

**DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

JAWAD SAFARI,

Petitioner,

v.

KEVIN RAYCRAFT,
Acting Field Office Director of Enforcement
and Removal Operations Detroit, United States
Immigration and Customs Enforcement, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Case No. 1:25-cv-00951

District Judge Jeffery P. Hopkins

Magistrate Judge Karen L. Litkovitz

RETURN OF WRIT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION..... 2

FACTUAL AND PROCEDUAL BACKGROUND..... 3

ARGUMENT..... 4

I. IF PETITIONER IS ENTITLED TO RELIEF IN THE *MALDONADO BAUTISTA* BOND ELIGIBLE CLASS, HE SHOULD SEEK RELIEF IN THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA. 4

II. PETITIONER’S CLAIMS SHOULD BE DISMISSED FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION UNDER RULE 12(b)(1)...... 6

A. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(e)(3) bars review of Petitioner’s claims..... 6

B. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) bars review of Petitioner’s claims..... 7

C. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9) bars review of Petitioner’s claim..... 9

III. PETITIONER FAILED TO EXHAUST ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES...... 12

A. The agency decision denying release is not administratively final..... 12

IV. THE COURT SHOULD DISMISS THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AS PETITIONER IS PROPERLY DETAINED UNDER 8 U.S.C. § 1225...... 14

A. Applicants for admission are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225. 14

B. Applicants for Admission in Expedited Removal Proceedings Are Detained Pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1). Purs 17

C. Applicants for Admission in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a Removal Proceedings Are Detained Pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)...... 18

D. Applicants for Admission May Only Be Released from Detention on an 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5) Parole...... 29

E. Section 1226 Does Not Impact the Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission. 31

F. Petitioner’s Detention is Does Not Run Afoul of the Due Process Clause. 34

CONCLUSION 36

INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Jawad Safari (“Petitioner”), a citizen of Afghanistan, seeks the grant of a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, challenging the lawfulness of his detention by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) and seeking his immediate release from custody. His petition must be denied.

The Court must deny the petition as it is without jurisdiction. Further, Petitioner has failed to exhaust administrative remedies. Petitioner was arrested by ICE on December 12, 2025, (Petition, ECF 1, at PageID 1, 3, ¶¶2, 8.) On March 15, 2024, Mr. Safari was served a Notice to Appear because he is an arriving alien present in the United States who is not in possession of a valid entry document, (Notice to Appear (“NTA”), ECF 1-9, PageID 63, ¶4), or other suitable travel document, or document of identity and nationality as required. (*Id.* at 66.) He was released on parole. (I-94, ECF 1-3.) Aliens inadmissible under 212(a)(7), like Mr. Safari, are subject to mandatory detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii), (iii)(IV) for the duration of their removal proceedings.

Additionally, Petitioner is lawfully detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and 8 C.F.R. 1003.19(h)(2)(i)(B), without a bond hearing as an arriving alien in removal proceedings. 8 U.S.C.

§§ 1182(d)(5)(A). He is therefore ineligible for release under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). (Petition, ECF 1, PageID 2, ¶¶3-4; Jan. 14, 2026 Bond Denial, Ex. A.)

Petitioner seeks to circumvent the detention statute under which he is rightfully detained to secure a custody redetermination hearing to which he is not entitled. Petitioner claims he is member of the Certified Bond Eligible Class in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-cv-01873, --- F.Supp.3d ---, 2025 WL 3713987 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025). (Petition, ECF 1, PageID 2-4, ¶¶3-8, 11-13.) He claims that, as an arriving alien, he is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). (Petition, ECF 1, PageID 3, 7, ¶¶6-8, 28.) He argues that, contrary to the plain language of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), the authority for his detention is better understood to arise under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), a detention statute that allows for release on bond or conditional parole. That argument fails to square with the fact that he falls neatly and precisely within the statutory definition of aliens subject to detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B) and (b)(2)(A).

FACTUAL AND PROCEDUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner is an alien “applicant for admission.” On March 14, 2025, He entered in the United States at San Ysidro, California, and applied for admission. (NTA, ECF 1-9, PageID 63, ¶3.) On March 15, 2024, Mr. Safari was served a Notice to Appear because he is an arriving alien present in the United States who is not in possession of a valid entry document, (Notice to Appear (“NTA”), Ex. A, at 1, ¶4), or other suitable travel document, or document of identity and nationality as required and inadmissible under 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I). (*Id.* at 4.) On March 15, 2025, he was released on parole. (I-94, ECF 1-3.) On May 19, 2025, an Immigration Judge found that Mr. Safari was removable pursuant to INA 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) as charged in the March 15, 2025 Notice to Appear. (Removability Finding, Ex. C.)

