)(9) mean that *any* issue—whether legal or factual—arising from *any* removal-related activity can be reviewed *only* through the [petition for review] PFR process." *J.E.F.M.*, 837 F.3d at 1031 ("[W]hile these sections limit *how* immigrants can challenge their removal proceedings, they are not jurisdiction-stripping statutes that, by their terms, foreclose *all* judicial review of agency actions. Instead, the provisions channel judicial review over final orders of removal to the courts of appeal.") (emphasis in original); *see id.* at

1035 ("§§ 1252(a)(5) and [(b)(9)] channel review of all claims, including policies-and-practices challenges . . . whenever they 'arise from' removal proceedings"). Critically, "1252(b)(9) is a judicial channeling provision, not a claim-barring one." *Aguilar v. ICE*, 510 F.3d 1, 11 (1st Cir. 2007). Indeed, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(D) provides that "[n]othing . . . in any other provision of this chapter . . . shall be construed as precluding review of constitutional claims or questions of law raised upon a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals in accordance with this section." *See also Ajlani v. Chertoff*, 545 F.3d 229, 235 (2d Cir. 2008) ("[J]urisdiction to review such claims is vested exclusively in the courts of appeals[.]"). The petition-for-review process before the court of appeals ensures that noncitizens have a proper forum for claims arising from their immigration proceedings and "receive their day in court." *J.E.F.M.*, 837 F.3d at 1031–32 (internal quotations omitted); *see also Rosario v. Holder*, 627 F.3d 58, 61 (2d Cir. 2010) ("The REAL ID Act of 2005 amended the [INA] to obviate . . . Suspension Clause concerns" by permitting judicial review of "nondiscretionary" BIA determinations and "all constitutional claims or questions of law.").

Thus, Petitioner's claims unrelated to the lawfulness of his current detention do not arise under § 2241 and should be dismissed.

**B. Claims and Requested Relief Jurisdictionally Barred**

Petitioner bears the burden of establishing that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over asserted claims. *See Ass'n of Am. Med. Coll. v. United States*, 217 F.3d 770, 778-79 (9th Cir. 2000); *Finley v. United States*, 490 U.S. 545, 547-48 (1989).

Courts lack jurisdiction over any claim or cause of action arising from any decision to commence or adjudicate removal proceedings or execute removal orders. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) ("[N]o court shall have jurisdiction to hear any cause or claim by or on behalf of any alien arising from the decision or action by the Attorney General to *commence proceedings*, *adjudicate cases*, or execute removal orders.") (emphasis added). Section 1252(g) also bars district courts from hearing challenges to the method

by which the government chooses to commence removal proceedings, including the decision to detain an alien pending removal. *See Alvarez v. ICE*, 818 F.3d 1194, 1203 (11th Cir. 2016) ("By its plain terms, [§ 1252(g)] bars us from questioning ICE's discretionary decisions to commence removal" and bars review of "ICE's decision to take [plaintiff] into custody and to detain him during his removal proceedings").

Removal proceedings commence by the filing of a notice to appear in immigration court. *See Jimenez-Angeles v. Ashcroft*, 291 F.3d 594, 600 (9th Cir. 2002). "The Attorney General may arrest the alien against whom proceedings are commenced and detain that individual until the conclusion of those proceedings." *Herrera-Correra v. United States*, No. 08-2941 DSF (JCx), 2008 WL 11336833, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2008). "[A]n alien's detention throughout this process arises from the Attorney General's decision to commence proceedings." *Id.* (citing *Sissoko v. Rocha*, 509 F.3d 947, 949 (9th Cir. 2007)); 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g); *but see Vasquez Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02180-DMS-MMP, 2025 WL 2549431, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025).

Here, Petitioner's claims arise from his detention during removal proceedings, which stem from the Attorney General's decision to commence such proceedings. As such, § 1252(g) bars this Court's review over Petitioner's claims. *See S.Q.D.C. v. Bondi*, No. 25-3348 (PAM/DLM), 2025 WL 2617973, at * 2 (D. Minn. Sept. 9, 2025) (finding that § 1252(g) jurisdictionally bars review of a petitioner's challenge to ongoing detention during removal proceedings).

