

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

5  
6 *Attorney for Petitioner*

7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
8 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

9 Inocente Quiju Ramos,  
10  
11 **Petitioner,**

12 **v.**

13 John E. Cantu, Field Office Director of  
Enforcement and Removal Operations,  
14 Phoenix Field Office, Immigration and  
Customs Enforcement;  
15  
16 Kristi Noem, Secretary, U.S. Department of  
Homeland Security;  
17  
18 Pamela Bondi, U.S. Attorney General;  
19  
20 David R. Rivas, Warden of San Luis  
Regional Detention Center;  
21  
22 Todd Lyons, Acting Director, Immigration  
and Customs Enforcement and Removal  
Operations.

23  
24 **Respondents.**

Case No.

**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 David R. Rivas, in his official capacity as Warden of the San Luis Regional 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.

Petitioner is submitting a Habeas petition for same, on the same grounds, and is also filing this preliminary injunction motion to prevent irreparable injury before a hearing on his Habeas Petition may be held.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that this Court grant his request for a

1 preliminary injunction enjoining Respondents from continuing to detain him, and order a  
2 bond hearing before an immigration judge in fifteen days.

3 Dated: December 17, 2025

Respectfully Submitted

4 s/Gregory P. Fay  
5 Attorney for Petitioner

6  
7  
8  
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 ..... 3

    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..... 6

    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 Inocente Quiju Ramos 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 55-year-old resident of Tampa, Florida. *Ex. D.* He first entered the  
22 United States in 1999 at the age of 29 and has resided here continuously since that time.  
23 *Id.* Petitioner is married and has two children who are United States citizens. *Ex. E, F.* He  
24 will apply for cancellation of removal and is prima facie eligible for such relief. *Ex. D.*  
25 Prior to detention, Petitioner worked in construction. *Id.* Petitioner has no criminal  
26  
27  
28

1 convictions and was only arrested once in 2010 for a domestic dispute that was ultimately  
2 dismissed. *Ex. J.* Petitioner has strong community ties and good moral character, as  
3 demonstrated by the various letters he submitted with his bond request. *Ex. F-I.*

4           Petitioner was detained on September 18, 2025, during a traffic stop as he traveled  
5 to work. *Ex. A.* Petitioner has been detained since that time. He is currently detained at the  
6 San Luis Regional Detention Center. Petitioner has a Master Calendar hearing scheduled  
7 on December 30, 2025, before the Immigration Court in Imperial, California. *Ex. E.*  
8 Petitioner is still detained at a federal detention center in Arizona. Absent this Court's  
9 intervention, he will remain detained for the duration of his removal proceedings, over  
10 2,000 miles from his wife, children, and community. Petitioner sought a custody  
11 redetermination under 8 C.F.R. § 1236. *Ex. D.* On December 2, 2025, the immigration  
12 judge denied that bond request, citing *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*. *Ex. C.*

### 15                           **III. LEGAL STANDARD**

16           Petitioner is entitled to preliminary injunctive relief if he establishes that he is  
17 “likely to succeed on the merits, . . . likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of  
18 preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in  
19 the public interest.” *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008). Even if  
20 Petitioner does not show a likelihood of success on the merits, the Court may still grant  
21 relief if he raises “serious questions” as to the merits of his claims, the balance of hardships  
22 tips “sharply” in his favor, and the remaining equitable factors are satisfied. *Alliance for*  
23 *the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127 (9th Cir. 2011). As shown below, Petitioner  
24 overwhelmingly satisfies both standards.  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 **IV. ARGUMENT**

2 Petitioner should prevail on this motion because he is likely to succeed on the merits  
3 of his claims, likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, the  
4 balance of equities tips in his favor, and an injunction is in the public interest. Respondents  
5 have violated the Immigration and Nationality Act and applicable regulations. Indeed, the  
6 text of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) demonstrate that Petitioner is not subject to  
7 mandatory detention. Further, other federal courts have rejected the Respondents’ novel  
8 argument that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) governs the detention of every noncitizen without lawful  
9 immigration status.  
10

