

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 **Miguel Eliseo Bernal Ramirez,**
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; **Luis Rosa, Jr.**, Warden of the
24 Florence Correctional 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 Miguel Eliseo Bernal
28 Ramirez, at the Florence Correctional 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

1 Immigration Appeals (BIA) issued a precedential decision on September 5, 2025,
2 holding that all noncitizens present in the United States without admission – no matter
3 how long they have resided here – are still “applicants for admission” under 8 U.S.C. §
4 1225(a) and not entitled to bond hearings because they are subject to mandatory
5 detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). *See, Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216
6 (B.I.A. 2025) filed 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 has been living in the United States for over 10 years and is eligible
18 for cancelation of removal. *See*, Petitioner’s Affidavit , filed herewith as Exhibit 4.
19 Petitioner has no criminal history. Further, when Respondents issued a Notice to
20 Appear, it identified Petitioner as an “alien present in the United States” despite
21 “arriving alien” being an option. *See*, Petitioner’s Notice to Appear, filed herewith as
22 Exhibit 5.
23

24 In addition to BIA decisions not being binding precedent upon this Court, the
25 Supreme Court decision last year in *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S.
26 369, 400 (2024), made clear that federal courts must independently interpret statutes and
27 no longer defer under so-called “Chevron deference.” This Court is therefore in the best
28

1 position to determine whether the Respondents are misinterpreting the relevant federal
2 statutes and improperly denying alien detainees bond hearings on the grounds that they
3 are all subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). The petition for writ of
4 habeas corpus should be granted.
5

6 JURISDICTION & CUSTODY

7
8 1. Petitioner Miguel Eliseo Bernal Ramirez, is in the physical custody of
9 Respondents and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), an agency within the
10 Department of Homeland Security.

11 2. Petitioner is currently detained at Florence Correctional Center and is
12 under the direct control of Respondents and their agents.

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

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

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

26 6. The Court must grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus or order
27 Respondents to show cause “forthwith,” unless the petitioner is not entitled to relief. 28
28

1 U.S.C. § 2243. If an order to show cause is issued, Respondents must file a return
2 “within three days unless for good cause additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is
3 allowed.” *Id.*


4
5 7. The Court has inherent power to release the petitioner pending review
6 of his petition. *See Martin v. Solem*, 801 F.2d 324, 329 (8th Cir. 1986).

7 VENUE

8
9 8. Pursuant to *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410
10 U.S. 484, 493- 500 (1973), venue lies in this Court, the federal judicial district in which
11 Petitioner is currently is in custody.

12
13 9. Venue is also properly in this Court pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1391(e)
14 because Respondents are employees, officers, and agencies of the United States.

15 PARTIES

16
17 10. Petitioner Miguel Eliseo Bernal Ramirez was born on  in
18 Quiche Nebaj, Guatemala and is currently detained by ICE at Florence Correctional
19 Center. *See*, ICE Online Detainee Locator, filed herewith as Exhibit 3.

20
21 11. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of the U.S. Department of
22 Homeland Security (“DHS”). In this capacity, Respondent Noem is a legal custodian of
23 Petitioner. Respondent Noem is sued in her official capacity.

24
25 12. Respondent DHS is a federal executive agency responsible for, among
26 other things, enforcing federal immigration laws and overseeing lawful immigration to
27 the United States. Respondent DHS is a legal custodian of Petitioner.

1 is therefore reasonable to read these statutes “against [that] backdrop.” *See Hewitt v.*
2 *United States*, 605 U.S. —, 145 S. Ct. 2165, 2173 (2025).

3
4 26. Due process thus requires “adequate procedural protections” to ensure
5 that the government’s asserted justification for a noncitizen’s physical confinement
6 “outweighs the individual’s constitutionally protected interest in avoiding physical
7 restraint.” *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690 (internal quotation marks omitted).

8
9 27. In the immigration context, the Supreme Court has recognized only
10 two valid purposes for civil detention: to mitigate the risks of danger to the community
11 and to prevent flight. *Id.*; *Demore*, 538 U.S. at 528. The government may not detain a
12 noncitizen based on any other justification.

13
14 28. Congress has granted the Attorney General discretion to decide
15 whether to detain or release certain noncitizens pending a removal decision. *See* 8 U.S.C.
16 § 1226(a). The Attorney General has delegated that authority to IJs. 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19,
17 1236.1.