Moreover, under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9), "[j]udicial review of all questions of law and fact . . . *arising from any action taken or proceeding brought to remove an alien from the United States* under this subchapter shall be available only in judicial review of a final order under this section." (emphasis added). While holding that it was unnecessary to comprehensively address the scope of § 1252(b)(9), the Supreme Court in *Jennings* provided guidance on the types of challenges that may fall within the scope of § 1252(b)(9). *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 293–94. The Court found that "§ 1252(b)(9) [did] not present a jurisdictional bar" in situations where "respondents . . . [were] not

challenging the decision to detain them in the first place." *Id.* at 294–95. In this case, Petitioner does challenge the government's decision to detain him in the first place. Though Petitioner attempts to frame his challenge as one relating to detention authority, rather than a challenge to DHS's decision to detain him in the first instance, such creative framing does not evade the preclusive effect of § 1252(b)(9). Indeed, that Petitioner is challenging the basis upon which he is detained is enough to trigger § 1252(b)(9) because "detention *is* an 'action taken . . . to remove' an alien." *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 319 (emphasis in original); *see also* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9).

The Court should dismiss this matter for lack of jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. *See S.Q.D.C.*, 2025 WL 2617973.[2]

**B. Petitioner is Lawfully Detained**

Petitioner's claims for alleged statutory and constitutional violations fail because he is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225.

While Petitioner was previously released from custody on parole, his parole was terminated and, in any event, has expired. After Petitioner was detained on November 28, 2025, he was served with a Notice to Appear, which served to terminate his parole status. *See* 8 CFR § 212.5(e)(2)(i) ("When a charging document is served on the alien, the charging document will constitute written notice of termination of parole . . . ."). Moreover, Petitioner's grant of parole was valid for only four years and that period has now expired. Ex. 1 at 1 ("Your parole expired on August 28, 2025"). The termination and expiration of his parole emphasizes his status as an applicant for admission, subject

[2] On an alternative basis, the Court should ensure Petitioner properly exhausts administrative remedies. The Ninth Circuit requires that "habeas petitioners exhaust available judicial and administrative remedies before seeking relief under § 2241." *Castro–Cortez v. INS*, 239 F.3d 1037, 1047 (9th Cir. 2001). "When a petitioner does not exhaust administrative remedies, a district court ordinarily should either dismiss the petition without prejudice or stay the proceedings until the petitioner has exhausted remedies, unless exhaustion is excused." *Leonardo v. Crawford*, 646 F.3d 1157, 1160 (9th Cir. 2011); *see also Alvarado v. Holder*, 759 F.3d 1121, 1127 n.5 (9th Cir. 2014) (issue exhaustion is a jurisdictional requirement); *Tijani v. Holder*, 628 F.3d 1071, 1080 (9th Cir. 2010) (no jurisdiction to review legal claims not presented in the petitioner's administrative proceedings before the BIA).

to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A) (". . . *such parole of such alien shall not be regard as an admission* of the alien and when the purposes of such parole shall . . . have been served the alien shall forthwith return or be return to the custody from which he was paroled and thereafter his case shall continue to be dealt with in the same manner as that of any other *applicant for admission* to the United States") (emphasis added).

Section 1225(b)(2)(A) requires mandatory detention 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[.]'" *Chavez v. Noem*, No. 3:25-cv-02325, 2025 WL 2730228, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2025) (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)) (emphasis in original). Section 1225(a)(1) "expressly defines that '[a]n alien present in the United States who has not been admitted ... shall be deemed for purposes of this Act *an applicant for admission*.'" *Id.* (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1)) (emphasis in original).

Here, Petitioner is an alien present in the United States who has not been admitted. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A) ("such parole of such alien shall not be regarded as an admission of the alien."). Thus, as found by the district court in *Chavez v. Noem* and as mandated by the plain language of the statute, Petitioner is an "applicant for admission" and subject to the mandatory detention provisions of § 1225(b)(2).

Because Petitioner is properly detained under § 1225, he cannot show entitlement to relief.

## IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Respondents respectfully request that the Court dismiss this action.

DATED: December 11, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney

*s/ Robbin Lee*
ROBBIN O. LEE
Assistant United States Attorney

Attorneys for Respondents