

1 GREGORY P. FAY
2 AZ Bar: 035534
3 Green Evans-Schroeder, PLLC
4 130 W. Cushing Street
5 Tucson, Arizona 85701
6 Tel: (480) 588-3430
7 Email: greg@arizonaimmigration.net

8 *Attorney for Petitioner*

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

11 Edgar Rodriguez Garcia,
12
13 Petitioner,

14 v.

15 John E. Cantu, Field Office Director of
16 Enforcement and Removal Operations,
17 Phoenix Field Office, Immigration and
18 Customs Enforcement;

19 Kristi Noem, Secretary, U.S. Department
20 of Homeland Security;

21 Pamela Bondi, U.S. Attorney General;

22 Christopher Howard, Warden, Eloy
23 Detention Center

24 Todd Lyons, Acting Director,
25 Immigration and Customs Enforcement
26 and Removal Operations.

27 Respondents.
28

Case No. CV-25-04674-PHX-SMB

**FIRST AMENDED EMERGENCY
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
INJUNCTION AND TEMPORARY
RESTRAINING ORDER (TRO)**

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
INJUNCTION AND TEMPORARY
RESTRAINING ORDER**

Challenge to Unlawful Incarceration;
Request for Declaratory and
Injunctive Relief

NOTICE OF MOTION

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

Pursuant to Rule 65(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Rule 65-1 of the Local Rules of this Court, Petitioner moves this Court for an order enjoining Respondents John E. Cantú, in his official capacity as Field Office Director of Enforcement and Removal Operations, Phoenix Field Office, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), Kristi Noem, in her official capacity as the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Pamela Bondi, in her official capacity as the U.S. Attorney General with authority over the Executive Office for Immigration Review, Todd M. Lyons, in his official capacity as the Acting Director of ICE, and Christopher Howard, Acting Warden of the Eloy Detention Center where Petitioner is detained, from continuing to detain Petitioner, or ordering a bond hearing before an immigration judge. Respondents should also not transfer the Petitioner outside the District of Arizona, where he is presently located. Such an order would maintain the status quo while habeas jurisdiction is litigated, and would also ensure that Petitioner remains close to legal counsel.

The reasons for this Motion are in the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities. As this Motion shows, Petitioner warrants a preliminary injunction as he is eligible for release or a bond hearing before an immigration judge. This motion is being refiled after the denial of a motion to exceed the page limit for the initial motion.

Petitioner submitted a Habeas petition for same on December 15, 2025, on the same grounds, and is re-filing this preliminary injunction motion per the Court’s January 2, 2026 order denying leave to file excessive pages in order to prevent irreparable injury

1 before a hearing on his Habeas Petition may be held.

2 WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that this Court grant his request for a
3 preliminary injunction enjoining Respondents from continuing to detain him, and order a
4 bond hearing before an immigration judge in fifteen days.

5 Dated: January 5, 2026

Respectfully Submitted

6
7 s/Gregory P. Fay
8 Attorney for Petitioner
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

- I. INTRODUCTION 1
- II. STATEMENT OF THE FACTS 1
- III. LEGAL STANDARD 1
- IV. ARGUMENT 2
 - A. PETITIONER IS LIKELY TO SUCCEED ON THE MERITS OF HIS CLAIM .. 3
 - 1. Discretionary Versus Mandatory Detention in Removal Proceedings..... 3
 - 2. The Government’s Novel and Widely Rejected Theory That All Noncitizens Who Entered Without Admission Are Subject to Mandatory Detention 5
 - B. PETITIONER WILL SUFFER IRREPARABLE HARM IN THE ABSENCE OF A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION..... 13
 - C. THE BALANCE OF EQUITIES TIPS IN PETITIONER’S FAVOR AND A PI IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST..... 14
 - 1. Futility..... 16
 - 2. Irreparable injury 16
 - 3. Agency delay 17
 - D. THERE IS NO JURISDICTIONAL HURDLE BARRING RELIEF 17
- V. CONCLUSION 17

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Petitioner Edgar Rodriguez-Garcia seeks a Preliminary Injunction (PI) that requires
3 Respondents to either release him from custody within seven days of the issuance of a PI,
4 or order a bond hearing before an immigration judge within fifteen days where the
5 Department of Homeland Security (DHS) bears the burden of demonstrating that his
6 removal is reasonably foreseeable and whether his detention is justified (i.e. whether he
7 poses a danger or a flight risk). Finally, Petitioner seeks a PI enjoining Respondents from
8 transferring Petitioner outside the District of Arizona, where he is presently located.
9

10 Petitioner should prevail on this motion because he is likely to succeed on the merits
11 of his claims. The text of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) demonstrates that he is not
12 subject to mandatory detention. Further, other federal courts have rejected the respondents'
13 novel argument that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) governs the detention of every noncitizen without
14 lawful immigration status. Petitioner will also suffer irreparable harm in the absence of a
15 PI. The balance of equities tips in his favor, and a PI is in the public interest. Prudential
16 exhaustion is not required here due to futility, irreparable injury, and agency delay. Finally,
17 there is no jurisdictional hurdle barring relief. This Court should thus grant this motion.
18
19