11  
12 Petitioner will also suffer irreparable harm in the absence of a PI. The balance of  
13 equities tips in his favor, and a PI is in the public interest. Prudential exhaustion is not  
14 required here due to futility, irreparable injury, and agency delay. Finally, there is no  
15 jurisdictional hurdle barring relief. This Court should thus grant this motion.  
16

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

18 Petitioner is likely to succeed on his claim that his ongoing detention by  
19 Respondents under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), and the denial of access to bond, is unlawful.  
20

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

22 Noncitizens detained by DHS while in removal proceedings generally can request a  
23 bond—or “custody redetermination”—hearing before an immigration judge. 8 U.S.C.  
24 1226(a); 8 C.F.R. 1236.1(d)(1). If the noncitizen does not present a danger to others, a  
25 threat to the national security, or a flight risk, the immigration judge may order that  
26 individual released on conditional parole or upon the posting of a monetary bond of no less  
27 individual released on conditional parole or upon the posting of a monetary bond of no less  
28

1 than \$1,500. 8 U.S.C. 1226(a)(2)(A)-(B); *Matter of Guerra*, 24 I&N Dec. 37 (BIA 2006).

2 Certain categories of noncitizens are subject to mandatory detention while in  
3 removal proceedings. Under a provision in Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant  
4 Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA), if “an alien seeking admission is not clearly and  
5 beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, the alien shall be detained for a proceeding under  
6 [8 U.S.C. 1229a].” 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(A). In the same bill, Congress defined “admission”  
7 and “admitted” as the “lawful entry of the alien into the United States after inspection and  
8 authorization by an immigration officer.” 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(13)(A). In other words, the  
9 terms “admission” and “admitted” “refer to inspection and authorization by an immigration  
10 officer at the port of entry.” *Hing Sum v. Holder*, 602 F.3d 1092, 1101 (9th Cir. 2010).  
11 Thus, as the Supreme Court has explained, 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(A) only applies to  
12 noncitizens who are “seeking admission into the country,” *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S.  
13 281, 289 (2018), i.e., those who are “arriving in the United States.” *Clark v. Martinez*, 543  
14 U.S. 371, 373 (2005).  
15  
16  
17

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

1 ineligible for bond. *Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal*  
2 *of Aliens; Conduct of Removal*, 62 Fed. Reg. 444, 483 (Jan. 3, 1997). After receiving  
3 comments, however, the Attorney General deleted the proposed provision and replaced it  
4 with one that would apply only to “[a]rriving aliens.” *Inspection and Expedited Removal*  
5 *of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum*  
6 *Procedures*, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10361 (March 6, 1997).

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

14 The IIRIRA also made subject to mandatory detention those noncitizens who have  
15 been convicted of certain crimes or engaged in terrorist activity. For example, the IIRIRA  
16 made noncitizens who are inadmissible by reason of having committed certain criminal  
17 offenses subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. 1226(c)(1)(A), and those  
18 inadmissible for having engaged in terrorist activity subject to mandatory detention under  
19 8 U.S.C. 1226(c)(1)(D). More recently, under the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No. 119-1,  
20 Congress mandated detention for noncitizens who entered without admission and were  
21 subsequently charged with, arrested for, convicted of, or admitted to certain offenses. 8  
22 U.S.C. 1226(c)(1)(E). These provisions under 8 U.S.C. 1226(c) would be superfluous if all  
23 noncitizens who were present without admission were already subject to mandatory  
24 detention under 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(A).  
25  
26  
27  
28

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

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

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

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

1 provisions of 8 U.S.C. 1226(c), including one recently enacted in the Laken Riley Act, but  
2 it stated that “redundancies are common in statutory drafting.” *Id.* at 221-22 (quoting  
3 *Barton v. Barr*, 590 U.S. 222 (2020)).

