

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

JHAIR ABADIA VICTORIA,

Petitioner,

v.

PAMELA BONDI, ATTORNEY
GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
et al.,

Respondents.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action 4:25-cv-05890

**RESPONSE TO THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
AND MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

The Government¹ hereby responds to Petitioner Jhair Abadia Victoria's habeas petition and respectfully requests that this Court deny his petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and grant summary judgment for the Government under Federal Rule of Civil procedure 56. For the reasons discussed in this response, the Court should also deny the TRO request.

Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), based on the statute's plain language and structure, the history of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), and persuasive decisions from other district courts, including the recent decision in *Cabanas v. Bondi*, No. 4:25-CV-04830, 2025 WL 3171331 (S.D. Tex. Nov. 13, 2025) (J. Eskridge).

¹ The proper respondent in a habeas petition is the person with custody over the petitioner. 28 U.S.C. § 2242; *see also* § 2243; *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 435 (2004). That said, it is the named federal respondents, not the named warden in this case, who make the custodial decisions regarding aliens detained in immigration custody under Title 8 of the United States Code.

Accordingly, this Court should deny Mr. Abadia's petition and grant summary judgment for the Government.

I. BACKGROUND

Petitioner is a native and citizen of Colombia. Dkt. 1, ¶ 11; Government's Ex. 1, Notice to Appear. In 2022, Petitioner entered the United States without inspection. Dkt. 1, ¶ 12; *Id.* Petitioner was detained by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security ("ICE") and ICE served Petitioner with a Notice to Appear ("NTA") charging him with removability pursuant to Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA") section 212(a)(6)(A)(i), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i), as 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. *Id.* In the NTA, the examining immigration official denied Petitioner admission into the United States, explained the basis for charging Petitioner with being subject to removal, and ordered Petitioner to appear in immigration court on September 19, 2022. *Id.* Petitioner applied for asylum on or around October 2022. Dkt. 1, ¶ 13. On December 13, 2023, an Immigration Judge (IJ) denied Petitioner's request for asylum, found Petitioner removable under section 212(a)(6)(A)(i) and ordered Petitioner removed to Colombia. Dkt. 1, ¶ 14, Government's Ex. 2, IJ's Order for Removal². On December 29, 2023, Petitioner appealed the IJ's order for removal with the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). Dkt. 1, ¶ 15; Dkt. 1-2. Petitioner's appeal to the BIA remains pending. Dkt. 1, ¶ 16. Petitioner was detained on November 19, 2025, and transferred to the Montgomery Processing Center in Conroe, Texas. Dkt. 1, ¶¶ 1, 17.

² The IJ's Order for Removal includes all family members.

II. ARGUMENT

Prior to addressing the merits, the Government acknowledges that this Court has previously rejected its arguments concerning the applicability of § 1225(b)(2). However, the Government, with this motion, requests a reconsideration of that prior ruling. *See Camreta v. Greene*, 563 U.S. 692, 701 n. 7 (2011) (“A decision of a federal district court judge is not binding precedent in either a different judicial district, the same judicial district, or even upon the same judge in a different case.”). For the reasons discussed below, including recent decisions from other courts in the Fifth Circuit and the Southern District of Texas, this Court should reconsider its interpretation of § 1225(b)(2) and find that Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention.

A. PETITIONER IS SUBJECT TO MANDATORY DETENTION UNDER 8 U.S.C. § 1225

Petitioner incorrectly argues that he is being detained pursuant to INA § 241(a)(6), 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6). Dkt. 1, Count Two. Section 241(a) provides for the detention of an alien following entry of a final removal order. However, Petitioner’s Order for Removal is not final because Petitioner appealed the IJ’s decision to the BIA. This appeal remains pending and therefore the removal order is, admittedly, not final. This fact is not contested. Dkt. 1, Count One. Petitioner requests immediate release or an order for an individualized bond hearing before an IJ. Dkt. 1, Request for Relief.

However, Petitioner is detained under INA § 235(b), 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) and his habeas petition should be denied because he falls under the plain language of the mandatory detention provisions in 8 U.S.C. § 1225. Here, Petitioner admits that he is an alien present in the United States who entered the country unlawfully “without inspection.” Dkt. 1, ¶ 12. As

discussed below, an alien “present in the United States who has not been admitted,” is by definition “an applicant for admission.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1). Thus, Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention. *See id.* § 1225(b)(2)(A) (instructing that “the alien *shall* be detained” in the case of “an alien seeking admission” who “is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted” (emphasis added)).

