United States District Court
Western District of Texas
El Paso Division

Eladio Rodriguez Muniz, Petitioner, v. Kristi Noem, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *et al*, Respondents.	Case No. 3:25-cv-671-DB

Federal Respondents' Response to Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus

Federal[1] Respondents provide this response to Petitioner's habeas petition and concurrently filed motion for temporary restraining order ("TRO"). Any allegations that are not specifically admitted herein are denied. Petitioner is not entitled to the relief she seeks, including attorney's fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA")[2], and this Court should deny this habeas petition without the need for an evidentiary hearing. Any non-habeas claims should be denied. [3]

I. Introduction

Petitioner is lawfully detained on a mandatory basis as an applicant for admission pending

[1] The Department of Justice represents only federal employees in this action.

[2] *Barco v. Witte*, 65 F.4th 782 (5th Cir. 2023).

[3] Petitioner did not pay the filing fee for non-habeas claims. *See Ndudzi v. Castro*, No. SA–20–CV–0492–JKP, 2020 WL 3317107 at *2 (W.D. Tex. June 18, 2020) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a)). "When a filing contains both habeas and on-habeas claims, 'the district court should separate the claims and decide the [non-habeas] claims' separately from the habeas ones given the differences between the two types of claims. *Id* (collecting cases and further noting the "vast procedural differences between the two types of actions"). Given the differences, the Court should either sever the non-habeas claims or dismiss them altogether without prejudice if severance is not warranted. *Id.* at *3.

removal proceedings before an immigration judge. This case is governed by the plain language of the statute, but also by Supreme Court precedent.

Additionally, given the influx of cases before this Court, Respondent's would highlight that this case is very different. Petitioner is detained in expedited removal proceedings pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225 (b)(1)(B)(ii) and not 1225 (b)(2).

II. Relevant Facts and Procedural History

Petitioner alleges that he is a citizen of Cuba who was apprehended upon his unlawful entry into the United States, released under an Order of Release on Recognizance and later served with a Notice to Appear ("NTA"). ECF No. 1 at ¶¶ 11, 17,18, 20. Prior to be serving with the NTA, Petitioner filed an affirmative Application for Asylum (I-589) with USCIS on January 21, 2022. ECF No. 1 at 5 ¶ 18. However, Petitioner's Asylum application was closed out on May 13, 2025 by USCIS. On August 14, 2025, Petitioner appeared for a scheduled Master Calendar Hearing and DHS moved to orally dismiss his case and the Immigration Judge granted the motion to dismiss.[4] ECF No. 1 at 6 ¶ 21; *see also*, Exh. A (Order to Dismiss and Amended Order to Dismiss). Thereafter, on or about August 28, 2025, Petitioner filed a Motion to Reopen with the Immigration Court but the Court denied the motion because Petitioner does not have a final order of removal because his case was dismissed. Exh B. (Order denying Motion to Reopen). On November 6, 2025, Petitioner claimed fear of returning to Cuba and the Asylum Officer

[4] Department of Homeland Security has the authority to dismiss a case when circumstances have changed since the issuance of the NTA and its in the Government's best interest to do so. 8 C.F.R. § 239.2(a)(7). Petitioner was determined to be amendable to Expedited Removal because he was encountered by an immigration officer within 100 miles of the U.S. international land border and was unable to establish continuous presence in the United States for the 14-day period immediately prior to the date of the encounter.

determined his fear to be credible. ECF No. 1 at ¶ 24. Petitioner does not have any pending hearings before the Immigration Court at this time[5]. ECF No. 1 at 7 ¶ 25. Petitioner is awaiting the issuance of an NTA by USCIS based on the credible fear finding. ECF No. 1 at ¶25.

III. Argument

As a threshold issue, 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). Petitioner, however, has no claim to any lawful status in the United States that would permit her to reside lawfully in the United States upon release. Even if this Court were to order her release from custody, she would be subject to re-arrest as an alien present within the United States without having been admitted.

A. Petitioner Is Detained under § 1225(b)(1), Not § 1225(b)(2).

Petitioner concedes that he is now in expedite removal proceedings. ECF No. 1 at ¶¶ 23-25. As an application for admission, intercepted at or near the port of entry shortly after unlawfully entering, who indicates a fear of persecution, and whom an asylum officer determines has a credible fear of persecution or torture, "shall be detained for further consideration of the application for asylum," properly described under § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii), and not under the "catchall" provision. *Compare* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii); 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii) *with* § 1225(b)(2)(A).