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

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

18  
19  
20 The district court in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, 5:25-cv-01873 (C.D. Cal.  
21 Nov. 20, 2025) (Sykes, J.), has granted nationwide class certification and summary  
22 judgment on this issue. Specifically, the court has declared illegal the Immigration and  
23

24  
25  
26 <sup>1</sup> 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 Customs Enforcement policy, and the Board of Immigration Appeals decision in *Matter of*  
2 *Yajure-Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), requiring detention without bond of all  
3 persons who entered without inspection or admission. Thus, class members nationwide  
4 now have a binding judgment declaring they are detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), not §  
5 1225(b)(2)(A), and are entitled to consideration for release on bond. *Maldonado Bautista*,  
6 No. 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM, at \*26 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2025) (extending the same  
7 declaratory relief granted to individual petitioners to the class as a whole).  
8

9 The court there expressly extended the declaratory relief to the Bond Eligible Class,  
10 which is nationwide and encompasses:  
11

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

17 *Id.* at \*4, 26.

18 Petitioner in this case is thus a class member and covered by the declaratory relief  
19 granted in *Maldonado Bautista*. Still, Petitioner's habeas action and motion for PI are  
20 necessary because the class-wide declaratory judgment in *Maldonado Bautista* does not  
21 provide coercive remedies like a writ of habeas corpus ordering release or a bond hearing.  
22 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a); *Steffel v. Thompson*, 415 U.S. 452, 471 (1974) (explaining that  
23 declaratory judgment "is not ultimately coercive; noncompliance with it may be  
24 inappropriate, but is not contempt.")  
25

26 It is not difficult to understand why federal district courts have rejected the  
27 government's novel interpretation. By its terms, 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(A) only applies to  
28

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

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

24 Recent amendments to § 1226 dramatically reinforce that this section covers people  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 like Petitioner, whom DHS alleges to be present without admission. Specifically, the Laken  
2 Riley Act added language to § 1226 that directly references those who are inadmissible  
3 under § 1182(a)(6) because they are present without admission or under § 1182(a)(7)  
4 because of the lack of valid documentation. *See* Laken Riley Act (LRA), Pub. L. No. 119-  
5 1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025); 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E). By including such individuals under §  
6 1226(c) and carving them out of § 1226(a) if they have been arrested, charged with, or  
7 convicted of certain crimes, Congress reaffirmed that § 1226(a) covers persons charged  
8 under § 1182(a)(6) or (a)(7). *See Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, No. 3:25-CV-05240-TMC,  
9 2025 WL 1193850, at \*14 (W.D. Wash. June 6, 2025) (explaining these amendments  
10 explicitly provide that § 1226(a) covers people like Petitioner because the “‘specific  
11 exceptions’ [in the LRA] for inadmissible noncitizens who are arrested, charged with, or  
12 convicted of the enumerated crimes logically leaves those inadmissible noncitizens not  
13 criminally implicated under Section 1226(a)’s default rule for discretionary detention.”);  
14 *Diaz Martinez v. Hyde*, 2025 WL 2084238, at \*7 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025) (“if, as the  
15 Government argue[s], . . . a non-citizen’s inadmissibility were alone already sufficient to  
16 mandate detention under section 1225(b)(2)(A), then the 2025 amendment would have no  
17 effect.” 2025 WL 2084238, at \*7; *Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11571-JEK, 2025 WL  
18 1869299, at \*7 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025) (similar).

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

1 “seeking admission” to the United States.<sup>2</sup> *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”).