Mr. Safari incorrectly claims he entered without inspection and being present in the United States without admitted or paroled. (Petition, ECF 1, PageID 1, 3, ¶¶1, 9.) He claims he has been living in the United States since March 2024. (Petition, ECF 1, PageID 1, ¶1, 51.) He was placed in removal proceedings for being inadmissible under 212(a)(7), and released on parole. (NTA, Ex. A; I-213, Ex. B, at 3.)

On December 12, 2025, Petitioner was arrested by ICE is currently in detained at the Butler County Correctional Complex. (Petition, ECF 1, at PageID 1, 3, ¶¶2, 8.) On December 19, 2025, Petitioner filed the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus. (Petition, ECF 1.) Petitioner received a custody redetermination hearing on January 14, 2026, and the Immigration Judge denied bond. (Bond Denial, Ex. B.) On February 23, 2026, Mr. Safari is scheduled for an individual hearing in immigration court in his Removal Proceedings. (Notice of Internet-Based Hearing, Ex. D.)

Because Petitioner is an “applicant for admission” under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1), he is thus subject to mandatory detention 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Indeed, Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention as an arriving alien pursuant to mandatory detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii), (iii)(IV) for the duration of their removal proceedings. He is also subject to mandatory detention pursuant to § 1225(b)(2)(A) and the Immigration Court further lacks authority to release him pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 1003.19(h)(2)(i)(B). The Court must deny the petition. Petitioner has failed to exhaust administrative remedies and because he is properly detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). This Court also lacks proper jurisdiction.

ARGUMENT

I. IF PETITIONER IS ENTITLED TO RELIEF IN THE *MALDONADO BAUTISTA* BOND ELIGIBLE CLASS, HE SHOULD SEEK RELIEF IN THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

First, Petitioner is an “arriving alien” applicant for admission, as set forth in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1), and does not qualify as a Bond Eligible Class member in *Maldonado Bautista. Bautista*

v. Santacruz, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, 2025 WL 3288403, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2025), *reconsideration granted in part*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, 2025 WL 3713982 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025), and *amended and superseded on reconsideration*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, 2025 WL 3713987 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025), *judgment entered sub nom. Maldonado Bautista v. Noem*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, 2025 WL 3678485 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025).

Specifically, the Bond Eligible Class members are: All noncitizens in the United States without lawful status who (1) have entered or will enter the United States without inspection; (2) were not or will not be apprehended upon arrival; and (3) are not or will not be subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c) [criminal aliens], § 1225(b)(1) [arriving aliens], or § 1231 [post-removal order] at the time the Department of Homeland Security makes an initial custody determination. *Id.* Arriving aliens, like Petitioner, who are found inadmissible under 212(a)(7), (Removability Finding, Ex. C), are subject to mandatory detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii), (iii)(IV). *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I & N Dec. 216 BIA, Interim Decision 4125, 2025 WL 2674169 (2025) (explaining the three categories of applicants for admission); *see also* 8 C.F.R. 235.3(b)(2)(iii). He is also subject to mandatory detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) because he is an applicant for admission.

If Mr. Safari believes he qualifies to be in the Bond Eligible Class certified in the *Maldonado Bautista*, certified the day before he filed this Petition, he must seek relief in the court that issued the decision, the Central District of California. 2025 WL 3713987. *See Coronado v. Secretary, Dept. of Homeland Security*, 2025 WL 3628229, *13 (S.D. Ohio Dec. 15, 2025) (Cole, J.). As Judge Cole explained, “If another federal district court in another district has ordered a party (e.g., ICE) to do something, and the party is failing to follow that order, the relief for that failure primarily lies before the court that entered the order in the first instance.”). Indeed, habeas

jurisdiction only lies in “one district: the district of confinement.” *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 443 (2004).

Other courts agree. “[T]he Court is not bound by the Central District of California’s ruling, and it declines to honor its approach or afford it any persuasive authority. *Amaya-Velis v. Raycraft*, No. 4:26-CV-73, 2026 WL 100596, at *5 (N.D. Ohio Jan. 14, 2026) (“[I]t is doubtful that class relief may be obtained in a habeas proceeding.” Citing *A.A.R.P. v. Trump*, 605 U.S. 91, 107 (2025) (Alito, J., dissenting)). At least one court, concluded that the Central District of California’s “orders exceeded its constitutional and statutory authority,” in declining to apply the Bond Eligible Class relief to the petitioner in that habeas decision. *Calderon Lopez v. Lyons*, No. 1:25-CV-226-H, 2026 WL 44683, at *2 (N.D. Tex. Jan. 7, 2026)

Accordingly, the *Maldonado Bautista* decision cannot be directly applied to Petitioner. Therefore, this Court must decide the petition on its merits.

II. PETITIONER’S CLAIMS SHOULD BE DISMISSED FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION UNDER RULE 12(b)(1).

A. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(e)(3) bars review of Petitioner’s claims.