20 **II. STATEMENT OF THE FACTS**

21 Petitioner is a 37-year-old individual who entered the United States without
22 inspection on June 29, 2025. Exhibit A. Although he was initially charged with illegal
23 reentry on June 30, 2025, the charges were dropped after his defense counsel filed notice
24 regarding his incompetency. Tabs E, F, G. Petitioner has been found incompetent in his
25 removal proceedings and his case has been administratively closed as a result. Tab H.
26
27
28

1 Petitioner has a history of mental health treatment in his native Colombia, and his
2 mental health is in decline while he remains in detention in Arizona. Tabs B, C. He
3 requested release directly from DHS, which denied the request. Tabs J, K. On December
4 8, 2025, he requested bond under 8 CFR § 1236 in order to reunite with his family and
5 continue treatment. Tab H. The immigration judge denied that bond request, citing *Matter*
6 *of Yajure Hurtado*, and failed to give effect to the class-wide declaratory judgment in
7 *Maldonado Bautista* or recognize Petitioner’s membership in the certified class. Tab I.

9 Petitioner is therefore still detained at a federal detention center in Arizona, even as
10 his removal proceedings remain administratively closed. Tab I. Absent this Court’s
11 intervention, he will remain detained for the duration of his removal proceedings.
12

13 III. LEGAL STANDARD

14 Petitioner is entitled to preliminary injunctive relief if he establishes that he is
15 “likely to succeed on the merits, . . . likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of
16 preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in
17 the public interest.” *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008). Even if
18 Petitioner does not show a likelihood of success on the merits, the Court may still grant
19 relief if he raises “serious questions” as to the merits of his claims, the balance of hardships
20 tips “sharply” in his favor, and the remaining equitable factors are satisfied. *Alliance for*
21 *the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127 (9th Cir. 2011). As shown below, Petitioner
22 overwhelmingly satisfies both standards.
23
24

25 IV. ARGUMENT

26
27 Petitioner should prevail on this motion because he is likely to succeed on the merits
28

1 of his claims, likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, the
2 balance of equities tips in his favor, and an injunction is in the public interest. Respondents
3 have violated the Immigration and Nationality Act and applicable regulations. Indeed, the
4 text of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) demonstrate that Petitioner is not subject to
5 mandatory detention. Further, other federal courts have rejected the Respondents' novel
6 argument that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) governs the detention of every noncitizen without lawful
7 immigration status.
8

9 Petitioner will also suffer irreparable harm in the absence of a PI. The balance of
10 equities tips in his favor, and a PI is in the public interest. Prudential exhaustion is not
11 required here due to futility, irreparable injury, and agency delay. Finally, there is no
12 jurisdictional hurdle barring relief. This Court should thus grant this motion.
13

14 **A. PETITIONER IS LIKELY TO SUCCEED ON THE MERITS OF HIS CLAIM**

15 Petitioner is likely to succeed on his claim that his ongoing detention by
16 Respondents under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), and the denial of access to bond, is unlawful.
17

18 **1. Discretionary Versus Mandatory Detention in Removal Proceedings**

19 Noncitizens detained by DHS while in removal proceedings generally can request a
20 bond—or “custody redetermination”—hearing before an immigration judge. 8 U.S.C.
21 1226(a); 8 C.F.R. 1236.1(d)(1). If the noncitizen does not present a danger to others, a
22 threat to the national security, or a flight risk, the immigration judge may order that
23 individual released on conditional parole or upon the posting of a monetary bond of no less
24 than \$1,500. 8 U.S.C. 1226(a)(2)(A)-(B); *Matter of Guerra*, 24 I&N Dec. 37 (BIA 2006).
25
26

27 Certain categories of noncitizens are subject to mandatory detention while in
28

1 removal proceedings. Under a provision in Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant
2 Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA), if “an alien seeking admission is not clearly and
3 beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, the alien shall be detained for a proceeding under
4 [8 U.S.C. 1229a].” 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(A). In the same bill, Congress defined “admission”
5 and “admitted” as the “lawful entry of the alien into the United States after inspection and
6 authorization by an immigration officer.” 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(13)(A). In other words, the
7 terms “admission” and “admitted” “refer to inspection and authorization by an immigration
8 officer at the port of entry.” *Hing Sum v. Holder*, 602 F.3d 1092, 1101 (9th Cir. 2010).
9
10 Thus, as the Supreme Court has explained, 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(A) only applies to
11 noncitizens who are “seeking admission into the country,” *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S.
12 281, 289 (2018), i.e., those who are “arriving in the United States.” *Clark v. Martinez*, 543
13 U.S. 371, 373 (2005).
14

15 Consistent with the text of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), federal regulations preclude
16 immigration judges from granting bond to “arriving aliens,” 8 C.F.R. 1003.19(h)(1)(B)(ii),
17 a phrase defined in relevant part as “an applicant for admission coming or attempting to
18 come into the United States at a port-of-entry.” 8 C.F.R. 1001.1(q). The decision to
19 preclude immigration judges from granting bond to arriving aliens—as distinct from all
20 noncitizens who entered without admission—was the product of notice and comment
21 rulemaking in early 1997 following the enactment of the IIRIRA. As the regulations were
22 initially proposed, all “[i]nadmissible aliens in removal proceedings” would have been
23 ineligible for bond. *Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal*
24 *of Aliens; Conduct of Removal*, 62 Fed. Reg. 444, 483 (Jan. 3, 1997). After receiving
25
26
27
28

1 comments, however, the Attorney General deleted the proposed provision and replaced it
2 with one that would apply only to “[a]rriving aliens.” *Inspection and Expedited Removal*
3 *of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum*
4 *Procedures*, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10361 (March 6, 1997).