1. The Plain Language and Statutory Structure of the INA

“As usual, we start with the statutory text.” *Restaurant Law Center v. U.S. Dep’t of Labor*, 120 F.4th 163, 177 (5th Cir. 2024). Section 1225(b)(2) provides the following:

in 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 [removal proceedings].

8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). Based on this text, if an alien is an “applicant for admission”, then they are subject to mandatory detention. The INA defines “applicant for admission” as “an alien present in the United States who has not been admitted.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1). Here, Petitioner was not previously admitted into the United States, and the Petitioner is therefore subject to mandatory detention and is not eligible for a bond. *See Cabanas v. Bondi*, No. 4:25-CV-04830, 2025 WL 3171331 (S.D. Tex. Nov. 13, 2025).

2. Persuasive decisions from other district courts.

Although the Government acknowledges that there are many district court decisions holding to the contrary, including orders from this Court,³ the Court should consider the

³ This includes decisions from other courts in the Southern District of Texas. *See, e.g., Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi*, No. CV H-25-3726, 2025 WL 2886346 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 7, 2025)(on appeal); *Fuentes v. Lyons*, 5:25-cv-153 (S.D. Tex. October 16, 2025); *Ortiz v. Bondi*, 5:25-cv-132 (S.D. Tex. October 15, 2025); *Baltazar v. Vasquez*, 25-cv-175 (S.D. Tex. October 14, 2025); *Covarrubias v. Vergara*, 5:25-cv-112 (S.D. Texas October 8, 2025).

recent decisions of several district courts that have adopted the Government's and the BIA's interpretation.⁴

Another court in the Southern District of Texas decided *Cabanas v. Bondi*, No. 4:25-CV-04830, 2025 WL 3171331 (S.D. Tex. Nov. 13, 2025), in the Government's favor. In denying the habeas petition and granting the Government's motion for summary judgment, the *Cabanas* Court held "[t]he text of § 1225(b)(2)(A) supports the Government's position." The *Cabanas* Court reasoned that "[t]he statutory definition of *applicant for admission* is broad and, indeed, so broad that Petitioner doesn't dispute that she is such a person. . . . That factual

