

United States District Court  
Western District of Texas  
San Antonio Division

Thomas Chinnappan,  
Petitioner,

v.

Todd M. Lyons, in his official capacity as  
Acting Director of U.S. ICE, *et al.*,  
Respondents.

No. 5:25-CV-01711-XR

**Federal Respondents' Response to  
Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus**

Federal<sup>1</sup> Respondents provide this response to Petitioner's habeas petition. Any allegations that are not specifically admitted herein are denied. Petitioner is not entitled to the relief he seeks, including attorney's fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA")<sup>2</sup>, and this Court should deny this habeas petition without the need for an evidentiary hearing.

**Petitioner alleges but for the Board of Immigration Appeals decision in the *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), he would be eligible for bond.** ECF No. 1 at 5 (emphasis added). **This is inaccurate as Petitioner is an, 'arriving alien' who was ineligible for bond pre-*Hurtado* from an immigration judge.** 8 C.F.R. 1003.19(h)(2)(i).

**I. Relevant Facts and Procedural History**

Petitioner is a citizen of India who applied for admission at the Otay Mesa, California port of entry.<sup>3</sup> Exh. A at 1. He was served with a Notice to Appear (NTA) in immigration court and

---

<sup>1</sup> The Department of Justice represents only federal employees in this action.

<sup>2</sup> *Barco v. Witte*, 65 F.4th 782 (5th Cir. 2023).

<sup>3</sup> This is a factual difference between this petition and the others frequently filed before the Court, where Petitioner entered the United States *in between* the ports of entry. Petitioner here presented himself to a port of entry.

was released. *See* ECF No. 1 at ¶¶ 14, 16; Exh. A at 1 (redacted). Petitioner concedes that he was detained by ICE on or about November 19, 2025, has been placed in removal proceedings, and is being detained at the Karnes County Immigration Processing Center in Karnes City, Texas. *Id.* at 1, and ¶¶ 7, 17, 19. Petitioner is currently scheduled for a master hearing before the immigration judge on January 13, 2026. *See* EOIR [Automated Case Information System](#) (last accessed Dec. 22, 2025).

## II. Argument

The only relief available to Petitioner through habeas is release from custody. 28 U.S.C. § 2241; *DHS v. Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 118–19 (2020).

### A. Petitioner is an Arriving Alien

Again, this petition differs from those frequently filed before the Court because this Petitioner is an arriving alien who presented himself to a port of entry and did not enter the United States unlawfully within the ports of entry.

The term “arriving alien” means an applicant for admission coming or attempting to come into the United States at a port-of-entry ....” 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(q). Arriving aliens are inspected immediately upon arrival in the United States and, unless “ ‘ clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted,’ ” are placed in “removal proceedings to determine admissibility.” *Clark v. Martinez*, 543 U.S. 371, 373 (2005) (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)).

Since Petitioner applied for admission at the port of entry, he an arriving alien. *See* Exh. A at 1; 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(q). Pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), arriving aliens are to be detained unless released by ICE on a discretionary parole. 8 C.F.R. § 1235.3(c); *Clark*, 543 U.S. at 373 (explaining that detention of an “alien arriving in the United States” is “subject to the Secretary’s discretionary authority to parole him into the United States “for urgent humanitarian reasons or

significant public benefit,” “to meet a medical emergency[,] or ... for a legitimate law enforcement objective.”); 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A). Whether the government decides to parole an arriving alien or keep him detained, the regulations state that an immigration judge does not have authority to review the custody determination. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(h)(2)(i)(B).

Here, as Petitioner is an arriving alien, irrespective of the Board’s decision in *Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216, Petitioner would be ineligible to seek bond from an immigration judge. *See also Maldonado v. Macias*, 150 F.Supp.3d 788, 797–98 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 15, 2015) (the parties agree [Maldonado] is an arriving alien, and the Court finds this to be accurate, as [Maldonado] applied for admission to the United States at a port-of-entry... As such, Petitioner is currently detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)).

**B. On Its Face, and As Applied to Petitioner, § 1225(b)(2)(A) Comports with Due Process.**

Section 1225 does not provide for a bond hearing. The Supreme Court upheld the facial constitutionality of § 1225(b) in *Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 139 (2020). Aliens who arrive at ports of entry—even those paroled elsewhere in the country for years pending removal—are “treated” for due process purposes “as if stopped at the border.” *Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 139.

Mandatory detention of an applicant for admission during “full” removal proceedings does not violate due process, because the constitutional protections are built into those proceedings. The alien was served with a charging document (an NTA) outlining the factual allegations and the charge(s) of removability against him. Exh. A; § 1229a(a)(2). He has an opportunity to be heard by an immigration judge and represented by counsel of his choosing at no expense to the government. *Id.* § 1229a(b)(1), (b)(4)(A). He can seek reasonable continuances to prepare any applications for relief from removal, or he can waive that right and seek immediate removal or voluntary departure. *Id.* § 1229a(b)(4)(B), (c)(4). Should he receive any adverse decision, he has

the right to seek judicial review of the complete record and that decision not only administratively, but also in the circuit court of appeals. *Id.* § 1229a(b)(4)(C), (c)(5).

While an as-applied constitutional challenge, such as a prolonged detention claim, may be brought before the district court in certain circumstances, Petitioner here raises no such claim where he has been detained for only a brief period pending his removal proceedings. For aliens, like Petitioner, who are detained during removal proceedings as applicants for admission, what Congress provided to them by statute satisfies due process. *Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 140. As applied here to Petitioner, his detention does not violate due process.

### **III. Conclusion**

Petitioner is lawfully detained as an arriving alien. The Board's decision in *Hurtado* did not affect an alien, like Petitioner, who is an arriving alien, and was ineligible for bond before *Hurtado*'s issuance. The Court should deny the Petition in its entirety.

Respectfully submitted,

Justin R. Simmons  
United States Attorney

By: /s/ Deborah L. Fischer  
Deborah L. Fischer  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Texas Bar No. 00786039  
700 E. San Antonio Ave., Suite 200  
El Paso, Texas 79901  
(915) 534-6884 (phone)  
[Deborah.Fischer@usdoj.gov](mailto:Deborah.Fischer@usdoj.gov)

Attorneys for Federal Respondents