B. By Statute Petitioner is Subject to Mandatory Detention Pending Consideration of Asylum Claim

Additionally, 8 U.S.C. § 1225, mandates detention for people similarly situated procedurally as Petitioner. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1225 (b)(1)(B) all aliens found to have a credible fear of persecution **shall** be detained pending consideration of the application for asylum. 8 U.S.C.

[5] See Automated Case Information (last accessed on December 18, 2025).

§ 1225 (b)(1)(B)(ii). Petitioner in this case has already conceded that he is going through the exact process described in the above statute. *See* ECF No. 1 at ¶¶23-26.

C. Start with the Statutory Text: § 1225(a) Unambiguously Defines an Applicant for Admission as an Alien Present in the United States Without Having Been Admitted.

The statutory language is unambiguous: "An alien present in the United States who has not been admitted … shall be deemed … an applicant for admission." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1); *Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 109; *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 288 (2018); *Vargas v. Lopez*, No. 25-CV-526, 2025 WL 2780351 at *4–9 (D. Neb. Sept. 30, 2025); *Chavez v. Noem*, No. 25-CV-23250CAB-SBC, 2025 WL 2730228 at *4–5 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2025). Given the plain language of § 1225(a)(1), Petitioner cannot plausibly argue that she is not an applicant for admission. Nor can Petitioner plausibly challenge a DHS's officer's determination that she is "seeking admission" simply because she was not processed for expedited removal. 8 C.F.R. § 239.1 (allowing DHS to serve an NTA in the exercise of discretion at the port of entry). That she was subsequently released from custody under § 1226(a) for a brief period, either in error or in the exercise of discretion, does not change the fact that she was an applicant for admission at the time she was initially apprehended. It also does not change the fact that she was unable to show continuous presence in the United States for the two years preceding that apprehension. *See, e.g.*, § 1225(b)(1)(A)(iii)(II).

To the extent Petitioner challenges an officer's findings regarding her admissibility under § 1225(b)(1), that challenge must be raised in removal proceedings and reviewed only by the circuit court of appeals. 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(4); 1252(b)(9).

D. Congress Intended to Mandate Detention of All Applicants for Admission, Not Just Those Who Presented for Inspection at a Designated Port of Entry.

Congress, in the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996

("IIRIRA"), corrected an inequity in the prior law by substituting the term "admission" for "entry." *See Chavez*, 2025 WL 2730228, at *4 (citing *Torres v. Barr*, 976 F.3d 918, 928 (9th Cir. 2020); *United States v. Gambino-Ruiz*, 91 F.4th 918, 990 (9th Cir. 2024)). Under the prior version of the INA, aliens who lawfully presented themselves for inspection were not entitled to seek bond, whereas aliens who "entered" the country after successfully evading inspection were entitled to seek bond. *Id.* Petitioner's interpretation, however, would repeal the statutory fix that Congress made in IIRIRA. *Id.* IIRIRA, among other things, substituted the term "admission" for "entry," and replaced deportation and exclusion proceeding with removal proceedings. *See, e.g., Tula Rubio v. Lynch,* 787 F.3d 288, 292 n.2, n.8 (5th Cir. 2015) (collecting cases). In other words, in amending the INA, Congress acted in part to remedy the "unintended and undesirable consequence" of having created a statutory scheme that rewarded aliens who entered without inspection with greater procedural and substantive rights (including bond eligibility) while aliens who had "actually presented themselves to authorities for inspection were restrained by 'more summary exclusion proceedings'" and subjected to mandatory detention. *Martinez v. Att'y Gen.,* 693 F.3d 408, 414 (3d Cir. 2012) (*quoting Hing Sum v. Holder*, 602 F.3d1092, 1100 (9th Cir. 2010)).

This administration's interpretation of mandatory detention of applicants for admission only advances Congressional intent to equalize the playing field between those who follow the law and those who do not. The plain language of the statute in this case is clear, regardless of whether the agency interpreted it differently in the past than it interprets it today. *See Loper Bright Enters. v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369, 385-86 (2024); *Niz-Chavez v. Garland*, 593 U.S. 155, 171 (2021) (no amount of policy talk can overcome a plain statutory command). ICE does not dispute that this interpretation differs from the interpretation that the agency has taken previously, nor does it

dispute that the agency's own regulations necessarily support the prior interpretation. The statute itself, however, has not changed.

