

District Judge Tiffany M. Cartwright

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

CRISTINO HERNANDEZ-TRINIDAD,

Petitioner,

v.

KRISTI NOEM, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Case No. 2:25-cv-02610-TMC

FEDERAL RESPONDENTS'  
RETURN MEMORANDUM

Noted for Consideration:  
January 7, 2026

Petitioner seeks habeas relief from his mandatory immigration detention. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement detains them pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). Federal Respondents acknowledge that in *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, this Court granted summary judgment and found that detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) of the Bond Denial Class is unlawful. *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, No. 3:25-cv-05240-TMC, 2025 WL 2782499 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 30, 2025). That decision is presently on appeal. *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, No. 3:25-cv-05240-TMC, Dkt. 71. Additionally, in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, the district court found the same, and extended declaratory relief to a similarly defined and certified nationwide Bond Eligible Class. *See Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, 2025 WL 3288403 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2025).

1 **A. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)**

2 While acknowledging the decisions in *Rodriguez Vazquez* and *Maldonado*, Federal  
3 Respondents continue to believe Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C.  
4 § 1225(b). *See Vargas Lopez v. Trump*, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2025 WL 2780351 (D. Neb. Sept. 30,  
5 2025) (holding petitioner detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)); *Sixtos Chavez v. Noem*, --- F.  
6 Supp. 3d ---, 2025 WL 2730228 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2025) (same). Noncitizens who are  
7 apprehended shortly after illegally crossing the border and who are determined to be inadmissible  
8 due to lacking a visa or valid entry documentation, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(7)(A), may be removed  
9 pursuant to an expedited removal order unless they express an intention to apply for asylum or a  
10 fear of persecution in their home country. 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(1)(A)(i), (iii)(II). “The purpose of  
11 these provisions is to expedite the removal from the United States of aliens who indisputably have  
12 no authorization to be admitted to the United States, while providing an opportunity for such an  
13 alien who claims asylum to have the merits of his or her claim promptly assessed by officers with  
14 full professional training in adjudicating asylum claims.” H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 828, 104th Cong.,  
15 2d Sess. 209 (1996).

16 Applicants for admission fall into one of two categories. Section 1225(b)(1) covers  
17 noncitizens initially determined to be inadmissible due to fraud, misrepresentation, or lack of  
18 valid documentation, and certain other noncitizens designated by the Attorney General in her  
19 discretion. Separately, Section 1225(b)(2) serves as a catchall provision that applies to all  
20 applicants for admission not covered by Section 1225(b)(1) (with specific exceptions not relevant  
21 here). *See Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287 (2018).

22 Congress has determined that all noncitizens subject to Section 1225(b) are subject to  
23 mandatory detention. Regardless of whether a noncitizen falls under Section 1225(b)(1) or (b)(2),  
24

1 the sole means of release is “temporary parole from § 1225(b) detention ‘for urgent humanitarian  
2 reasons or significant public benefit,’ § 1182(d)(5)(A).” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 283.

3 Further, several provisions at 8 U.S.C. § 1252 preclude review. First, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g)  
4 bars review of Petitioner’s claims because they arise from the government’s decision to  
5 commence removal proceedings. Second, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9) bars the Court from hearing  
6 Petitioner’s claims because his claims challenge the decision and action to detain him, which  
7 arises from the government’s decision to commence removal proceedings, thus an “action taken  
8 . . . to remove an alien from the United States.” Third and lastly, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(e)(3) applies  
9 and limits “[j]udicial review of determinations under section 1225(b) of this title and its  
10 implementation.” The plain language of the statute precludes judicial review for noncitizens  
11 determined to be detained pursuant to Section 1225(b)(2) and applies to a “determination under  
12 section 1225(b)” and to its implementation.

13 **B. *Rodriguez Vazquez* Bond Denial Class Membership**

14 Through this habeas action, Petitioner seeks relief as a member of the nationwide Bond  
15 Eligible Class in *Maldonado Bautista*.<sup>1</sup> As mentioned above, the Bond Eligible Class in  
16 *Maldonado Bautista* is substantially similar to the Bond Denial Class in *Rodriguez Vazquez*, with  
17 *Rodriguez Vazquez* applying more narrowly to noncitizens detained at Northwest ICE Processing  
18 Center.<sup>2</sup> Again, Federal Respondents do not agree with the *Rodriguez Vazquez* and *Maldonado*  
19 *Bautista* decisions. However, in the alternative, Federal Respondents do not oppose Petitioner

20  
21 <sup>1</sup> “**Bond Eligible Class:** All noncitizens in the United States without lawful status who (1) have entered or will  
22 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 Bautista*, 2025 WL 3288403, at \*1.

23 <sup>2</sup> “**Bond Denial Class:** All noncitizens without lawful status detained at the Northwest ICE Processing Center who  
24 (1) have entered or will enter the United States without inspection, (2) are not apprehended upon arrival, (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 noncitizen is  
scheduled for or requests a bond hearing.” *Rodriguez*, 2025 WL 2782499, at \*6.

1 being considered a member of the *Rodriguez Vazquez* Bond Denial Class for purposes of this  
2 litigation. Federal Respondents do not believe that Petitioner can be a member of both classes  
3 simultaneously, and treating Petitioner as a member of the *Rodriguez Vazquez* Bond Denial Class will  
4 afford him the relief that he requests.

5 If the Court were to grant the habeas, the appropriate relief is not release. Rather, this  
6 Court should order the Immigration Judge to provide Petitioner a bond hearing pursuant to 8  
7 U.S.C. §1226(a), consistent with the Court's judgement in *Rodriguez*, 2025 WL 2782499, at \*27.

8  
9 DATED this 2nd day of January, 2026

10 Respectfully submitted,

11 CHARLES NEIL FLOYD  
12 United States Attorney

13 *s/ Katherine G. Collins*

14 KATHERINE G. COLLINS, CA #315903  
15 Assistant United States Attorney  
16 United States Attorney's Office  
17 Western District of Washington  
18 700 Stewart Street, Suite 5220  
19 Seattle, Washington 98101-1271  
20 Phone: 206-553-7970  
21 Fax: 206-553-4067  
22 Email: [katherine.collins@usdoj.gov](mailto:katherine.collins@usdoj.gov)

23 *Attorneys for Federal Respondents*

24 *I certify that this memorandum contains 774  
words, in compliance with Local Civil Rules*