Section 1252(e)(3) deprives this court of jurisdiction, including habeas corpus jurisdiction, over Petitioner’s challenge to his detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). Section 1252(e)(3) limits judicial review of “determinations under section 1225(b) of this title and its implementation” to only in the District Court for the District of Columbia. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(e)(3). Paragraph (e)(3) further confines this limited review to (1) whether § 1225(b) or an implementing regulation is constitutional or (2) whether a regulation or other written policy directive, guideline, or procedure implementing the section violates the law. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(e)(3)(A)(i)-(ii); *see also M.M.V. v. Garland*, 1 F.4th 1100, 1109 (D.C. Cir. 2021). Unlike other provisions within 1252(e), section 1252(e)(3) applies broadly to judicial review of section 1225(b), not just determinations under

section 1225(b)(1). Compare 8 U.S.C. § 1252(e)(1)(A), (e)(2), with 8 U.S.C. § 1252(e)(3)(A). See *Russello v. United States*, 464 U.S. 16, 23 (1983) (quoting *United States v. Wong Kim Bo*, 472 F.2d 720, 722 (5th Cir. 1972)) (“[W]here Congress includes particular language in one section of a statute but omits it in another section of the same Act, it is generally presumed that Congress acts intentionally and purposely in the disparate inclusion or exclusion.’ ... We refrain from concluding here that the differing language in the two subsections has the same meaning in each. We would not presume to ascribe this difference to a simple mistake in draftsmanship.”).

Here, Petitioner challenges the determination, set forth in writing by both the Department of Justice and DHS, that aliens who entered the United States without inspection are subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2), and that he is part of the Bond Eligible Class in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-cv-01873, --- F.Supp.3d ---, 2025 WL 3713987 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025). (See, e.g., Petition, ECF 1, PageID 6-11, 11-14, ¶¶26-45, 46-68.) Petitioner thus seeks judicial review of a written policy or guideline implementing § 1225(b), which is covered by § 1252(e)(3)(A)(ii).

B. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) bars review of Petitioner’s claims.

Section 1252(g) categorically bars jurisdiction over “any cause or claim by or on behalf of any alien *arising from* the decision or action by the [Secretary of Homeland Security] to *commence proceedings*, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders against any alien.” 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) (emphasis added). The Secretary of Homeland Security’s decision to *commence removal proceedings*, including the decision to detain an alien pending such removal proceedings, squarely falls within this jurisdictional bar. In other words, detention clearly “aris[es] from” the decision to commence removal proceedings against an alien. See *Alvarez v. ICE*, 818 F.3d 1194, 1203 (11th Cir. 2016) (“By its plain terms, [§ 1252(g)] bars us from questioning ICE’s discretionary decisions

to commence removal” and also to review “ICE’s decision to take [plaintiff] into custody and to detain him during removal proceedings”); *Tazu v. Att’y Gen. U.S.*, 975 F.3d 292, 298 (3d Cir. 2020) (“The text of § 1252(g)... strips us of jurisdiction to review... [T]o perform or complete a removal, the [Secretary of Homeland Security] must exercise [her] discretionary power to detain an alien for a few days. That detention does not fall within some other part of the deportation process.”) (cleaned up) (internal quotations and citations omitted); *Valencia-Mejia v. United States*, No. CV 08–2943 CAS (PJWx), 2008 WL 4286979, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2008) (“The decision to detain plaintiff until his hearing before the Immigration Judge *arose from* this decision to commence proceedings[.]”) (emphasis added); *Wang v. United States*, No. CV 10-0389, 2010 WL 11463156, at *6 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 18, 2010) (citing *Khorrami v. Rolince*, 493 F. Supp. 2d 1061 (N.D. Ill. 2007) (“[Plaintiff’s] detention necessarily *arises from* the decision to initiate removal proceedings against him.”) (emphasis added); *Herrera-Correra v. United States*, No. CV 08-2941, 2008 WL 11336833, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2008) (citing *Sissoko v. Rocha*, 509 F.3d 947, 949 (9th Cir. 2007) (“The [Secretary] may arrest the alien against whom proceedings are commenced and detain that individual until the conclusion of those proceedings. ... Thus, an alien’s detention throughout this process *arises from* the [Secretary]’s decision to commence proceedings[.]” and review of claims arising from such detention is barred under § 1252(g)) (emphasis added). Put in the Supreme Court’s words, detention pending removal is a “specification” of the decision to commence proceedings. *See Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.* (“AADC”), 525 U.S. 471, 485 n.9 (1999) (“§ 1252(g) covers” a “specification of the decision to ‘commence proceedings’”).

Significantly, Petitioner is not without a remedy. As the Sixth Circuit explained in *Hamama v. Adducci*, “[w]hen Congress stripped the courts of jurisdiction to grant habeas relief in § 1252(g),

it provided an aliens with an alternative method to challenge the legality an alien’s detention” 912 F.3d at 876. Moreover, the Suspension Clause is not violated when courts are stripped of “habeas jurisdiction so long as it provides a substitute that is adequate and effective to test the legality of a person’s detention. *Id.* As such, judicial review of the Petitioner’s claim[s] is barred by § 1252(g).

C. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9) bars review of Petitioner’s claim.

Under § 1252(b)(9), “judicial review of all questions of law . . . including interpretation and application of statutory provisions . . . arising from any action taken . . . to remove an alien from the United States” is only proper before the appropriate court of appeals in the form of a petition for review of a final removal order. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9); *Reno v. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 483 (1999) (“*AADC*”). Section 1252(b)(9) is an “unmistakable ‘zipper’ clause” that “channels judicial review of all [claims arising from deportation proceedings]” to a court of appeals in the first instance. *Id.*; *see Lopez v. Barr*, No. CV 20-1330 (JRT/BRT), 2021 WL 195523, at *2 (D. Minn. Jan. 20, 2021) (citing *Nasrallah v. Barr*, 590 U.S. 573, 579–80 (2020)).

Moreover, § 1252(a)(5) provides that a petition for review is the exclusive means for judicial review of immigration proceedings.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law (statutory or nonstatutory), . . . a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals in accordance with this section shall be the sole and exclusive means for judicial review of an order of removal entered or issued under any provision of this chapter, except as provided in subsection (e) [concerning aliens not admitted to the United States].

8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(5). “Taken together, § 1252(a)(5) and § 1252(b)(9) mean that *any* issue—whether legal or factual—arising from *any* removal-related activity can be reviewed *only* through the [petition-for-review] process.” *J.E.F.M. v. Lynch*, 837 F.3d 1026, 1031 (9th Cir. 2016)

(emphasis in original); *see id.* at 1035 (“§§ 1252(a)(5) and [(b)(9)] channel review of all claims, including policies-and-practices challenges . . . whenever they ‘arise from’ removal proceedings”); *accord Ruiz v. Mukasey*, 552 F.3d 269, 274 n.3 (2d Cir. 2009) (only when the action is “unrelated to any removal action or proceeding” is it within the district court’s jurisdiction); *cf. Xiao Ji Chen v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice*, 434 F.3d 144, 151 n.3 (2d Cir. 2006) (a “primary effect” of the REAL ID Act is to “limit all aliens to one bite of the apple” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

Critically, “[§] 1252(b)(9) is a judicial channeling provision, not a claim-barring one.” *Aguilar v. ICE*, 510 F.3d 1, 11 (1st Cir. 2007). Indeed, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(D) provides that “[n]othing . . . in any other provision of this chapter . . . shall be construed as precluding review of constitutional claims or questions of law raised upon a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals in accordance with this section.” *See also Ajlani v. Chertoff*, 545 F.3d 229, 235 (2d Cir. 2008) (“[J]urisdiction to review such claims is vested exclusively in the courts of appeals[.]”). The petition-for-review process before the court of appeals ensures that aliens have a proper forum for claims arising from their immigration proceedings and “receive their day in court.” *J.E.F.M.*, 837 F.3d at 1031–32 (internal quotations omitted); *see also Rosario v. Holder*, 627 F.3d 58, 61 (2d Cir. 2010) (“The REAL ID Act of 2005 amended the [INA] to obviate . . . Suspension Clause concerns” by permitting judicial review of “nondiscretionary” BIA determinations and “all constitutional claims or questions of law.”).

In evaluating the reach of subsections (a)(5) and (b)(9), the Second Circuit explained that jurisdiction turns on the substance of the relief sought. *Delgado v. Quarantillo*, 643 F.3d 52, 55 (2d Cir. 2011). Those provisions divest district courts of jurisdiction to review both direct and indirect challenges to removal orders, including decisions to detain for purposes of removal or for proceedings. *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 294–95 (section 1252(b)(9) includes challenges to the

“decision to detain [an alien] in the first place or to seek removal[.]”). Here, Petitioner challenges the decision and action to detain him, (Petition, ECF 1, PageID 2-4, 10, 13-14, ¶¶4, 11-14, 43, 57, 68), which arises from DHS’s decision to commence removal proceedings, and is thus an “action taken . . . to remove him from the United States.” *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9); *see also, e.g., Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 294–95; *Velasco Lopez v. Decker*, 978 F.3d 842, 850 (2d Cir. 2020) (finding that 8 U.S.C. § 1226(e) did not bar review in that case because the petitioner did not challenge “his initial detention”); *Saadulloev v. Garland*, No. 3:23-CV-00106, 2024 WL 1076106, at *3 (W.D. Pa. Mar. 12, 2024) (recognizing that there is no judicial review of the threshold detention decision, which flows from the government’s decision to “commence proceedings”). As such, the Court lacks jurisdiction over this action. The reasoning in *Jennings* outlines why the Petitioner’s claims cannot be reviewed by the Court.