5
6 As the Attorney General explained, “[t]he effect of this change [was] that
7 inadmissible aliens, except for arriving aliens, have available to them bond redetermination
8 hearings before an immigration judge, while arriving aliens do not.” *Id.* at 10323. “[A]liens
9 who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as aliens
10 who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination.” *Id.*

11
12 The IIRIRA also made subject to mandatory detention those noncitizens who have
13 been convicted of certain crimes or engaged in terrorist activity. For example, the IIRIRA
14 made noncitizens who are inadmissible by reason of having committed certain criminal
15 offenses subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. 1226(c)(1)(A), and those
16 inadmissible for having engaged in terrorist activity subject to mandatory detention under
17 8 U.S.C. 1226(c)(1)(D). More recently, under the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No. 119-1,
18 Congress mandated detention for noncitizens who entered without admission and were
19 subsequently charged with, arrested for, convicted of, or admitted to certain offenses. 8
20 U.S.C. 1226(c)(1)(E). These provisions under 8 U.S.C. 1226(c) would be superfluous if all
21 noncitizens who were present without admission were already subject to mandatory
22 detention under 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(A).
23
24

25
26 2. The Government’s Novel and Widely Rejected Theory That All Noncitizens
27 Who Entered Without Admission Are Subject to Mandatory Detention
28

1 On Friday, July 4, 2025, President Trump signed the One Big Beautiful Bill Act,
2 Pub. L. No. 119-21, 139 Stat. 72. Among other things, the bill appropriated \$45 billion to
3 ICE to detain noncitizens through fiscal year 2029. § 90003, 139 Stat. 358.

4 On Tuesday, July 8, 2025, Acting ICE Director Todd M. Lyons issued a
5 memorandum stating that DHS and the Department of Justice had “revisited” the
6 government’s legal position regarding the statutory basis for detaining noncitizens who
7 were present in the country without being admitted. According to Respondent Lyons, the
8 government now believed that noncitizens present without admission are subject to
9 mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. 1225(b), rather than discretionary detention under 8
10 U.S.C. 1226(a), because, under 8 U.S.C. 1225(a)(1), they are deemed “applicant[s] for
11 admission.” The memo further stated that this change in legal interpretation might “warrant
12 re-detention of a previously released alien in a given case.”
13
14

15 On September 5, 2025, the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) issued a
16 precedential decision adopting ICE’s novel argument that all noncitizens who are present
17 without admission are subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(A).
18 *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). The BIA acknowledged that 8
19 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(A) only applies to noncitizens who are “seeking admission,” but, like
20 ICE, concluded that the provision applied to all noncitizens who are present without
21 admission as they are also “applicant[s] for admission” under 8 U.S.C. 1225(a)(1). *Id.* at
22 218. The BIA acknowledged that its interpretation rendered superfluous multiple
23 provisions of 8 U.S.C. 1226(c), including one recently enacted in the Laken Riley Act, but
24 it stated that “redundancies are common in statutory drafting.” *Id.* at 221-22 (quoting
25
26
27
28

1 *Barton v. Barr*, 590 U.S. 222 (2020)).

2 A motion to reconsider had been filed in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*. The motion
3 challenges the Board’s statutory analysis, and asks it to withdraw its decision because (a)
4 the underlying removal proceedings had concluded by the time the Board issued its
5 decision, making the case moot, and (b) the decision conflicts with longstanding
6 regulations issued by the Attorney General.¹

7
8 To date, federal district judges have issued over 280 decisions either outright
9 rejecting the government’s novel interpretation,ⁱ or finding that noncitizens challenging the
10 government’s interpretation were substantially likely to prevail on the merits.ⁱⁱ These
11 judges have not been unsparing in their criticism of the government’s newfound position.
12 One called it “willfully blind.” *Leal-Hernandez v. Noem*, No. 25-2428, 2025 WL 2430025
13 at *25 (D. Md. Aug. 24, 2025). Another called it “a policy argument, projected onto
14 Congress.” *Romero v. Hyde*, No. 25-11631, ___ F. Supp. 3d ___, 2025 WL 2403827 at *28
15 (D. Mass. Aug. 19, 2025).
16
17

18 The district court in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, 5:25-cv-01873 (C.D. Cal.
19 Nov. 20, 2025) (Sykes, J.), has granted nationwide class certification and summary
20 judgment on this issue. Specifically, the court has declared illegal the Immigration and
21 Customs Enforcement policy, and the Board of Immigration Appeals decision in *Matter of*
22 *Yajure-Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), requiring detention without bond of all
23
24
25

26 ¹ The Board’s Decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* is also not entitled to deference because it
27 contravenes the statutory language and legislative history, and it deviates from longstanding
28 agency practice and regulations.

1 persons who entered without inspection or admission. Thus, class members nationwide
2 now have a binding judgment declaring they are detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), not §
3 1225(b)(2)(A), and are entitled to consideration for release on bond. *Maldonado Bautista*,
4 No. 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM, at *26 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2025) (extending the same
5 declaratory relief granted to individual petitioners to the class as a whole).
6

7 The court there expressly extended the declaratory relief to the Bond Eligible Class,
8 which is nationwide and encompasses:

9 All noncitizens in the United States without lawful status who (1) have
10 entered or will enter the United States without inspection; (2) were not or
11 will not be apprehended upon arrival; and (3) are not or will not be subject
12 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.

