

1 Erica Sanchez, Of Counsel
2 Shefer Law Firm, P.A.
3 800 SE 4th. Ave #803
4 Hallandale Beach, Florida 33009
5 Telephone: (480) 866-1111
6 erica@shefer.legal
7 Arizona Bar #027107
8 Attorney for Petitioner

9
10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

12 **Remigio Gomez-Marroquin,**
13 **Petitioner,**

14 v.

15 **Kristi Noem**, Secretary of the United States
16 Department of Homeland Security, in her official
17 capacity; **Todd Lyons**, Acting Director U.S.
18 Immigration and Customs Enforcement, in his official
19 capacity; **John Cantu**, Field Office Director for ICE's
20 Enforcement and Removal Operation's ("ERO") Field
21 Office, in his official capacity; **Sirce Owen**, Acting
22 Director of Executive Office for Immigration Review,
23 in her official capacity; **Fred Figueroa**, Warden of the
24 Eloy Detention Center, in his official capacity,
25 **Respondents.**

Case No.

Agency No. 

**PETITION FOR WRIT
OF HABEAS CORPUS
PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C.
§2241**

26 **INTRODUCTION**

27 The Respondents are unlawfully detaining Petitioner Remigio Gomez-
28 Marroquin, at the Eloy Detention Center, due to the Department of Homeland Security
(DHS) recently changed its long-standing position with regard to the status of mandatory
detention. See, ICE Memo: Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for
Applications for Admission filed herewith as Exhibit 1. The Bureau of Immigration

1 Appeals (BIA) issued a precedential decision on September 5, 2025, holding that all
2 noncitizens present in the United States without admission – no matter how long they
3 have resided here – are still “applicants for admission” under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a) and
4 not entitled to bond hearings because they are subject to mandatory detention under §
5 1225(b)(2)(A). *See, Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (B.I.A. 2025) filed
6 herewith as Exhibit 2.
7

8
9 But this interpretation of the Immigration and Naturalization Act (INA) violates
10 both procedural and substantive Fifth Amendment protections, ignores the plain
11 statutory language of both § 1225 and § 1226, and is contrary to numerous recent Federal
12 Court decisions in this District that have rejected these exact arguments. *See e.g.*
13 10/3/2025 Order entered in *Francisco Echevarria v. Pam Bondi, et al.*, CV-25-03252-
14 PHX-DWL (ESW), (D. Ariz. 10/3/2025), filed herewith as Exhibit 16.
15

16
17 Petitioner filed an Application for Cancellation of Removal for Certain
18 Nonpermanent Residents, which shows that he has been living in the United States for
19 21 years. He is the sole emotional and financial support for his ten-year-old U.S. citizen
20 daughter. *See*, Petitioner’s Affidavit, filed herewith as Exhibit 4. Further, when
21 Respondents issued a Notice to Appear, it identified Petitioner as an “alien present in
22 the United States” despite “arriving alien” being an option. *See*, Petitioner’s Notice to
23 Appear, filed herewith as Exhibit 5.
24

25
26 In addition to BIA decisions not being binding precedent upon this Court, the
27 Supreme Court decision last year in *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S.
28 369, 400 (2024), made clear that federal courts must independently interpret statutes and

1 no longer defer under so-called “Chevron deference.” This Court is therefore in the best
2 position to determine whether the Respondents are misinterpreting the relevant federal
3 statutes and improperly denying alien detainees bond hearings on the grounds that they
4 are all subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). The petition for writ of
5 habeas corpus should be granted.
6

7 **JURISDICTION & CUSTODY**

8
9 1. Petitioner Remigio Gomez-Marroquin, is in the physical custody of
10 Respondents and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), an agency within the
11 Department of Homeland Security.
12

13 2. Petitioner is currently detained at Eloy Detention Center and is under
14 the direct control of Respondents and their agents.