While holding that it was unnecessary to comprehensively address the scope of § 1252(b)(9), the Supreme Court in *Jennings* provided guidance on the types of challenges that may fall within the scope of § 1252(b)(9). *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 293–94. The Court found that “§1252(b)(9) [did] not present a jurisdictional bar” in situations where “respondents . . . [were] not challenging the decision to detain them in the first place.” *Id.* at 294–95. In this case, the Petitioner *does* challenge the government’s decision to detain him in the first place. *See, e.g.,* (Petition, ECF 1, PageID 2-4, 10, 13-14, ¶¶4, 11-14, 43, 57, 68.) Although the Petitioner frames his challenge as relating to detention authority, rather than a challenge to DHS’s decision to detain him in the first instance, such creative framing does not evade the preclusive effect of § 1252(b)(9). (*Id.*)

The fact that the Petitioner is challenging the basis upon which his is detained is enough to trigger § 1252(b)(9) because “detention *is* an ‘action taken . . . to remove’ an alien.” *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 319 (Thomas, J., concurring); 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9). The Court should dismiss the

Petitioner's claims for lack of jurisdiction under § 1252(b)(9). The Petitioner must present his claims before the appropriate court of appeals because he challenges the government's decision or action to detain him, which must be raised before a court of appeals, not this Court. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9).

III. PETITIONER FAILED TO EXHAUST ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES.

A. The agency decision denying release is not administratively final.

The Court should dismiss the petition for writ of habeas corpus for lack of jurisdiction as Petitioner has failed to exhaust administrative remedies. A habeas petitioner must normally exhaust administrative remedies before seeking federal court intervention. The exhaustion requirement "aims to provide the agency with a chance to correct its own errors, 'protect[] the authority of administrative agencies,' and otherwise conserve judicial resources by 'limiting interference in agency affairs, developing the factual record to make judicial review more efficient, and resolving issues to render judicial review unnecessary.'" *Beharry v. Ashcroft*, 329 F.3d 51, 62 (2d Cir. 2003) (Sotomayor, J.).

"When a petitioner does not exhaust administrative remedies, a district court ordinarily should either dismiss the [habeas] petition without prejudice or stay the proceedings until the petitioner has exhausted remedies, unless exhaustion is excused." *Ba v. Director, Detroit Field Office of ICE*, Case No. 4:25-cv-2208, 2025 WL 2977712, *2 (N.D. Ohio Oct. 22, 2025) (citing *Leonardo v. Crawford*, 646 F.3d 1157, 1160 (9th Cir. 2011) (requiring exhausting administrative remedies by appealing IJ decision to BIA before filing in district court); *see also Rojas-Garcia v. Ashcroft*, 339 F.3d 814, 819 (9th Cir. 2003)).

Courts within the Sixth Circuit have applied the Ninth Circuit's test for requiring prudential exhaustion in *Puga v. Chertoff*, 488 F.3d 812, 815 (9th Cir. 2007). *See, e.g., Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft*, Case No. 2:25-cv-12486, 2025 WL 2496379, *4 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025) (citing

Shweika v. DHS, Case No. 1:06-cv-11781, 2015 WL 6541689, *12 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 29, 2015)).

That is, courts will require prudential exhaustion when:

- (1) Agency expertise makes agency consideration necessary to generate a proper record and reach a proper decision;
- (2) Relaxation of the requirement would encourage the deliberate bypass of the administrative scheme; and
- (3) Administrative review is likely to allow the agency to correct its own mistakes and to preclude the need for judicial review.

Id.; see also *Espinoza v. Director, Detroit Field Office, ICE*, Case No. 4:25-cv-2107, 2025 WL 2878173 (N.D. Ohio Oct. 9, 2025) (petition dismissed for failure to exhaust); *Guerra v. Woosley*, Case No. 4:25-cv-119, 2025 WL 3046187 (W.D. Ky. Oct. 31, 2025); *Cortez v. Lynch*, No. 1:25-cv-822, 2026 WL 82039, *5-*7 (S.D. Ohio Jan. 12, 2026). A very similar petition for a writ of habeas corpus was dismissed under the *Puga* test just last week for failure to exhaust. See *Gonzalez Cortez v. Lynch*, No. 1:25-cv-00822, 2026 WL 82039 (S.D. Ohio Jan. 12, 2026) (McFarland, J.) (petition dismiss for failure to exhaust administrative remedies; *Puga* factors weigh in favor of exhaustion).

Petitioner has not availed himself of all the administrative remedies available to him. Petitioner can appeal the denial of his bond to the BIA until the deadline on February 13, 2023. (Bond Denial, Ex. A, at 2.) His Removal Proceeding remain ongoing as he is scheduled for an individual hearing in immigration court on February 23, 2026. (Notice of Internet-Based Hearing, Ex. D.)

By regulation, the BIA has authority to review IJ custody determinations. See 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.1(b)(7), 1003.19(f), 1003.38, 1236.1(d)(3). Petitioner's failure to complete the appellate process to the BIA here counsels requiring exhaustion. An appeal to the BIA will allow the agency's expertise to generate a proper record and reach a proper decision, in the first instance.