13 *Id.* at *4, 26.

14 Petitioner in this case is thus a class member and covered by the declaratory relief
15 granted in *Maldonado Bautista*. Still, Petitioner's habeas action and motion for PI are
16 necessary because the class-wide declaratory judgment in *Maldonado Bautista* does not
17 provide coercive remedies like a writ of habeas corpus ordering release or a bond hearing.
18 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a); *Steffel v. Thompson*, 415 U.S. 452, 471 (1974) (explaining that
19 declaratory judgment "is not ultimately coercive; noncompliance with it may be
20 inappropriate, but is not contempt.")
21

22 It is not difficult to understand why federal district courts have rejected the
23 government's novel interpretation. By its terms, 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(A) only applies to
24 noncitizens who are "seeking admission," and Congress defined "admission" as the "lawful
25 entry of the alien into the United States after inspection and authorization by an
26
27
28

1 immigration officer.” 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(13)(A). Accordingly, “[c]onstruing section
2 1225(b)(2) to apply to noncitizens already residing in the country would read the word
3 ‘entry’ out of the definitions of ‘admitted’ and ‘admission.’” *Chafla v. Scott*, No. 2:25-cv-
4 00437-SDN, at *19 (D. Me. Sep. 21, 2025) (citing 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(13)(A)). As
5 importantly, if “the [BIA was] correct that § 1225(b)’s mandatory detention provisions
6 apply to all persons who have not been admitted into the United States, that would render
7 superfluous those provisions of § 1226 that apply to certain categories of inadmissible
8 aliens, such as § 1226(c)(1)(A), (D), and (E).” *Hasan v. Crawford*, __ F. Supp. 3d __, 2025
9 WL 268225 at *22 (E.D. Va. Sept. 19, 2025) (Brinkema, J.).

12 Indeed, the plain text of § 1226 demonstrates that subsection (a) applies to
13 Petitioner. Section 1226(a) permits the release of noncitizens who are detained “pending a
14 decision on whether the [noncitizen] is to be removed from the United States.” 8 U.S.C. §
15 1226(a). While § 1226(a) provides the right to seek release, § 1226(c) carves out specific
16 categories of noncitizens—including certain categories of noncitizens who are
17 inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)—and subjects them instead to mandatory detention.
18 *See, e.g.*, § 1226(c)(1)(A), (C). If § 1226(a) could never apply to inadmissible noncitizens,
19 there would be no reason to specify that § 1226(c) governs certain persons who are
20 inadmissible; instead, § 1226(c) would only have needed to address people who are
21 deportable for certain offenses under 8 U.S.C. § 1227(a).

24 Recent amendments to § 1226 dramatically reinforce that this section covers people
25 like Petitioner, whom DHS alleges to be present without admission. Specifically, the Laken
26 Riley Act added language to § 1226 that directly references those who are inadmissible
27

1 under § 1182(a)(6) because they are present without admission or under § 1182(a)(7)
2 because of the lack of valid documentation. *See* Laken Riley Act (LRA), Pub. L. No. 119-
3 1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025); 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E). By including such individuals under §
4 1226(c) and carving them out of § 1226(a) if they have been arrested, charged with, or
5 convicted of certain crimes, Congress reaffirmed that § 1226(a) covers persons charged
6 under § 1182(a)(6) or (a)(7). *See Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, No. 3:25-CV-05240-TMC,
7 2025 WL 1193850, at *14 (W.D. Wash. June 6, 2025) (explaining these amendments
8 explicitly provide that § 1226(a) covers people like Petitioner because the “‘specific
9 exceptions’ [in the LRA] for inadmissible noncitizens who are arrested, charged with, or
10 convicted of the enumerated crimes logically leaves those inadmissible noncitizens not
11 criminally implicated under Section 1226(a)’s default rule for discretionary detention.”);
12 *Diaz Martinez v. Hyde*, 2025 WL 2084238, at *7 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025) (“if, as the
13 Government argue[s], . . . a non-citizen’s inadmissibility were alone already sufficient to
14 mandate detention under section 1225(b)(2)(A), then the 2025 amendment would have no
15 effect.” 2025 WL 2084238, at *7; *Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11571-JEK, 2025 WL
16 1869299, at *7 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025) (similar).

17
18
19
20
21 Unlike 8 U.S.C. § 1226, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) requires the detention of certain
22 individuals who are arriving at U.S. ports of entry or who recently entered the United
23 States. As relevant here, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) applies only to individuals who are
24
25
26
27
28

1 “seeking admission” to the United States.² *See Vasquez-Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02180-
2 DMS-MMP, at *18 (S.D. Cal. Sep. 3, 2025) (rejecting DHS’ contention that an individual
3 who entered the United States without inspection “is automatically understood to be
4 ‘seeking admission’ within the meaning of § 1225(b)(2)(A), without need[ing] to
5 affirmatively apply for admission or parole”); *Arrazola Gonzalez v. Noem*, No. 5:25-cv-
6 01789, at *6-7 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2025) (concluding that habeas petitioner showed
7 likelihood of success on the merits of argument that “[t]o ignore the ‘seeking admission’
8 language [in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) . . . would render the language purposeless and
9 violate a key rule of statutory construction”); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 1.2 (addressing
10 noncitizens who are presently “coming or attempting to come into the United States”).
11
12