18
19 29. On July 8, 2025, DHS adopted a new policy on mandatory detention
20 for noncitizens who have been residing in the United States. *See*, ICE Memo: Interim
21 Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applications for Admission filed herewith
22 as Exhibit 1.

23
24 30. On September 5, 2025, the BIA entered the precedential decision
25 *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (B.I.A. 2025), filed herewith as Exhibit 2,
26 which holds that all noncitizens who enter without inspection are “applicants for
27
28

1 admission" under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a) and therefore subject to mandatory detention under
2 § 1225(b)(2), without regard for the length of time they have lived in the United States.
3

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

14 32. Almost every Federal District Court that has considered the issue has
15 found that DHS’s interpretation defies the INA. In Arizona, the following decisions so
16 find and collect the cases from other district courts around the country:
17

- 18 a. 11/26/2025 Order granting habeas in *Luna-Gonzalez v. Noem*, et al., Case
19 No. 25-cv-03794-PHX (D. Ariz 11-26-25)(The court rejected the
20 government’s argument that the petitioner is an “arriving alien” subject to
21 mandatory detention under § 1225 and agrees instead with the growing
22 majority of courts that people like the petitioner—who were arrested
23 inside the United States long after entering—are detained under § 1226(a),
not § 1225.), gathering cases, filed with the Habeas Petition as Exhibit 6;
- 24 b. 11/24/25 Order granting habeas in *Padron-Carreron v. Noem*, et al., Case
25 No. 25-cv-04204-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-25-25)(“Respondents correctly
26 acknowledge that their view still represents the minority position—in the
27 weeks since the Court considered the issue in Echevarria, dozens of other
28 courts have reached the same conclusion... [that] § 1226(a)’s application
for the past three decades supports its application to noncitizens in

1 petitioner's position"), gathering cases, filed with the Habeas Petition as
2 Exhibit 7;

3 c. 11/18/2025 Order granting habeas in *Rodrigues da Silva v. Figueroa*, et
4 al., Case No. 25-cv-04015-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-18-25)("dozens of other
5 district courts have concluded individuals like Petitioner are subject to §
6 1226 and not § 1225 and, therefore, are not subject to mandatory
7 detention"), gathering cases, filed with the Habeas Petition as Exhibit 8;

8 d. 11/13/2025 Order granting habeas in *Perez Rodriguez v. Noem*, et al., Case
9 No. 25-cv-03921-PHX (D. Ariz. 11/13/2025)("the vast majority of courts
10 concluded individuals like Petitioner are subject to § 1226 and not § 1225
11 and, therefore, are not subject to mandatory detention"), gathering cases,
12 filed with the Habeas Petition as Exhibit 9;

13 e. 11/6/25 Order granting habeas in *Gonzalez Rodriguez v. Bondi*, et al., Case
14 No. 25-cv-03917-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-6-25)("dozens of other district courts
15 have concluded individuals like Petitioner are subject to § 1226 and not §
16 1225 and, therefore, are not subject to mandatory detention"), gathering
17 cases, filed with the Habeas Petition as Exhibit 10;

18 f. 11/6/2025 Order Granting Habeas in *Abrego-Zarate v. Noem, et al.*, Case
19 No. 25-cv-03564-KML (D. Ariz. 11-6-25)("the great weigh of authority
20 is that individuals like petitioner are not subject to mandatory detention.
21 This court agrees with the majority view. For these reasons, the petition is
22 granted, and petitioner must receive a bond hearing without application of
23 *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N 216 (B.I.A. 2025."), filed herewith as
24 Exhibit 11;

25 g. 11/03/25 Order granting habeas petition in *Lopez-Cruz v. Noem, et al*, No.
26 2:25-cv-03566-DJH--ASB (D. Ariz. 11/3/2025)("dozens of other district
27 courts have concluded individuals like Petitioner are subject to § 1226 and
28 not § 1225 and, therefore, are not subject to mandatory detention. This
Court agrees with this conclusion."), filed herewith as Exhibit 12;

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

1 Respondents point to two district court opinions adopting their
2 interpretation of § 1225(b)(2)(A), myriad other district courts have
3 reached the same conclusion as *Echevarria* and held individuals like
4 Petitioner are not subject to mandatory detention under 1225(b)(2)(A)”,
5 filed herewith as Exhibit 13;

6 i. 10/17/2025 Order granting habeas corpus in *Benitez-Cornejo v. Cantu, et*
7 *al.*, No. 2:25-cv-03672 (D. Arizona Oct. 17, 2025)(“individuals like
8 Petitioner are not “arriving aliens” subject to mandatory detention but,
9 rather, are subject to the general removal statute, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)”),
10 filed herewith as Exhibit 14;