See e.g., *Espinoza*, 2025 WL 2878173, at *2 (petition dismissed for review of “interpretation and application of the governing removal regime” by the BIA “in the first instance”).

Although Petitioner will argue exhaustion will be futile given the BIA’s recent decision in *Matter of Yahure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216, Interim Decision, 4125, 2025 WL 2674169 (Sept. 5, 2025), “allowing the BIA to evaluate Petitioner’s appeal[] regarding the . . . denial of bond w[ill] permit the agency to correct its own mistakes, if any, and preclude the need for judicial review if Petitioner is successful” See e.g., *Hernandez Torrealba v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, No. 1:25-cv-1621, 2025 WL 2444114, at *10 (N.D. Ohio Aug. 25, 2025). In fact, not requiring the Petitioner to appeal to the BIA encourages the deliberate bypass of the administrative scheme, which, Petitioner did here. Indeed, the BIA should be permitted to “apply its experience and expertise without judicial interference.” *Id.* (citation omitted). Even, an allegedly “high probability” that [a] bond appeal to the BIA will fail is not a proper basis for waiving the exhaustion requirement.” *Id.* at *11. The deadline for Mr. Safari to appeal the bond denial has yet to expire. (Bond Denial, Ex. A, at 2.)

Because Petitioner cannot demonstrate grounds for excusing exhaustion, his Petition should be denied for failure to exhaust.

III. THE COURT SHOULD DISMISS THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AS PETITIONER IS PROPERLY DETAINED UNDER 8 U.S.C. § 1225.

A. Applicants for admission are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225.

“As with any question of statutory interpretation, [the] analysis begins with the plain language of the statute.” *Jimenez v. Quarterman*, 555 U.S. 113, 118 (2009) (citing *Lamie v. U.S. Tr.*, 540 U.S. 526, 534 (2004)). Section 1225(a)(1) defines an “applicant for admission” as an “alien present in the United States who has not been admitted or who arrives in the United States (whether or not at a designated port of arrival . . .)” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1); see *Matter of*

Velasquez-Cruz, 26 I&N Dec. 458, 463 n.5 (BIA 2014) (“[R]egardless of whether an alien who illegally enters the United States is caught at the border or inside the country, he or she will still be required to prove eligibility for admission.”). Accordingly, by its very definition, the term “applicant for admission” includes two categories of aliens: (1) arriving aliens, and (2) aliens present without admission. *See Dep’t of Homeland Sec. v. Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 140 (2020) (explaining that “an alien who tries to enter the country illegally is treated as an ‘applicant for admission’” (citing 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1)); *Matter of Lemus*, 25 I&N Dec. 734, 743 (BIA 2012) (“Congress has defined the concept of an ‘applicant for admission’ in an unconventional sense, to include not just those who are expressly seeking permission to enter, but also those who are present in this country without having formally requested or received such permission”); *Matter of E-R-M- & L-R-M-*, 25 I&N Dec. 520, 523 (BIA 2011) (stating that “the broad category of applicants for admission . . . includes, *inter alia*, any alien present in the United States who has not been admitted” (citing 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1))). An arriving alien is defined, in pertinent part, as “an applicant for admission coming or attempting to come into the United States at a port-of-entry [(“POE”)]” 8 C.F.R. §§ 1.2, 1001.1(q).

All aliens who are applicants for admission “shall be inspected by immigration officers.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 235.1(a) (“Application to lawfully enter the United States shall be made in person to an immigration officer at a U.S. [POE] when the port is open for inspection”). An applicant for admission seeking admission at a United States POE “must present whatever documents are required and must establish to the satisfaction of the inspecting officer that the alien is not subject to removal . . . and is entitled, under all of the applicable provisions of the immigration laws . . . to enter the United States.” 8 C.F.R. § 235.1(f)(1); *see* 8

U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(2)(A) (describing the related burden of an applicant for admission in removal proceedings).

Here, Mr. Safari incorrectly claims that he entered without inspection and present in the United States without being admitted or paroled does not change his status as an arriving alien. (Petition, ECF 1, PageID 1, 3, ¶¶1, 9.)

Petitioner is an arriving alien because he presented himself at a United States POE at San Ysidro, California and applied for admission on March 14, 2024. (Petition, ECF 1, PageID 1; NTA, ECF 1-9, PageID 63, ¶3.) After he was found to be inadmissible pursuant to INA 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I), he was placed in removal proceedings, (NTA, ECF 1-9, PageID 66), and released on parole. (I-94, ECF 1-3.) As an arriving alien, Petitioner is an applicant for admission, and subject to mandatory detention for the duration of his removal proceedings. 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii), (iii)(IV); 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(2)(iii). 8 C.F.R. § 235.1(f)(1) and § 235.3(c)(1) also apply to Mr. Safari. In fact, § 235.3(c) applies to, “**Arriving aliens placed in proceedings under section 240** of the Act or aliens referred for an asylum merits interview under § 208.2(a)(1)(ii) of this chapter.” (emphasis added). Section 235.3(c)(1) states that, (1) Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, any arriving alien who appears to the inspecting officer to be inadmissible, and who is placed in removal proceedings pursuant to section 240 of the Act **shall be detained in accordance with section 235(b) of the Act**. Parole of such alien shall only be considered in accordance with § 212.5(b) of this chapter. (emphasis added).