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)

---

24 <sup>2</sup> 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         The Board in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* ignored the “seeking admission”  
20 requirement and instead focused solely on whether an individual who enters the United  
21 States without inspection is “applicant for admission,” as § 1225(b)(2)(A) also requires.  
22 But as the Ninth Circuit has explained, “when deciding whether language is plain, [courts]  
23 must read the words in their context and with a view to their place in the overall statutory  
24 scheme.” *San Carlos Apache Tribe v. Becerra*, 53 F.4th 1236, 1240 (9th Cir. 2022)  
25  
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. Petitioner has now been in custody following his detention for  
2 over 90 days. “Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or  
3 other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty” that the Due Process  
4 Clause protects. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001). Further, it “is well  
5 established that the deprivation of constitutional rights unquestionably constitutes  
6 irreparable injury.” *Melendres v. Arpaio*, 695 F.3d 990, 1002 (9th Cir. 2012) (citation  
7 modified); *Warsoldier v. Woodford*, 418 F.3d 989, 1001-02 (9th Cir. 2005); *see also*  
8 *Hernandez v. Sessions*, 872 F.3d 976, 994–95 (9th Cir. 2017) (concluding that Plaintiffs  
9 who established unconstitutional deprivation of physical liberty “also carried their burden  
10 as to irreparable harm.”); *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM,  
11 at \*16 (C.D. Cal. July 28, 2025) (“[T]he Court finds that the potential for Petitioners’  
12 continued detention without an initial bond hearing would cause immediate and irreparable  
13 injury, as this violates statutory rights afforded under § 1226(a).”).  
14  
15  
16

17 Detainees in civil ICE custody are held in “prison-like conditions” which have real  
18 consequences for their lives. *Preap v. Johnson*, 831 F.3d 1193, 1195 (9th Cir. 2016).  
19 During his more than two decades in the U.S., Petitioner has been gainfully employed,  
20 married and had two U.S. citizen children. Further, Petitioner has extensive community  
21 ties here, and has good moral character. Continued detention in such “prison-like”  
22 conditions which separate Petitioner from his wife, teenage children, and community  
23 constitute an irreparable harm.  
24

25  
26 C. THE BALANCE OF EQUITIES TIPS IN PETITIONER’S FAVOR AND A  
27 PI IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.  
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.”).

#### 16 D. PRUDENTIAL EXHAUSTION IS NOT REQUIRED.

17 Prudential exhaustion does not require Petitioner to be forced to endure the very  
18 harm he is seeking to avoid by awaiting an immigration judge or BIA decision, where the  
19 BIA’s recent precedential decision makes the outcome of that appeal a foregone  
20 conclusion. “[T]here are a number of exceptions to the general rule requiring exhaustion,  
21 covering situations such as where administrative remedies are inadequate or not  
22 efficacious, . . . [or] irreparable injury will result.” *Laing v. Ashcroft*, 370 F.3d 994, 1000  
23 (9th Cir. 2004) (citation omitted). Administrative exhaustion is not required where a request  
24  
25  
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 that the bond hearing was designed to prevent: prolonged detention without due process.”  
22 *Hechavarria v. Whitaker*, 358 F. Supp. 3d 227, 237 (W.D.N.Y. 2019) (internal quotation  
23 marks omitted). Indeed, “if Petitioner is correct on the merits of his habeas petition, then  
24 Petitioner has *already* been unlawfully deprived of a [lawful] bond hearing [,] [and] . . .  
25 each additional day that Petitioner is detained without a [lawful] bond hearing would cause  
26  
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  
21 For these reasons, the Court should grant Petitioner’s Motion for a Preliminary  
22 Injunction.

23 Dated: December 17, 2025

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 I, Gregory P. Fay hereby certify that on Wednesday, December 17, 2025, I served  
2 a copy of PETITIONER’S MOTION FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION by mail to  
3 the following individual(s):

4  
5 Chief, Civil Division, U.S. Attorney’s Office  
6 District of Arizona  
7 40 N. Central Ave., Ste. 1200  
8 Phoenix, AZ 85004