15 3. This action arises under the Constitution of the United States and 8
16 U.S.C. § 1101 et seq.
17

18 4. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, Art. I § 9, cl. 2 of
19 the United States Constitution, 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and the common law. This Court may
20 grant relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §
21 2201 *et seq.*, and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.
22

23 5. Congress has preserved judicial review of challenges to immigration
24 detention. *See Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 122, 130-131 (2018) (holding that 8
25 U.S.C. §§ 1226(e) and 1252(b)(9) do not bar review of challenges to prolonged
26 immigration detention).
27
28

1 12. Respondent DHS is a federal executive agency responsible for, among
2 other things, enforcing federal immigration laws and overseeing lawful immigration to
3 the United States. Respondent DHS is a legal custodian of Petitioner.
4

5 13. Respondent Todd M. Lyons is Acting Director and Senior Official
6 Performing the Duties of the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement
7 (“ICE”). Respondent Lyons is responsible for ICE’s policies, practices, and procedures,
8 including those relating to the detention of immigrants during their removal procedures.
9 Respondent Lyons is a legal custodian of Petitioner. Respondent Lyons is sued in his
10 official capacity.
11

12 14. Respondent ICE is a federal law enforcement agency within DHS.
13 Respondent ICE is responsible for the enforcement of immigration laws, including the
14 detention and removal of immigrants. Respondent ICE is a legal custodian of Petitioner.
15


16 15. Respondent John Cantu is Field Office Director for ICE’s Enforcement
17 and Removal Operation’s (“ERO”) Field Office. Respondent Cantu is a legal custodian
18 of Petitioner and is sued in his official capacity.
19

20 16. Respondent Fred Figueroa is the Warden of the Eloy Detention Center.
21 Respondent Figueroa is a legal custodian of Petitioner. Respondent Figueroa is sued in
22 his official capacity.
23

24 17. Respondent Sirce Owen is the Acting Director of the Executive Office
25 for Immigration Review (EOIR), a federal agency within the U.S. Department of Justice.
26 Respondent EOIR is responsible for the administration of immigration courts, and
27
28

1 acceptance of forms and petitions related to adjudication of immigration claims, as well
2 as motions for bond. Respondent Sirce Owen is sued in her official capacity.

3
4 **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

5 18. Petitioner Remigio Gomez-Marroquin was born on  in
6 San Juan Ostuncalco, Quetzaltenango, Guatemala.

7
8 19. Petitioner Remigio Gomez-Marroquin last entered the United States on
9 December 5, 2007.

10 20. Respondents arrested Petitioner on September 7, 2025. *See* Petitioner's
11 Notice to Appear, filed herewith as Exhibit 5.

12
13 21. Petitioner was issued a Notice to Appear which identified him as an
14 "alien present in the United States" even though "arriving alien" was an alternate option.
15 *Id.*

16 22. Petitioner is detained at the Eloy Detention Center where he remains
17 in custody. *See* ICE Online Detainee Locator Printout, filed herewith as Exhibit 3.

18
19 23. Petitioner has been living in the United States for 21 years and has filed
20 an Application for Cancellation of Removal for Certain Nonpermanent Residents on
21 November 24, 2025. *See*, Cover: Petitioner's Application for Cancellation of Removal
22 for Certain Nonpermanent Residents, filed herewith as Exhibit 6. Petitioner is eligible
23 for Cancellation of Removal due to his family ties and longtime presence in the United
24 States.
25
26

27 24. Petitioner has no criminal history in the U.S. or otherwise.
28

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

1
2 25. The length of time that a petitioner has been living in the United States
3 is a constitutionally relevant consideration, because “once an alien enters the country,
4 the legal circumstance changes, for the Due Process Clause applies to all ‘persons’
5 within the United States, including aliens, whether their presence here is lawful,
6 unlawful, temporary, or permanent.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001). It
7 is therefore reasonable to read these statutes “against [that] backdrop.” *See Hewitt v.*
8 *United States*, 605 U.S. —, 145 S. Ct. 2165, 2173 (2025).

9
10
11 26. Due process thus requires “adequate procedural protections” to ensure
12 that the government’s asserted justification for a noncitizen’s physical confinement
13 “outweighs the individual’s constitutionally protected interest in avoiding physical
14 restraint.” *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690 (internal quotation marks omitted).

15
16
17 27. In the immigration context, the Supreme Court has recognized only
18 two valid purposes for civil detention: to mitigate the risks of danger to the community
19 and to prevent flight. *Id.*; *Demore*, 538 U.S. at 528. The government may not detain a
20 noncitizen based on any other justification.

21
22 28. Congress has granted the Attorney General discretion to decide
23 whether to detain or release certain noncitizens pending a removal decision. *See* 8 U.S.C.
24 § 1226(a). The Attorney General has delegated that authority to IJs. 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19,
25 1236.1.