Both arriving aliens and aliens present without admission, as applicants for admission, may be removed from the United States by, *inter alia*, expedited removal procedures under 8 U.S.C. §

1225(b)(1)¹ or removal proceedings before an IJ under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(1), (b)(2)(A), 1229a; *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287 (2018) (describing how “applicants for admission fall into one of two categories, those covered by § 1225(b)(1) and those covered by § 1225(b)(2)”). Immigration officers have discretion to apply expedited removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) or to initiate removal proceedings before an IJ under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. *E-R-M- & L-R-M-*, 25 I&N Dec. at 524; *see also Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. 66, 68 (BIA 2025) (“DHS may place aliens arriving in the United States in either expedited removal proceedings under [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)], or full removal proceedings under [8 U.S.C. § 1229a]” (citations omitted)).

B. Applicants for Admission in Expedited Removal Proceedings Are Detained Pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1).

Applicants for admission whom DHS places into expedited removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1); such aliens (including those referred for 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings after establishing a credible fear of persecution or torture) are ineligible for a custody redetermination hearing before an IJ. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii) (providing for detention of any alien who is found to have established a credible fear of persecution in expedited removal proceedings for further consideration of their asylum application), (iii)(IV) (“Any alien subject to the procedures under this clause shall be

¹ Section 1225(b)(1) authorizes immigration officers to remove certain inadmissible aliens “from the United States without further hearing or review” if the immigration officer finds that the alien, “who is arriving in the United States or is described in [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(iii)] is inadmissible under [8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C) or (a)(7)].” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i); *see* 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(2)(i). If the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) wishes to pursue inadmissibility charges other than 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C) or (a)(7), DHS must place the alien in removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(3). Additionally, an alien who was not inspected and admitted or paroled, but “who establishes that he or she has been continuously physically present in the United States for the 2-year period immediately prior to the date of determination of inadmissibility shall be detained in accordance with [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)] for a proceeding under [8 U.S.C. § 1229a].” *Id.* § 235.3(b)(1)(ii); *id.* § 1235.6(a)(1)(i) (providing that an immigration officer will issue and serve an NTA to an alien “[i]f, in accordance with the provisions of [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)], the examining immigration officer detains an alien for a proceeding before an immigration judge under [8 U.S.C. § 1229a]”).

detained pending a final determination of credible fear of persecution and, if found not to have such a fear, until removed.”); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(2)(iii) (“An alien whose inadmissibility is being considered under this section or who has been ordered removed pursuant to this section shall be detained pending determination and removal.”), (b)(4)(ii) (“Pending the credible fear determination by an asylum officer and any review of that determination by an [IJ], the alien shall be detained.”); *Matter of M-S-*, 27 I&N Dec. 509 (A.G. 2019) (holding that aliens present without admission, placed in expedited removal, and transferred to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings after establishing a credible fear of persecution or torture are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and are ineligible for release under 8 U.S.C. § 1226).

Petitioner, an applicant for admission, has never been subject to expedited removal proceedings and is therefore not subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1). However, as discussed below, Petitioner is an applicant for admission in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings and is therefore subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

C. Applicants for Admission in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a Removal Proceedings Are Detained Pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

Applicants for admission whom DHS places in § 1229a removal proceedings are similarly subject to detention and ineligible for a custody redetermination hearing before an IJ. Specifically, aliens present without admission placed in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings are both applicants for admission as defined in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1) *and* aliens “seeking admission,” as contemplated in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Such aliens are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and thus ineligible for a bond redetermination hearing before the IJ.

Applicants for admission whom DHS places in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and ineligible for a custody redetermination hearing before an IJ. Section 1225(b)(2)(A) “serves as a catchall provision that applies to all

applicants for admission not covered by § 1225(b)(1).” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287; *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), (B). Under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), “an alien who is an applicant for admission” “*shall be detained* for a proceeding under [8 U.S.C. § 1229a]” “if the examining immigration officer determines that [the] alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) (emphasis added); 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(3) (providing that an alien placed into 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings in lieu of expedited removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1225 “shall be detained” pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)); 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(c) (providing that “any arriving alien . . . placed in removal proceedings pursuant to [8 U.S.C. § 1229a] shall be detained in accordance with [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)]” unless paroled pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)).