11 j. 10/09/2025 Order granting habeas entered in *Hector Lopez-Melo v. Bondi,*
12 *et. al.*, Case No. Case 2:25-cv-03394-DJH--JZB (D. Ariz.
13 10/9/2025)(“petitioner, who had been present in the United States for
14 years, was not an applicant for admission under 1225(b)(2)(A) or subject
15 to mandatory detention”), filed herewith as Exhibit 15;

16 k. 10/07/2025 Order granting habeas corpus in *Bo Li v. Cantu, et al.*, No.
17 CV-25-02989-PHX-SPL (D Arizona 10/07/2025)(“Respondents maintain
18 he is subject to mandatory detention under 1225(b)(2). Again,
19 Respondents are mistaken.”), filed herewith as Exhibit 16;

20 l. 10/3/2025 Order granting habeas corpus in *Echevarria v. Bondi, et al.*, No.
21 2:25-cv-03252-PHX-DWL, 2025 WL 2821282 (D. Ariz. Oct. 3,
22 2025)(“Court agrees with the majority of courts that have concluded that
23 § 1226(a), rather than § 1225(b)(2)(A), applies in this circumstance.”),
24 filed herewith as Exhibit 17;

25 m. 08/11/2025 Magistrate’s Report and Recommendation in *Rocha Rosado*
26 *v. Figueroa*, No. CV-25-02157-PHX-DLR 2025 WL 2349133 at *10 (D.
27 Ariz. Aug. 13, 2025)(Magistrate’s Report and Recommendation Adopted
28 at 2025 WL 2349133)([t]he text of § 1226, the canons of statutory
interpretation, this section's legislative history, and longstanding agency
practice indicate that Rosado is subject to § 1226(a)’s ‘default’ rule for
discretionary detention rather than § 1225’s mandatory detention
requirement, and that the IJ erred by finding they did not have jurisdiction

1 to consider Rosado's detention.”) *report and recommendation adopted sub*
2 *nom.* 2025 WL 2349133 (D. Ariz. Aug. 13, 2025), filed herewith as
3 Exhibit 18.

4 33. Petitioner has located only 5 cases holding to the contrary. In *Vargas*
5 *Lopez v. Trump*, --F. Supp. 3d--, 2025 WL 2780351 (D. Neb. Sept. 30, 2025), the court
6 held that Vargas Lopez failed to meet his burden to show that he falls under § 1226(a),
7 so “his Petition fails regardless of the parties’ arguments about the scope of § 1225(b)
8 and § 1226(a).” *Vargas Lopez v. Trump*, 2025 WL 2780351 at *7 (emphasis added). In
9 *Chavez v. Noem*, -- F. Supp. 3d --, 2025 WL 2730228 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2025), the
10 court denied a temporary restraining order on the grounds that the petitioners had “not
11 demonstrated serious questions about the application of Section 1225 to aliens present
12 in the United States.” *Chavez v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2730228 at *4. However, the court
13 spent less than 2 pages analyzing the statutory language and caselaw before concluding
14 that “Petitioners have not shown either a likelihood of success or serious questions going
15 to the merits [therefore] we do not address the remaining Winter factors.” *Chavez v.*
16 *Noem*, 2025 WL 2730228 at *5. *Mejia Olalde v. Noem*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 221830
17 (E.D. Mo. Nov. 10, 2025) was concerned with whether the habeas petition had been
18 properly filed in that court’s jurisdiction and never reached the application of § 1225(b)
19 to the petitioner. *Pipa-Aquise v. Bondi*, No. 25-1094, 2025 WL 2490657 (E.D. Va. Aug.
20 5, 2025) and *Pena v. Hyde*, No. 25-11983, 2025 WL 2108913 (D. Mass. July 28, 2025)
21 were each shorter than two pages long and neither contained any significant analysis.
22 Thus, none of these cases are particularly instructive.
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 34. In 1997, after Congress amended the INA through the Illegal
2 Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA), EOIR and
3 the then-Immigration and Naturalization Service issued an interim rule to interpret and
4 apply IIRIRA. Specifically, under the heading of “Apprehension, Custody, and
5 Detention of Aliens,” the agencies explained that:
6

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

11 62 Fed. Reg. at 10323 (emphasis added). The agencies thus made clear that
12 individuals who had entered without inspection *were* eligible for consideration for
13 bond and bond hearings before IJs under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and its implementing
14 regulations.
15