26
27 29. On July 8, 2025, DHS adopted a new policy on mandatory detention
28 for noncitizens who have been residing in the United States. *See*, ICE Memo: Interim

1 Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applications for Admission filed herewith
2 as Exhibit 1.

3
4 30. On September 5, 2025, the BIA entered the precedential decision
5 *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (B.I.A. 2025), filed herewith as Exhibit 2,
6 which holds that all noncitizens who enter without inspection are “applicants for
7 admission” under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a) and therefore subject to mandatory detention under
8 § 1225(b)(2), without regard for the length of time they have lived in the United States.
9

10 31. The Ninth Circuit has held that § 1226(a) is the “default” detention
11 statute for aliens in removal proceedings “[8 U.S.C. §1226(a) (“Subsection A”)] is the
12 default detention statute for noncitizens in removal proceedings and applies to
13 noncitizens “[e]xcept as provided in [Subsection C].” 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).” *Avilez v.*
14 *Garland*, 69 F. 4th 525, 529-530 (9th Cir. 2022). *Accord, Rodriguez Diaz v. Garland*,
15 83 F. 4th 1177, 1179 (9th Cir. 2023); *Sarr v. Scott*, 765 F. Supp. 3d 1091, 1095 (WD
16 Wash. 2025); *Prieto-Romero v. Clark*, 534 F.3d 1053, 1057 (9th Cir. 2008). *Casas-*
17 *Castrillon v. DHS*, 535 F.3d 942 (9th Cir. 2008).
18
19

20 32. Almost every Federal District Court that has considered the issue has
21 found that DHS’s interpretation defies the INA. In Arizona, the following decisions so
22 find and collect the cases from other district courts around the country:
23

- 24 a. 11/26/2025 Order granting habeas in *Luna-Gonzalez v. Noem*, et al., Case
25 No. 25-cv-03794-PHX (D. Ariz 11-26-25)(The court rejected the
26 government’s argument that the petitioner is an “arriving alien” subject to
27 mandatory detention under § 1225 and agrees instead with the growing
28 majority of courts that people like the petitioner—who were arrested

1 inside the United States long after entering—are detained under § 1226(a),
2 not § 1225.), gathering cases, filed with the Habeas Petition as Exhibit 7;

- 3
4 b. 11/24/25 Order granting habeas in *Padron-Carreron v. Noem, et al.*, Case
5 No. 25-cv-04204-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-25-25)(“Respondents correctly
6 acknowledge that their view still represents the minority position—in the
7 weeks since the Court considered the issue in *Echevarria*, dozens of other
8 courts have reached the same conclusion... [that] § 1226(a)’s application
9 for the past three decades supports its application to noncitizens in
10 petitioner’s position”), gathering cases, filed with the Habeas Petition as
11 Exhibit 8;
- 12 c. 11/18/2025 Order granting habeas in *Rodrigues da Silva v. Figueroa, et*
13 *al.*, Case No. 25-cv-04015-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-18-25)(“dozens of other
14 district courts have concluded individuals like Petitioner are subject to §
15 1226 and not § 1225 and, therefore, are not subject to mandatory
16 detention”), gathering cases, filed with the Habeas Petition as Exhibit 9;
- 17 d. 11/13/2025 Order granting habeas in *Perez Rodriguez v. Noem, et al.*, Case
18 No. 25-cv-03921-PHX (D. Ariz. 11/13/2025)(“the vast majority of courts
19 concluded individuals like Petitioner are subject to § 1226 and not § 1225
20 and, therefore, are not subject to mandatory detention”), gathering cases,
21 filed with the Habeas Petition as Exhibit 10
- 22 e. 11/6/25 Order granting habeas in *Gonzalez Rodriguez v. Bondi, et al.*, Case
23 No. 25-cv-03917-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-6-25)(“dozens of other district courts
24 have concluded individuals like Petitioner are subject to § 1226 and not §
25 1225 and, therefore, are not subject to mandatory detention”), gathering
26 cases, filed with the Habeas Petition as Exhibit 11
- 27 f. 11/6/2025 Order Granting Habeas in *Abrego-Zarate v. Noem, et al.*, Case
28 No. 25-cv-03564-KML (D. Ariz. 11-6-25)(“the great weigh of authority
is that individuals like petitioner are not subject to mandatory detention.
This court agrees with the majority view. For these reasons, the petition is
granted, and petitioner must receive a bond hearing without application of
Matter of Yajure Hurtado, 29 I&N 216 (B.I.A. 2025.”), filed herewith as
Exhibit 12.