9  
10 s/Gregory P. Fay  
11 Gregory P. Fay

12 *Attorney for Petitioner*

1

2 <sup>i</sup> *Castellanos Lopez v. Warden*, No. 25-2527 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 27, 2025) (Huie, J.); *Esquivel-Ipina v.*  
3 *Larose*, No. 25-2672 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2025) (Sammartino, J.); *Benitez-Cornejo v. Cantu*, No.  
4 25-3672 (D. Ariz. Oct. 17, 2025) (Tuchi, J.); *Torres v. Wamsley*, 2025 WL 2855379 (W.D. Wash.  
5 Oct. 8, 2025) (Menendez, J.); *BDVS v. Forestal*, No. 25-1968 (S.D. Ind. Oct. 8, 2025) (Evans  
6 Barker, J.); *Eliseo v. Olson*, No. 25-3381, Oct. 8, 2025) (Blackwell, J.); *Buenrostro-Mendez v.*  
7 *Bondi*, No. 25-3726, (S.D. Tex. Oct. 7, 2025) (Rosenthal, J.); *Echevarria v. Bondi*, No. 25-3252,  
8 2025 LX 492534 (D. Ariz. Oct. 3, 2025) (Joun, J.); *Belsai D.S. v. Bondi*, No. 25-3682 (D. Minn.  
9 Oct. 1, 2025) (Menendez, J.); *Santiago Santiago v. Noem*, No. 25-361 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 1, 2025)  
10 (Cardone, J.); *Quispe-Ardiles v. Noem*, No. 25-1382, 2025 WL 2783799 (E.D. Va. Sept. 30, 2025)  
11 (Nachmanoff, J.); *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, No. 25-5240, 2025 WL 2782499 (W.D. Wash.  
12 Sept. 30, 2025) (Cartwright, J.); *Da Silva v. ICE*, No. 25-284, 2025 WL 2778083 (D.N.H. Sept.  
13 29, 2025) (McCafferty, J.); *Quispe v. Crawford*, No. 25-1471, 2025 WL 2783799 (E.D. Va. Sept.  
14 29, 2025) (Trenga, J.); *Inlago Tocagon v. Moniz*, No. 25-12453, 2025 WL 2778023 (D. Mass. Sept.  
15 29, 2025) (Joun, J.); *Barrios v. Shepley*, No. 25-406, 2025 WL 2772579 (D. Maine Sept. 29, 2025)  
16 (Woodcock, Jr.); *J.U. v. Maldonado*, No. 25-4836, 2025 WL 2772765 (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 29, 2025)  
17 (Merchant, J.); *Savane v. Francis*, No. 25-6666, 2025 WL 2774452 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 28, 2025)  
18 (Woods, J.); *Zumba v. Bondi*, No. 25-14626, 2025 WL 2753496 (D.N.J. Sept. 26, 2025) (Hayden,  
19 J.); *Villanueva Herrera v. Tate*, No. 25-3364 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 26, 2025) (Hittner, J.); *Gamez Lira*  
20 *v. Noem*, No. 25-855 (D.N.M. 25-855) (Johnson, J.); *Singh v. Lewis*, No. 25-96, 2025 LX 400065  
21 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 22, 2025) (Jennings, J.); *Chafra v. Scott*, No. 25-437, 2025 LX 422663 (D. Maine  
22 Sept. 21, 2025) (Neumann, J.); *Hasan v. Crawford*, No. 25-1408, 2025 LX 499354 (E.D. Va. Sept.  
23 19, 2025) (Brinkema, J.); *Barrera v. Tindall*, No. 25-451, 2025 LX 435572 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 19,  
24 2025) (Jenning, J.); *Salazar v. Dedos*, No. 25-835, 2025 WL 2676729 (D.N.M. Sept. 17, 2025)  
25 (Urias, J.); *Garcia Cortes v. Noem*, No. 25-2677, 2025 WL 2652880 (D. Colo. Sept. 16, 2025)  
26 (Sweeney, J.); *Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft*, No. 25-12546, 2025 WL 2609425 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9,  
27 2025) (White, J.); *Sampiao v. Hyde*, No. 25-11981, 2025 WL 2607924 (D. Mass. Sept. 9, 2025)  
28 (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.).

<sup>ii</sup> *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*  
No. 25-379 (D. Haw. Oct. 10, 2025) (Park, J.); *Alvarez Chavez v. Kaiser*, 2025 WL 2909526 (N.D.

28

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