13 8 U.S.C. § 1225 further defines its scope by reference to “inspections”—a term not
14 defined in the INA, but which typically connotes an examination upon or soon after
15 physical entry. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225 (titled “Inspection by immigration officers; expedited
16 removal of inadmissible arriving [noncitizens]; referral for hearing”); §§ 1225(b)(1)–(2)
17 (referring to “inspections” in their titles); § 1225(b)(2)(A), (b)(4) (referring to “examining
18 immigration officers”); § 1225(d)(1) (authorizing immigration officials to search certain
19 conveyances in order to conduct “inspections” where noncitizens “are being brought into
20 the United States”); *see also Dubin v. United States*, 599 U.S. 110, 120–21 (2023)
21
22

23
24 ² 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) concerns “expedited removal of inadmissible arriving [noncitizens],”
25 including those who present themselves for inspection upon “arriving” and other individuals
26 designated by the Attorney General who have been present in the United States for less than two
27 years, and who are “inadmissible under section 1182(a)(6)(C) or § 1182(a)(7).” 8 U.S.C. §
28 1225(b)(1)(A)(i). Subsection (b)(1) does not require Petitioner’s detention because he did not
present himself for inspection.

1 (emphasis added) (relying on section title to help construe statute). Many statutory
2 provisions, various regulations, and agency precedent also discuss “inspection” in the
3 context of admission processes at ports of entry, further supporting the conclusion that §
4 1225 has a limited temporal and geographic scope. *See, e.g.*, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1187(h)(2)(B)(i),
5 1225A; 8 U.S.C. § 1752a; 8 C.F.R. § 235.1; *Matter of Quilantan*, 25 I&N Dec. 285 (BIA
6 2010)); *see also King v. Burwell*, 576 U.S. 473, 492 (2015) (looking to an Act’s “broader
7 structure . . . to determine [the statute’s] meaning”).
8

9 The statutory and regulatory text’s use of the present and present progressive tenses
10 further excludes noncitizens apprehended in the interior, because they are no longer in the
11 process of arriving in or seeking admission to the United States. *See* 8 U.S.C. §
12 1225(b)(2)(C) (addressing the “[t]reatment of [noncitizens] *arriving* from contiguous
13 territory,” i.e. those who are “*arriving* on land”) (emphasis added). As the Supreme Court
14 recognized, this mandatory detention scheme applies “at the Nation’s borders and ports of
15 entry, where the Government must determine whether a [] [noncitizen] seeking to enter the
16 country is admissible,” and § 1225 is concerned “primarily [with those] seeking entry.”
17 *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287, 297.
18
19

20 The Board in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* ignored the “seeking admission”
21 requirement and instead focused solely on whether an individual who enters the United
22 States without inspection is “applicant for admission,” as § 1225(b)(2)(A) also requires.
23 But as the Ninth Circuit has explained, “when deciding whether language is plain, [courts]
24 must read the words in their context and with a view to their place in the overall statutory
25 scheme.” *San Carlos Apache Tribe v. Becerra*, 53 F.4th 1236, 1240 (9th Cir. 2022)
26
27
28

1 (internal quotation marks omitted). In context, the differential phrasing of “applicant for
2 admission” and “seeking admission” in the same statutory subsection is significant,
3 because “applicant for admission” is a term of art that has been analyzed as such by both
4 the Supreme Court and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. *See DHS v. Thuraissigiam*, 591
5 U.S. 103, 109 (2020); *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287, 297; *see also Torres v. Barr*, 976 F.3d
6 918, 927 (9th Cir. 2020) (en banc) (an individual submits an “application for admission”
7 only at “the moment in time when the immigrant actually applies for admission into the
8 United States.”). By contrast, an individual who has not presented at a port of entry and
9 has not filed any affirmative application for immigration benefits is not “seeking” anything
10 under the plain meaning of the word. *See Merriam Webster’s Dictionary* (2025) (defining
11 “seek” as, inter alia, “to go in search of” or “to try to acquire or gain”).
12

13
14 Thus, Petitioner prevails regardless of the scope of § 1225(a)(1)’s definition of
15 “applicant for admission.” This is because classification as an “applicant for admission”
16 is not sufficient to render someone subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2). The
17 “applicant for admission” must *also* be “seeking admission,” and that is clearly not the case
18 for Petitioner. In sum, § 1226 governs this case. The mandatory detention provision of §
19 1225 applies only to individuals arriving in the United States as specified in the statute,
20 while § 1226 applies to those who previously entered without admission.
21
22

23 **B. PETITIONER WILL SUFFER IRREPARABLE HARM IN THE ABSENCE OF**
24 **A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION.**

25 In the absence of a PI, Petitioner will continue to be unlawfully detained by
26 Respondents under § 1225(b)(2) and denied his freedom based on an erroneous
27
28

1 interpretation of the law. “Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody,
2 detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty” that the Due
3 Process Clause protects. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001). Further, it “is well
4 established that the deprivation of constitutional rights unquestionably constitutes
5 irreparable injury.” *Melendres v. Arpaio*, 695 F.3d 990, 1002 (9th Cir. 2012) (citation
6 modified); *Warsoldier v. Woodford*, 418 F.3d 989, 1001-02 (9th Cir. 2005); *see also*
7 *Hernandez v. Sessions*, 872 F.3d 976, 994–95 (9th Cir. 2017) (concluding that Plaintiffs
8 who established unconstitutional deprivation of physical liberty “also carried their burden
9 as to irreparable harm.”); *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM,
10 at *16 (C.D. Cal. July 28, 2025) (“[T]he Court finds that the potential for Petitioners’
11 continued detention without an initial bond hearing would cause immediate and irreparable
12 injury, as this violates statutory rights afforded under § 1226(a).”).