- 1
- 2 g. 11/03/25 Order granting habeas petition in *Lopez-Cruz v. Noem, et al.*, No. 2:25-cv-03566-DJH--ASB (D. Ariz. 11/3/2025)(“dozens of other district
- 3 courts have concluded individuals like Petitioner are subject to § 1226 and
- 4 not § 1225 and, therefore, are not subject to mandatory detention. This
- 5 Court agrees with this conclusion.”), filed herewith as Exhibit 13.
- 6
- 7 h. 10/22/2025 Order granting habeas in *Garcia-Rosales v. Noem, et al.*, No. 2:25-cv-03391-SHD-DMF at page 2 (D. Ariz. Oct. 22, 2025)(“while
- 8 Respondents point to two district court opinions adopting their
- 9 interpretation of § 1225(b)(2)(A), myriad other district courts have
- 10 reached the same conclusion as *Echevarria* and held individuals like
- 11 Petitioner are not subject to mandatory detention under 1225(b)(2)(A)”),
- 12 filed herewith as Exhibit 14.
- 13
- 14 i. 10/17/2025 Order granting habeas corpus in *Benitez-Cornejo v. Cantu, et*
- 15 *al.*, No. 2:25-cv-03672 (D. Arizona Oct. 17, 2025)(“individuals like
- 16 Petitioner are not “arriving aliens” subject to mandatory detention but,
- 17 rather, are subject to the general removal statute, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)”),
- 18 filed herewith as Exhibit 15.
- 19
- 20 j. 10/09/2025 Order granting habeas entered in *Hector Lopez-Melo v. Bondi,*
- 21 *et. al.*, Case No. Case 2:25-cv-03394-DJH--JZB (D. Ariz.
- 22 10/9/2025)(“petitioner, who had been present in the United States for
- 23 years, was not an applicant for admission under 1225(b)(2)(A) or subject
- 24 to mandatory detention”), filed herewith as Exhibit 16.
- 25
- 26 k. 10/07/2025 Order granting habeas corpus in *Bo Li v. Cantu, et al.*, No. CV-25-02989-PHX-SPL (D Arizona 10/07/2025)(“Respondents maintain
- 27 he is subject to mandatory detention under 1225(b)(2). Again,
- 28 Respondents are mistaken.”), filed herewith as Exhibit 17.
- 29
- 30 l. 10/3/2025 Order granting habeas corpus in *Echevarria v. Bondi, et al.*, No. 2:25-cv-03252-PHX-DWL, 2025 WL 2821282 (D. Ariz. Oct. 3, 2025)(“Court agrees with the majority of courts that have concluded that § 1226(a), rather than § 1225(b)(2)(A), applies in this circumstance.”), filed herewith as Exhibit 18.

1
2 m. 08/11/2025 Magistrate's Report and Recommendation in *Rocha Rosado*
3 *v. Figueroa*, No. CV-25-02157-PHX-DLR 2025 WL 2349133 at *10 (D.
4 Ariz. Aug. 13, 2025)(Magistrate's Report and Recommendation Adopted
5 at 2025 WL 2349133)([t]he text of § 1226, the canons of statutory
6 interpretation, this section's legislative history, and longstanding agency
7 practice indicate that Rosado is subject to § 1226(a)'s 'default' rule for
8 discretionary detention rather than § 1225's mandatory detention
9 requirement, and that the IJ erred by finding they did not have jurisdiction
10 to consider Rosado's detention.") *report and recommendation adopted sub*
11 *nom.* 2025 WL 2349133 (D. Ariz. Aug. 13, 2025), filed herewith as
12 Exhibit 19.