That does not leave § 1226(a) meaningless. Section 1226(a) applies to aliens within the interior of the United States who were once lawfully admitted but are now subject to removal from the United States under 8 U.S.C. § 1227(a). *See Jennings,* 583 U.S. at 287–88. Section 1226(a) allows DHS to arrest and detain an alien during removal proceedings and release them on bond, but it does **not** mandate that all aliens found within the interior of the United States be processed in this manner. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a); *see also Vargas v. Lopez*, 2025 WL 2780351 at *4–9; *Chavez v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2730228 at *4–5. Nothing in the plain language of § 1226(a) entitles an applicant for admission to a bond hearing, much less release.

Nor does this interpretation render the Laken Riley Act superfluous simply because it appears redundant. Indeed, "redundancies are common in statutory drafting … redundancy in one portion of a statute is not a license to rewrite or eviscerate another portion of the statute…" *Barton v. Barr*, 590 U.S. 222, 229 (2020). Even Justice Scalia acknowledged in *Reading Law* that "Sometimes drafters *do* repeat themselves and *do* include words that add nothing of substance, either out of a flawed sense of style or to engage in the ill-conceived but lamentably common belt-and-suspenders approach." ANTONIN SCALIA & BRYAN A. GARNER, READING LAW: THE INTERPRETATION OF LEGAL TEXTS (2012), 176–77 (emphasis added). Moreover, as the BIA explains, the statutes at issue in this case were:

> … implemented at different times and intended to address different issues. The INA is a complex set of legal provisions created at different times and modified over a series of years. Where these provisions impact one another, they cannot be read in a vacuum.

Matter of Yajure Hurtado, 29 I&N Dec. 216, *227 (BIA 2025). This explanation tracks the Fifth Circuit's approach and reasoning in *Martinez*, 519 F. 3d at 541–42.

E. Petitioner Does Not Overcome Jurisdictional Hurdles.

Where an alien, like this Petitioner, challenges the decision to detain her in the first place or to seek a removal order against her, or if an alien challenges any part of the process by which her removability will be determined, the court lacks jurisdiction to review that challenge. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g); *see also Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 294–95. In *Jennings*, the Court did not find that the claims were barred, because unlike Petitioner here, the aliens in that case were challenging their continued and allegedly prolonged detention during removal proceedings. *Id.* Here, Petitioner is challenging the decision to detain her in the first place, which arises directly from the decision to commence and/or adjudicate removal proceedings against her after encountering her upon unlawful entry at the border. *See id.*

Even if the alien claims she is not appropriately categorized as an applicant for admission subject to § 1225(b), such a challenge must be raised before an immigration judge in removal proceedings. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(4). This is consistent with the channeling provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9), which mandates that judicial review of all questions of law and fact, including interpretation and application of constitutional and statutory provisions, arising from any action or proceeding brought to remove an alien from the United States must be reviewed by the court of appeals upon review of a final order of removal. *See SQDC v. Bondi*, No. 25–3348 (PAM/DLM), 2025 WL2617973 (D. Minn. Sept. 9, 2025).

F. On Its Face, and As Applied to Petitioner, § 1225(b) 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. at 140 (finding that applicants for admission are entitled only to the protections set forth by statute and that "the Due Process Clause provides nothing more"). An "expectation of receiving process is not, without more, a liberty

interest protected by the Due Process Clause." *Olim v. Wakinekona*, 461 U.S. 238, 250 n.12 (1983). That the alien in *Thuraissigiam* failed to request his own release in his prayer for relief does not make the holding any less binding here. *But see Lopez-Arevelo v. Ripa*, No. 25–CV–337–KC, 2025 WL 2691828 (W.D. Tex. Sept. 22, 2025). The alien in *Thuraissigiam* undisputedly brought his claim in habeas, and the Court noted that even if he had requested release, his claim would have failed. *Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 118–19. The close proximity between Petitioner's unlawful entry into the United States and her apprehension by immigration authorities is similar to the alien in *Thuraissigiam*. Just like Petitioner, the alien in *Thuraissigiam* was on "the threshold of entry" as an applicant for admission detained under § 1225(b)(1)(A). Although Petitioner was issued an NTA and the alien in *Thuraissigiam* was not, both are nonetheless applicants for admission as defined by § 1225(a)(1), and *Thuraissigiam* remains binding. In any event, Petitioner is not entitled to more process than what Congress provided her by statute, regardless of the applicable statute. *Id.; see also Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 297–303.