13
14
15 Detainees in civil ICE custody are held in “prison-like conditions” which have real
16 consequences for their lives. *Preap v. Johnson*, 831 F.3d 1193, 1195 (9th Cir. 2016).
17 During his more than two decades in the U.S., Petitioner has been gainfully employed,
18 married and had two U.S. citizen children. Further, Petitioner has extensive community
19 ties here, and has good moral character. Continued detention in such “prison-like”
20 conditions which separate Petitioner from his wife, teenage children, and community
21 constitute an irreparable harm.

22
23
24 C. THE BALANCE OF EQUITIES TIPS IN PETITIONER’S FAVOR AND A
25 PI IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.
26
27
28

1 Because the government is a party, these two factors are considered together. *Nken*
2 *v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 435 (2009). Petitioner has established that the public interest
3 factor weighs in his favor because his claim asserts that the new policy violates federal
4 laws. *See Valle del Sol Inc. v. Whiting*, 732 F.3d 1006, 1029 (9th Cir. 2013). Because the
5 policy preventing Petitioner from realizing any bond an immigration judge may grant “is
6 inconsistent with federal law, . . . the balance of hardships and public interest factors weigh
7 in favor of a preliminary injunction.” *Moreno Galvez v. Cuccinelli*, 387 F. Supp. 3d 1208,
8 1218 (W.D. Wash. 2019).

10 Finally, any burden imposed by requiring the Respondents to release Petitioner from
11 custody or providing a hearing before an immigration judge is both *de minimis* and clearly
12 outweighed by the substantial harm he will suffer as he continues to be detained. *See Lopez*
13 *v. Heckler*, 713 F.2d 1432, 1437 (9th Cir. 1983) (“Society’s interest lies on the side of
14 affording fair procedures to all persons, even though the expenditure of governmental
15 funds is required.”).

18 D. PRUDENTIAL EXHAUSTION IS NOT REQUIRED.

19 Prudential exhaustion does not require Petitioner to be forced to endure the very
20 harm he is seeking to avoid by awaiting an immigration judge or BIA decision, where the
21 BIA’s recent precedential decision makes the outcome of that appeal a foregone
22 conclusion. “[T]here are a number of exceptions to the general rule requiring exhaustion,
23 covering situations such as where administrative remedies are inadequate or not
24 efficacious, . . . [or] irreparable injury will result.” *Laing v. Ashcroft*, 370 F.3d 994, 1000
25 (9th Cir. 2004) (citation omitted). Administrative exhaustion is not required where a request
26
27
28

1 for relief before the agency would be futile because the agency has “predetermined the
2 issue before it.” *McCarthy v. Madigan*, 503 U.S. 140, 148 (1992). Here, the exceptions
3 regarding futility, irreparable injury, and agency delay warrant waiving any prudential
4 exhaustion requirement.

5
6 1. Futility

7 The BIA’s decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216, renders
8 prudential exhaustion futile in bond cases involving individuals who entered the United
9 States without inspection. *Zaragoza Mosqueda, v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2591530, at *7 (C.D.
10 Cal. Sept. 8, 2025). The BIA’s decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* “predetermine[s]” the
11 outcome of DHS’s administrative appeal. *McCarthy*, 503 U.S. at 148. Prudential
12 exhaustion is therefore unnecessary, and the Court should take jurisdiction over
13 Petitioner’s case.
14

15
16 2. Irreparable injury

17 Because Petitioner was denied access to a bond, each day he remains in detention is
18 one in which his statutory and constitutional rights have been violated. Similarly situated
19 district courts have repeatedly recognized this fact. As one court has explained, “because
20 of delays inherent in the administrative process, BIA review would result in the very harm
21 of delays inherent in the administrative process, BIA review would result in the very harm
22 that the bond hearing was designed to prevent: prolonged detention without due process.”
23 *Hechavarria v. Whitaker*, 358 F. Supp. 3d 227, 237 (W.D.N.Y. 2019) (internal quotation
24 marks omitted). Indeed, “if Petitioner is correct on the merits of his habeas petition, then
25 Petitioner has *already* been unlawfully deprived of a [lawful] bond hearing [,] [and] . . .
26 each additional day that Petitioner is detained without a [lawful] bond hearing would cause
27
28

1 him harm that cannot be repaired.” *Villalta v. Sessions*, No. 17-CV-05390-LHK, 2017 WL
2 4355182, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 2, 2017) (internal quotation marks and brackets omitted);
3 *see also Cortez v. Sessions*, 318 F. Supp. 3d 1134, 1139 (N.D. Cal. 2018) (similar).