⁴ Although many courts originally rejected the Government's interpretation of § 1225(b)(2), including this Court, there is a growing body of case law agreeing with the Government's position. See *Alonzo v. Noem*, -- F. Supp. 3d --, 2025 WL 3208284 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2025) (Shubb, J.); *Andrade v. Patterson*, No. 6:25-cv-01695, 2025 WL 3252707 (W.D. La. Nov. 21, 2025) (Joseph, J.); *Ba v. Dir. of Detroit Field Office*, No. 4:25-CV-02208, 2025 WL 3264535 (N.D. Ohio Nov. 24, 2025) (Calabrese, J.); *Ba v. Dir. of Detroit Field Office*, No. 4:25-CV-02208, 2025 WL 2977712 (N.D. Ohio Oct. 22, 2025) (Calabrese, J.), reconsideration denied, 2025 WL 3264535 (N.D. Ohio Nov. 24, 2025); *Candido v. Bondi*, No. 25-CV-867, 2025 WL 3484932 (W.D.N.Y. Dec. 4, 2025) (Sinatra Jr., J.); *Chavez v. Noem*, -- F. Supp. 3d --, 2025 WL 2730228 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2025) (Bencivengo, J.); *Chen v. Almodovar*, No. 1:25-cv-08350, 2025 WL 3484855 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 4, 2025) (Vyskocil, J.); *Cruz v. Noem*, No. 8:25-CV-02566, 2025 WL 3482630 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 2, 2025) (Blumenfeld Jr., J.); *Garcia v. Immigr. & Customs Enft Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, No. 2:25-CV-1004-KCD-NPM, 2025 WL 3277163 (M.D. Fla. Nov. 25, 2025) (Dudek, J.); *Garibay-Robledo v. Noem*, No. 1:25-CV-177-H, 2025 WL 3264478 (N.D. Tex. Oct. 24, 2025) (Hendrix, J.); *Kum v. Ross*, No. 6:25-CV-00451, 2025 WL 3113646 (W.D. La. Oct. 22, 2025), (Whitehurst, M.J.), report and recommendation adopted, 2025 WL 3113644 (W.D. La. Nov. 6, 2025) (Joseph, J.); *Melgar v. Bondi*, No. 8:25CV555, 2025 WL 3496721 (D. Neb. Dec. 5, 2025) (Buescher, J.); *Mursalin v. Dedos, Warden*, No. 1:25-cv-00681, 2025 WL 3140824 (D.N.M. Nov. 10, 2025) (Strickland, M.J.); *Olalde v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-00168, 2025 WL 3131942 (E.D. Mo. Nov. 10, 2025) (Divine, J.); *Oliveira v. Patterson*, No. 6:25-cv-01463, 2025 WL 3095972 (W.D. La. Nov. 4, 2025) (Joseph, J.); *Pena v. Hyde*, No. 25-cv-11983, 2025 WL 2108913 (D. Mass. July 28, 2025) (Gorton, J.); *Ramos v. Lyons*, No. 2:25-cv-09785, 2025 WL 3199872 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2025) (Wilson, J.); *Rojas v. Olson*, No. 25-cv-1437, 2025 WL 3033967 (E.D. Wis. Oct. 30, 2025) (Ludwig, J.); *Sandoval v. Acuna*, No. 6:25-cv-01467, 2025 WL 3048926 (W.D. La. Oct. 31, 2025) (Joseph, J.); *Suarez v. Noem*, No. 1:25-CV-00202-JMD, 2025 WL 3312168 (E.D. Mo. Nov. 28, 2025) (Divine, J.); *Topal v. Bondi*, No. 1:25-cv-01612, 2025 WL 3486894 (W.D. La. Dec. 3, 2025) (Doughty, J.); *Ugarte-Arenas v. Olson*, No. 25-C-1721, 2025 WL 3514451 (E.D. Wis. Dec. 8, 2025) (Griesbach, J.); *Valencia v. Chestnut*, -- F. Supp. 3d --, 2025 WL 3205133 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2025) (Shubb, J.); *Vargas Lopez v. Trump*, -- F. Supp. 3d --, 2025 WL 2780351 (D. Neb. Sept. 30, 2025) (Buescher, J.).

determination itself resolves the question as to whether § 1225(b)(2)(A) applies.” *Id.* at *4 (emphasis in original). Thus, the *Cabanas* Court held that the plain language of the Immigration and Nationality Act required a ruling in the Government’s favor. The court also explained why it was not persuaded by the many other district court decisions deciding to the contrary. *Id.* at * 5; *see also Jimenez v. Thompson*, No. 4:25-CV-05026, 2025 WL 3265493, at *1 (S.D. Tex. Nov. 24, 2025).

In addition to the statutory arguments, Petitioner asserts a Due Process claim which does not have merit. Petitioner argues that his detention without a bond violates Due Process. This type of conclusory assertion, which merely reasserts a disagreement with the Government’s application of § 1225(b)(2), does not establish a valid Due Process claim. *See Cabanas*, 2025 WL 3171331, at *7 (S.D. Tex.).

The Government requests this Court follow the reasoning of *Cabanas* and the Government’s other proffered authorities.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Government respectfully requests that the Court deny Petitioner’s request for habeas relief and grant the instant motion. The Court should enter judgment as a matter of law finding that Petitioner is lawfully subject to mandatory detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).

Dated: December 17, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

NICHOLAS J. GANJEI
United States Attorney
Southern District of Texas

By: *s/Hilda M. Garcia Concepcion*
HILDA M GARCIA CONCEPCION
Assistant United States Attorney
S.D. Tex. ID. No. 3399716
1000 Louisiana, Suite 2300
Houston, Texas 77002
Telephone: (713)567-9529
Facsimile: (713) 718-3300
E-mail: Hilda.garcia.concepcion@usdoj.gov
Counsel for Federal Respondents

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that, on December 17, 2025, the foregoing was filed and served on all attorneys of record via the District's ECF system.

s/Hilda M. Garcia Concepcion
HILDA M GARCIA CONCEPCION
Assistant United States Attorney