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, regardless of whether the alien is detained. 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. The alien is served with a charging document (NTA) outlining the factual allegations and the charge(s) of removability against her. *Id.* § 1229a(a)(2). She has an opportunity to be heard by an immigration judge and represented by counsel of her choosing at no expense to the government. *Id.* § 1229a(b)(1), (b)(4)(A). She can seek reasonable continuances to prepare any applications for relief from removal, or she can waive that right and seek immediate removal or voluntary departure. *Id.* § 1229a(b)(4)(B), (c)(4). Should she receive any adverse decision, she 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). Moreover, relief applications are heard more expeditiously on the detained docket than the non-detained docket. *See* Section 9.1(e), Executive Office for Immigration Review | 9.1 - Detention | United States Department of Justice (last accessed December 18, 2025).

While an as-applied constitutional challenge, such as a prolonged detention claim, may be brought before the district court in certain circumstances, Petitioner cannot raise such a claim where she has been detained for only a brief period pending her 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, § 1225(b)(1)(A)(iii)(II) does not violate due process. *See Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 140.

IV. Respondent's Position on Maldonado-Bautista Class Action

The *Maldonado* court granted class certification under Rule 23(b)(2) and partial summary judgment for the petitioners in that case but did not issue a class-wide declaratory judgment. The court also did not issue a class-wide injunction, which would not be permitted by law. Rather, the court set a January 9, 2026 joint status report deadline and January 16, 2026 status conference. 2025 WL 3288403.

The *Maldonado* court defined the certified class as follows:

> Bond Eligible Class: All noncitizens in the United States without lawful status who (1) have entered or will enter the United States without inspection; (2) were not or will not be apprehended upon arrival; and (3) are not or will not be subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231 at the time the Department of Homeland Security makes an initial custody determination.

Maldonado, 2025 WL 3288403 at *9. Petitioner asserts in their petition that their continued detention is in violation of *Maldonado*. ECF 1 at 14 ¶ 53. Petitioner entered the United States

unlawfully in November 2021 and was detained into ICE/ERO custody on August 14, 2025. ECF No. 1 at 4 ¶ 11. Petitioner claims he is not subject to detention under § 1226(c)(criminal aliens), § 1225(b)(1)(arriving alien), or § 1231(post final order of removal) at the time DHS made their initial custody determination.

Assuming for the sake of argument that the Court finds that Petitioner is a member of the *Maldonado* class, the *Maldonado* court's decision does not yet have preclusive effect in this matter. As noted above, the *Maldonado* court did not enter a final judgment with respect to the class. Although the court stated it was extending "the same declaratory relief" to the class, a court cannot grant declaratory relief prior to the entry of a final judgment, *i.e.*, a declaratory judgment. *See Doran v. Salem Inn, Inc.*, 422 U.S. 922, 931 (1975)("prior to final judgment there is no established declaratory remedy comparable to a preliminary injunction"). A pre-final judgment declaration is, by its nature, not a declaratory judgment "[b]ecause a preliminary declaration—unlike a final declaration—does not specifically bind anyone, it is more akin to an advisory opinion, which the Court is precluded from issuing by history and the implicit policies embodied in Article III." *Vazquez Perez v. Decker*, No. 18-CV-10683 (AJN), 2019 WL 4784950, at *10 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 30, 2019). Absent an entry of final judgment with respect to the class, or a certification of partial final judgment under Rule 54(b), there is no declaratory judgment in *Maldonado*. The partial summary judgment ruling does not operate as a "judgment" because it is not an appealable order and "does not end the action as to any of the claims or parties and may be revised at any time before the entry of a judgment adjudicating all the claims and all the parties' rights and liabilities." Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(a), (b). Thus, there is no class-wide judgment, let alone any final judgment that could have preclusive effect as to class members.

V. Conclusion

The Court should deny the Petition.

Respectfully submitted,

Justin R. Simmons
United States Attorney

By: */s/ Tasha May*
Tasha May
Special Assistant United States Attorney
North Carolina Bar No.: 55518
601 N.W. Loop 410, Suite 600
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(210) 384-7130 (phone)
(210) 384-7312 (fax)
latasha.mau@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Federal Respondents