13 33. Petitioner has located only 5 cases holding to the contrary. In *Vargas*
14 *Lopez v. Trump*, --F. Supp. 3d--, 2025 WL 2780351 (D. Neb. Sept. 30, 2025), the court
15 held that Vargas Lopez failed to meet his burden to show that he falls under § 1226(a),
16 so "his Petition fails regardless of the parties' arguments about the scope of § 1225(b)
17 and § 1226(a)." *Vargas Lopez v. Trump*, 2025 WL 2780351 at *7 (emphasis added). In
18 *Chavez v. Noem*, -- F. Supp. 3d --, 2025 WL 2730228 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2025), the
19 court denied a temporary restraining order on the grounds that the petitioners had "not
20 demonstrated serious questions about the application of Section 1225 to aliens present
21 in the United States." *Chavez v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2730228 at *4. However, the court
22 spent less than 2 pages analyzing the statutory language and caselaw before concluding
23 that "Petitioners have not shown either a likelihood of success or serious questions going
24 to the merits [therefore] we do not address the remaining Winter factors." *Chavez v.*
25 *Noem*, 2025 WL 2730228 at *5. *Mejia Olalde v. Noem*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 221830
26 (E.D. Mo. Nov. 10, 2025) was concerned with whether the habeas petition had been
27
28

1 properly filed in that court's jurisdiction and never reached the application of § 1225(b)
2 to the petitioner. *Pipa-Aquise v. Bondi*, No. 25-1094, 2025 WL 2490657 (E.D. Va. Aug.
3 5, 2025) and *Pena v. Hyde*, No. 25-11983, 2025 WL 2108913 (D. Mass. July 28, 2025)
4 were each shorter than two pages long and neither contained any significant analysis.
5 Thus, none of these cases are particularly instructive.
6

7
8 34. In 1997, after Congress amended the INA through the Illegal
9 Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA), EOIR and
10 the then-Immigration and Naturalization Service issued an interim rule to interpret and
11 apply IIRIRA. Specifically, under the heading of "Apprehension, Custody, and
12 Detention of Aliens," the agencies explained that:
13

14 Despite being applicants for admission, aliens who are
15 present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly
16 referred to as aliens who entered without inspection) ***will be***
17 ***eligible*** for bond and bond redetermination.

18 62 Fed. Reg. at 10323 (emphasis added). The agencies thus made clear that
19 individuals who had entered without inspection ***were*** eligible for consideration for
20 bond and bond hearings before IJs under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and its implementing
21 regulations.
22

23 35. Thus, for almost 30 years, all participants in the immigration system
24 have understood that people arrested inside the United States generally fall within §
25 1226 for detention purposes and are therefore required to receive a bond hearing upon
26 request—even if they initially entered the country without permission. *See Martinez v.*
27 *Hyde*, No. 25-11613, 2025 WL 2084238, at *4 n.9 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025) (citing the
28

1 United States Solicitor General’s representation to the Supreme Court at oral argument
2 that “DHS’s long-standing interpretation has been that 1226(a) applies to those who
3 have crossed the border between ports of entry and are shortly thereafter apprehended”).
4

5 36. Despite the overwhelming number of federal cases that have ruled
6 against the government’s position, DHS and DOJ are continuing to systemically
7 misclassify people and unlawfully deny them access to bond hearings and release on
8 bond during the pendency of their immigration proceedings.
9

10 **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**
11 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
12 **Violation of Fifth Amendment – Substantive Due Process**

13 37. Petitioner realleges and incorporates herein the allegations contained
14 in the preceding paragraphs of the petition as if fully set forth herein.
15

16 38. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment forbids the
17 government from depriving any “person” of liberty “without due process of law,”
18 including noncitizens. U.S. Const. amend. V.
19

20 39. Substantive due process asks whether a person’s life, liberty, or
21 property is deprived without sufficient purpose. There is no question that Petitioner has
22 been deprived of his liberty in this case.
23

24 40. The government’s continued detention of Petitioner is not supported
25 by any special interest or compelling justification that outweighs his liberty interest.
26
27
28

1 41. Petitioner's ongoing detention when so many federal courts have held
2 that he is entitled to be considered for release upon posting an appropriate bond under §
3 1226 constitutes prolonged detention and violates his substantive due process rights.
4

5 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
6 **Violation of Fifth Amendment Right - Procedural Due Process**

7 42. Petitioner realleges and incorporates herein the allegations contained
8 in the preceding paragraphs of the petition as if fully set forth herein.
9

10 43. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment guarantees Petitioner
11 the right to procedural due process in seeking a bond redetermination and the
12 government may not unreasonably restrict this right.
13