4
5 3. Agency delay

6 Third, the BIA’s delays in adjudicating bond appeals warrant excusing any
7 exhaustion requirement. A court’s ability to waive exhaustion based on delay is especially
8 broad here given the “fundamental” interest in physical liberty that is at stake for Petitioner.
9 *Hernandez*, 872 F.3d at 993. The BIA’s months-long review is unreasonable and results in
10 ongoing injury to Petitioner. *See, e.g., Perez v. Wolf*, 445 F. Supp. 3d 275, 286 (N. D. Cal.
11 April 14, 2020)

12
13 D. THERE IS NO JURISDICTIONAL HURDLE BARRING RELIEF

14 Finally, there is no jurisdictional bar under the INA because Petitioner does not seek
15 review of a removal order, but of custody, and his challenge does not fall within the discrete
16 actions specified in the bar to review at 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g). *Maldonado Bautista*, at *9-10
17 (C.D. Cal. July 28, 2025) (addressing “zipper clause” at 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9)).

18
19 V. CONCLUSION

20 For these reasons, the Court should grant Petitioner’s First Amended Motion for a
21 Preliminary Injunction.

22 Dated: January 5, 2026

23
24 Respectfully Submitted,

25
26 s/Gregory P. Fay
27 Gregory P. Fay
28 *Attorney for Petitioner*

MOTION LENGTH CERTIFICATION

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

The undersigned counsel of record for Petitioner certifies that this Motion and accompanying Memorandum does not exceed seventeen (17) pages, exclusive of attachments and any required statement of facts, which complies with LR Civ. 7.2.

s/Gregory P. Fay
Gregory P. Fay

Attorney for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

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

I, Gregory P. Fay hereby certify that on Monday, January 5, 2026, I served a copy of PETITIONER'S FIRST AMENDED MOTION FOR A TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER/PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION by mail to the following individual(s):

Chief, Civil Division, U.S. Attorney's Office
District of Arizona
40 N. Central Ave., Ste. 1200
Phoenix, AZ 85004

s/Gregory P. Fay
Gregory P. Fay

Attorney for Petitioner

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

Castellanos Lopez v. Warden, No. 25-2527 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 27, 2025) (Huie, J.); *Esquivel-Ipina v. Larose*, No. 25-2672 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2025) (Sammartino, J.); *Benitez-Cornejo v. Cantu*, No. 25-3672 (D. Ariz. Oct. 17, 2025) (Tuchi, J.); *Torres v. Wamsley*, 2025 WL 2855379 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 8, 2025) (Menendez, J.); *BDVS v. Forestal*, No. 25-1968 (S.D. Ind. Oct. 8, 2025) (Evans Barker, J.); *Eliseo v. Olson*, No. 25-3381, Oct. 8, 2025) (Blackwell, J.); *Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi*, No. 25-3726, (S.D. Tex. Oct. 7, 2025) (Rosenthal, J.); *Echevarria v. Bondi*, No. 25-3252, 2025 LX 492534 (D. Ariz. Oct. 3, 2025) (Joun, J.); *Belsai D.S. v. Bondi*, No. 25-3682 (D. Minn. Oct. 1, 2025) (Menendez, J.); *Santiago Santiago v. Noem*, No. 25-361 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 1, 2025) (Cardone, J.); *Quispe-Ardiles v. Noem*, No. 25-1382, 2025 WL 2783799 (E.D. Va. Sept. 30, 2025) (Nachmanoff, J.); *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, No. 25-5240, 2025 WL 2782499 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 30, 2025) (Cartwright, J.); *Da Silva v. ICE*, No. 25-284, 2025 WL 2778083 (D.N.H. Sept. 29, 2025) (McCafferty, J.); *Quispe v. Crawford*, No. 25-1471, 2025 WL 2783799 (E.D. Va. Sept. 29, 2025) (Trenka, J.); *Inlago Tocagon v. Moniz*, No. 25-12453, 2025 WL 2778023 (D. Mass. Sept. 29, 2025) (Joun, J.); *Barrios v. Shepley*, No. 25-406, 2025 WL 2772579 (D. Maine Sept. 29, 2025) (Woodcock, Jr.); *J.U. v. Maldonado*, No. 25-4836, 2025 WL 2772765 (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 29, 2025) (Merchant, J.); *Savane v. Francis*, No. 25-6666, 2025 WL 2774452 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 28, 2025) (Woods, J.); *Zumba v. Bondi*, No. 25-14626, 2025 WL 2753496 (D.N.J. Sept. 26, 2025) (Hayden, J.); *Villanueva Herrera v. Tate*, No. 25-3364 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 26, 2025) (Hittner, J.); *Gamez Lira v. Noem*, No. 25-855 (D.N.M. 25-855) (Johnson, J.); *Singh v. Lewis*, No. 25-96, 2025 LX 400065 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 22, 2025) (Jennings, J.); *Chafra v. Scott*, No. 25-437, 2025 LX 422663 (D. Maine Sept. 21, 2025) (Neumann, J.); *Hasan v. Crawford*, No. 25-1408, 2025 LX 499354 (E.D. Va. Sept. 19, 2025) (Brinkema, J.); *Barrera v. Tindall*, No. 25-451, 2025 LX 435572 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 19, 2025) (Jenning, J.); *Salazar v. Dedos*, No. 25-835, 2025 WL 2676729 (D.N.M. Sept. 17, 2025) (Urias, J.); *Garcia Cortes v. Noem*, No. 25-2677, 2025 WL 2652880 (D. Colo. Sept. 16, 2025) (Sweeney, J.); *Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft*, No. 25-12546, 2025 WL 2609425 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9, 2025) (White, J.); *Sampiao v. Hyde*, No. 25-11981, 2025 WL 2607924 (D. Mass. Sept. 9, 2025) (Kobick, J.); *Jimenez v. FCI Berlin*, No. 25-326, 2025 LX 360066 (D.N.H. Sept. 8, 2025) (McCafferty, J.); *Doe v. Moniz*, No. 25-12094, 2025 WL 2576819 (D. Mass. Sept. 5, 2025) (Talwani, J.); *Lopez Benitez v. Francis*, No. 25-5937, 2025 WL 2267803 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 8, 2025) (Ho, J.); *Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft*, No. 25-12486, 2025 WL 2496379 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025) (McMillion, J.); *Diaz v. Mattivelo*, No. 25-12226, 2025 WL 2457610 (D. Mass. Aug. 27, 2025) (Kobick, J.); *Jose J.O.E. v. Bondi*, No. 25-3051, 2025 WL 2466670 (D. Minn. Aug. 27, 2025) (Tostrud, J.); *Leal-Hernandez v. Noem*, No. 25-2428, 2025 WL 2430025 (D. Md. Aug. 24, 2025) (Rubin, J.); *Romero v. Hyde*, No. 25-11631, ___ F.Supp.3d ___, 2025 WL 2403827 (D. Mass. Aug. 19, 2025) (Murphy, J.); *Samb v. Joyce*, No. 25-6373, 2025 WL 2398831 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 19, 2025) (Ho, J.); *dos Santos v. Noem*, No. 25-12052, 2025 WL 2370988 (D. Mass. Aug. 14, 2025) (Kobick, J.); *Diaz Martinez v. Hyde*, No. 25-11613, ___ F.Supp.3d ___, 2025 WL 2084238 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025) (Murphy, J.); *Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 25-11571, 2025 WL 1869299 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025) (Kobick, J.).