16 35. Thus, for almost 30 years, all participants in the immigration system
17 have understood that people arrested inside the United States generally fall within §
18 1226 for detention purposes and are therefore required to receive a bond hearing upon
19 request—even if they initially entered the country without permission. *See Martinez v.*
20 *Hyde*, No. 25-11613, 2025 WL 2084238, at *4 n.9 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025) (citing the
21 United States Solicitor General’s representation to the Supreme Court at oral argument
22 that “DHS’s long-standing interpretation has been that 1226(a) applies to those who
23 have crossed the border between ports of entry and are shortly thereafter apprehended”).
24

25 36. Despite the overwhelming number of federal cases that have ruled
26 against the government’s position, DHS and DOJ are continuing to systemically
27
28

1 misclassify people and unlawfully deny them access to bond hearings and release on
2 bond during the pendency of their immigration proceedings.

3
4 **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**
FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

5 **Violation of Fifth Amendment – Substantive Due Process**

6
7 37. Petitioner realleges and incorporates herein the allegations contained
8 in the preceding paragraphs of the petition as if fully set forth herein.

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

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

15 40. The government’s continued detention of Petitioner is not supported
16 by any special interest or compelling justification that outweighs his liberty interest.

17 41. Petitioner’s ongoing detention when so many federal courts have held
18 that he is entitled to be considered for release upon posting an appropriate bond under §
19 1226 constitutes prolonged detention and violates his substantive due process rights.

20
21
22 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
23 **Violation of Fifth Amendment Right - Procedural Due Process**

24 42. Petitioner realleges and incorporates herein the allegations contained
25 in the preceding paragraphs of the petition as if fully set forth herein.
26
27
28

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

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 Miguel Eliseo Bernal Ramirez 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 10th 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

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS	
2	Exhibit 1	<u>ICE Memo: Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applications for Admission</u> (last visited September 8, 2025).
3		
4	Exhibit 2	<i>Matter of Yajure Hurtado</i> , 29 I&N Dec. 216 (B.I.A. 2025).
5	Exhibit 3	ICE Online Detainee Locator Printout
6	Exhibit 4	Petitioner's Affidavit
7	Exhibit 5	Notice to Appear
8	Exhibit 6	Order granting habeas in <i>Luna-Gonzalez v. Noem</i> , et al., Case No. 25-cv-03794-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-26-25)
9	Exhibit 7	Order granting habeas in <i>Padron-Carreron v. Noem</i> , et al., Case No. 25-cv-04204-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-24-25)
10	Exhibit 8	Order granting habeas in <i>Rodrigues da Silva v. Figueroa</i> , et al., Case No. 25-cv-04015-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-18-25)
11	Exhibit 9	Order entered <i>Perez Rodriguez v. Noem</i> , et al., Case No. 25-cv-03921-PHX (D. Ariz. 11/13/2025)
12	Exhibit 10	Order entered <i>Gonzalez Rodriguez v. Bondi</i> , et al., Case No. 25-cv-03917-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-6-25)
13	Exhibit 11	Order entered in <i>Abrego-Zarate v. Noem</i> , et al., Case No. 25-cv-03564-KML (D. Ariz. 11-6-25)
14	Exhibit 12	Order entered in <i>Lopez-Cruz v. Noem</i> , et al., No. 2:25-cv-03566-DJH--ASB (D. Ariz. 11/3/2025)
15	Exhibit 13	Order entered in <i>Garcia-Rosales v. Noem</i> , et al., No. 2:25-cv-03391-SHD—DMF (D. Ariz. Oct. 22, 2025)
16	Exhibit 14	Order granting habeas corpus in <i>Benitez-Cornejo v. Cantu</i> , et al., No. 2:25-cv-03672 (D. Arizona Oct. 17, 2025)
17	Exhibit 15	Order entered in <i>Hector Lopez-Melo v. Bondi</i> , et al., Case No. Case 2:25-cv-03394-DJH--JZB [docket no. 11] (D.C. Ariz. 10/9/2025)
18	Exhibit 16	Order granting habeas corpus in <i>Bo Li v. Cantu</i> , et al., No. CV-25-02989-PHX-SPL (D Arizona 10/07/2025)
19	Exhibit 17	Order entered in <i>Francisco Echevarria v. Pam Bondi</i> , et al., CV-25-03252-PHX-DWL (ESW), (D. Ariz. 10/3/2025)
20	Exhibit 18	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)
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		