14 44. The government's knowing misclassification of Petitioner as an
15 "applicant for admission" under § 1225 in order to justify its argument for mandatory
16 detention is not supported by any special interest or compelling justification that
17 outweighs Petitioner's liberty interest.
18

19 45. The continued detention of Petitioner is not supported by any special
20 interest or compelling justification that outweighs his liberty interest.
21

22 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

23 **WHEREFORE** Petitioner Remigio Gomez-Marroquin respectfully requests
24 that the Court grant the following relief:

- 25 1. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
26 2. Order Respondents not to transfer Petitioner out of this District during the
27 pendency of these proceedings, to preserve jurisdiction;
28 3. Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and order

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Respondents to immediately release Petitioner from custody or, in the alternative, order Respondents to provide Petitioner a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226, and without regard to the holding of *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (B.I.A. 2025), within three (3) business days;

4. Award Petitioner reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to the Equal Access to Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2412; and
5. Grant any further relief the Court deems just and proper.

Dated this 9th day of December, 2025.

By: /s/ Erica Sanchez
Erica Sanchez, Esq.
Shefer Law Firm, P.A.
800 SE 4th. Ave #803
Hallandale Beach, Florida 33009
(786) 295-9077
erica@shefer.legal

VERIFICATION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2242

I represent Petitioner Remigio Gomez-Marroquin and submit this verification on his behalf. I hereby verify that the factual statements made in the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated this 9th day of December, 2025.

By: /s/ *Erica Sanchez*
Erica Sanchez, Esq.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1	<u>ICE Memo: Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applications for Admission</u> (last visited September 8, 2025).
Exhibit 2	<i>Matter of Yajure Hurtado</i> , 29 I&N Dec. 216 (B.I.A. 2025).
Exhibit 3	ICE Online Detainee Locator Printout
Exhibit 4	Petitioner's Affidavit
Exhibit 5	Notice to Appear
Exhibit 6	Cover Page: Petitioner's Application for Cancellation of Removal for Certain Nonpermanent Residents
Exhibit 7	Order granting habeas in <i>Luna-Gonzalez v. Noem, et al.</i> , Case No. 25-cv-03794-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-26-25)
Exhibit 8	Order granting habeas in <i>Padron-Carreron v. Noem, et al.</i> , Case No. 25-cv-04204-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-24-25)
Exhibit 9	Order granting habeas in <i>Rodrigues da Silva v. Figueroa, et al.</i> , Case No. 25-cv-04015-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-18-25)
Exhibit 10	Order entered <i>Perez Rodriguez v. Noem, et al.</i> , Case No. 25-cv-03921-PHX (D. Ariz. 11/13/2025)
Exhibit 11	Order entered <i>Gonzalez Rodriguez v. Bondi, et al.</i> , Case No. 25-cv-03917-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-6-25)
Exhibit 12	Order entered in <i>Abrego-Zarate v. Noem, et al.</i> , Case No. 25-cv-03564-KML (D. Ariz. 11-6-25)
Exhibit 13	Order entered in <i>Lopez-Cruz v. Noem, et al.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-03566-DJH--ASB (D. Ariz. 11/3/2025)
Exhibit 14	Order entered in <i>Garcia-Rosales v. Noem, et al.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-03391-SHD—DMF (D. Ariz. Oct. 22, 2025)
Exhibit 15	Order granting habeas corpus in <i>Benitez-Cornejo v. Cantu, et al.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-03672 (D. Arizona Oct. 17, 2025)
Exhibit 16	Order entered in <i>Hector Lopez-Melo v. Bondi, et al.</i> , Case No. Case 2:25-cv-03394-DJH--JZB [docket no. 11] (D.C. Ariz. 10/9/2025)
Exhibit 17	Order granting habeas corpus in <i>Bo Li v. Cantu, et al.</i> , No. CV-25-02989-PHX-SPL (D. Arizona 10/07/2025)
Exhibit 18	Order entered in <i>Francisco Echevarria v. Pam Bondi, et al.</i> , CV-25-03252-PHX-DWL (ESW), (D. Ariz. 10/3/2025)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Exhibit 19	Magistrate's Report and Recommendation in <i>Rocha Rosado v. Figueroa</i> , No. CV-25-02157-PHX-DLR (CDB), 2025 WL 2349133 (D. Ariz. Aug. 13, 2025)
------------	---