ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney
GLEN F. DORGAN
Assistant United States Attorney
Cal Bar Number 160502
Office of the U.S. Attorney
880 Front Street, Room 6293
San Diego, CA 92101-8893
Telephone: (619) 546-7665
Email: glen.dorgan@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Respondents

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FRANCISCO JAVIER QUIROZ FIGUEROA,

Petitioner,

v.

CHRISTOPHER J. LAROSE, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Case No.: 3:25-cv-3623-AGS-DEB

RESPONSE TO PETITION

I.

EFFECT OF FINAL JUDGMENT IN *BAUTISTA*

On July 8, 2025, the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") instituted a notice titled "Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission" (the "Notice") requiring, in general, that anyone arrested in the United States and charged with being inadmissible to be considered an "applicant for admission" under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and not subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).

In *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2025 WL 3289861 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2025), the district court declared the Notice unlawful under the Administrative Procedures Act but did not issue a final judgment. On December 18, 2025, however, the *Bautista* court entered final judgement. *Bautista*, ECF No. 94. Accordingly, Respondents acknowledge that Petitioner is detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and is entitled to an order from this Court directing a bond hearing be held pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).

Respondents reserve the right to supplement this response in the event of a stay of enforcement of the *Bautista* final judgment, appellate relief, or a change in DHS policy.

II.

FOURTH AMENDMENT CLAIMS FAIL

To the extent Petitioner asserts claims under the Fourth Amendment, he fails to explain why release is the remedy for such alleged violations. *United States v. Crews*, 445 U.S. 463, 474 (1980) (noting, in the criminal context, that Fourth Amendment's "exclusionary principle" "delimits what proof the Government may offer against the accused at trial, closing the courtroom door to evidence secured by official lawlessness," but an individual "is not himself a suppressible 'fruit'"); *Cruz v. Barr*, 926 F.3d 1128, 1146 (9th Cir. 2019) (releasing petitioner on Fourth Amendment grounds because fruits of the regulatory violation were the only evidence of petitioner's alienage).

Moreover, Fourth Amendment claims related to alienage "belong in front of an Immigration Judge, not a federal district court." *See Marvan v. Slaughter*, No. CV 25-49-H-DLC, 2025 WL 1940043, at *3 (D. Mont. July 15, 2025) (denying habeas petition challenging detention based on Fourth Amendment violations for lack of subject matter jurisdiction). Petitioner cannot simply "'bypass the immigration courts and proceed directly to district court. Instead, [he] must exhaust the administrative process before [he] can access the federal courts.'" *Id.* at *4 (quoting *J.E.F.M.*, 837 F.3d at 1029). To the extent Petitioner desires to bring such claims, this district court does not have jurisdiction. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9), "[j]udicial review of all questions of law and fact . . . *arising from any action taken or proceeding brought to remove an alien from the United States* under this subchapter shall be available only in judicial review of a final order under this section." Further, judicial review of a final order is available only through "a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals." 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(5).

DATED: December 19, 2025

ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney

s/ Glen F. Dorgan
GLEN F. DORGAN
Assistant United States Attorney