ⁱⁱ *Arce-Cervera v. Noem*, 25-1895 (D. Nev. Oct. 28, 2025); *Martinez Lopez v. Noem*, No. 3:25-2734 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 23, 2025) (Park, J.); *Sabi Polo v. Chestnut*, No. 25-1342 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2025) (Thurston, J.); *Menjivar Sanchez v. Wofford*, No. 25-1187 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2025) (Oberto, J.); *E.C. v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2916264 (D. Nev. Oct. 14, 2025) (Boulware, J.); *Rico-Tapia v. Smith*

1 No. 25-379 (D. Haw. Oct. 10, 2025) (Park, J.); *Alvarez Chavez v. Kaiser*, 2025 WL 2909526 (N.D.
2 Cal. Oct. 9, 2025) (Beeler, J.) *Flores v. Noem*, No. 25-2490, 2025 LX 444718 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 29,
3 2025) (Birotte, J.); *Roa v. Albarran*, No. 25-7802, 2025 WL 2732923 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2025)
4 (*Seeborg*, J.); *Lopez v. Hardin*, No. 25-830, 2025 WL 2732717 (M.D. Fla. Sept. 25, 2025) (Dudek,
5 J.); *Guerrero Lepe v. Andrews*, No. 1:25-cv-01163 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2025) (Sherriff, J.); *Aceros*
6 *v. Kaiser*, No. 25-06924, 2025 LX 330524 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 12, 2025) (Chen, J.); *Guzman v.*
7 *Andrews*, No. 25-01015, 2025 LX 354551 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025) (Sherriff, J.); *Mosqueda v.*
8 *Noem*, No. 25-2304, 2025 WL 2591530 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2025) (Snyder, J.); *Nieves v. Kaiser*,
9 No. 25-6921, 2025 LX 320701 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025) (Beeler, J.); *Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-
10 2180, 2025 WL 2549431 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025) (Sabraw, J.); *Garcia v. Kaiser*, No. 25-06916,
11 2025 LX 322337 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 29, 2025) (Gonzalez Rogers, J.); *Kostak v. Trump*, No. 25-1093,
12 2025 WL 2472136 (W.D. La. Aug. 27, 2025) (Edwards, J.); *Benitez v. Noem*, No. 25-02190, 2025
13 LX 322897 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 26, 2025) (Klausner, J.); *Ramirez Clavijo v. Kaiser*, No. 25-06248,
14 2025 WL 2419263 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2025) (Freeman, J.); *Arrazola-Gonzalez v. Noem*, No. 25-
15 01789, 2025 WL 2379285 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2025) (Wright, J.); *Maldonado v. Olson*, No. 25-
16 3142, 2025 WL 2374411 (D. Minn. Aug. 15, 2025) (Nelson, J.); *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*,
17 No. 25-01873, 2025 LX 341363 (C.D. Cal. July 28, 2025); *Vazquez v. Bostock*, No. 25-05240, 779
18 F. Supp. 3d 1239 (W.D. Wash. April 24, 2025) (Cartwright, J.). *But see Sixtos Chavez v. Noem*,
19 No. 25-2325 (S.D. Cal. Sep. 24, 2025) (Bencivengo, J.) (denying temporary restraining order);
20 *Villanueva v. Chestnut*, No. 25-2 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2025) (Sheriff, J.) (same).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28