Thus, according to the plain language of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), applicants for admission in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings “*shall be detained.*” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) (emphasis added). “The ‘strong presumption’ that the plain language of the statute expresses congressional intent is rebutted only in ‘rare and exceptional circumstances,’ . . .” *Ardestani v. INS*, 502 U.S. 129, 135–36 (1991) (quoting *Rubin v. United States*, 449 U.S. 424, 430 (1981)); *see Lamie*, 540 U.S. at 534 (“It is well established that when the statute’s language is plain, the sole function of the courts—at least where the disposition required by the text is not absurd—is to enforce it according to its terms.” (quotation marks omitted)). As the Supreme Court observed in *Jennings*, nothing in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) “says anything whatsoever about bond hearings.” 583 U.S. at 297. Further, there is no textual basis for arguing that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) applies only to arriving aliens. The distinction the Attorney General drew in the 1997 Interim Rule (addressed in detail below) between “arriving aliens,” *see* 8 C.F.R. §§ 1.2, 1001.1(q), and “aliens who are present without being admitted or paroled,” Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens;

Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum Procedures, 62 Fed. Reg. 10,312, 10,323 (Mar. 6, 1997),² finds no purchase in the statutory text. No provision within 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) refers to “arriving aliens,” or limits that paragraph to arriving aliens, as Congress intended for it to apply generally “in the case of an alien who is an applicant for admission.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Where Congress means for a rule to apply only to “arriving aliens,” it uses that specific term of art or similar phrasing. *See, e.g., id.* §§ 1182(a)(9)(A)(i), 1225(c)(1).

On September 5, 2025, the BIA issued a published decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). In its decision, the BIA affirmed “the Immigration Judge’s determination that he did not have authority over [a] bond request because aliens who are present in the United States without admission are applicants for admission as defined under section 235(b)(2)(A) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), and must be detained for the duration of their removal proceedings.” *Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 220.³

The BIA concluded that aliens “who surreptitiously cross into the United States remain applicants for admission until and unless they are lawfully inspected and admitted by an

² As discussed more below, the preamble language of the 1997 Interim Rule states that “[d]espite being applicants for admission, aliens who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as aliens who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination.” 62 Fed. Reg. at 10,323. However, preambular language is not binding and “should not be considered unless the regulation itself is ambiguous.” *El Comite Para El Bienestar de Earlimart v. Warmerdam*, 539 F.3d 1062, 1070 (9th Cir. 2008); *see also Wards Cove Packing Corp. v. Nat’l Marine Fisheries Serv.*, 307 F.3d 1214, 1219 (9th Cir. 2002) (“[T]he plain meaning of a regulation governs and deference to an agency’s interpretation of its regulation is warranted only when the regulation’s language is ambiguous.” (citing *Christensen v. Harris County*, 529 U.S. 576, 588 (2000))).

³ Previously, as alluded to in BIA decisions, DHS and the Department of Justice interpreted 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) to be an available detention authority for aliens present without admission placed directly in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings. *See, e.g., Matter of Cabrera-Fernandez*, 28 I&N Dec. 747, 747 (BIA 2023); *Matter of R-A-V-P-*, 27 I&N Dec. 803, 803 (BIA 2020); *Matter of Garcia-Garcia*, 25 I&N Dec. 93, 94 (BIA 2009); *Matter of D-J-*, 23 I&N Dec. 572 (A.G. 2003). However, as noted by the BIA, the BIA had not previously addressed this issue in a precedential decision. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. at 216.

immigration officer. Remaining in the United States for a lengthy period of time following entry without inspection, by itself, does not constitute an ‘admission.’” *Id.* at 228. To hold otherwise would lead to an “incongruous result” that rewards aliens who unlawfully enter the United States without inspection and subsequently evade apprehension for number of years. *Id.*

In so concluding, the BIA rejected the alien’s argument that “because he has been residing in the interior of the United States for almost 3 years . . . he cannot be considered as ‘seeking admission.’” *Id.* at 221. The BIA determined that this argument “is not supported by the plain language of the INA” and creates a “legal conundrum.” *Id.* If the alien “is not admitted to the United States (as he admits) but he is not ‘seeking admission’ (as he contends), then what is his legal status?” *Id.* (parentheticals in original). The BIA’s decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* is consistent not only with the plain language of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), but also with the Supreme Court’s 2018 decision in *Jennings* and other caselaw issued subsequent to *Jennings*. Specifically, in *Jennings*, the Supreme Court explained that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) applies to all applicants for admission, noting that the language of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) is “quite clear” and “unequivocally mandate[s]” detention. 583 U.S. at 300, 303 (explaining that “the word ‘shall’ usually connotes a requirement” (quoting *Kingdomware Technologies, Inc. v. United States*, 579 U.S. 162, 171 (2016))).

Similarly, relying on *Jennings* and the plain language of 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225 and 1226(a), the Attorney General, in *Matter of M-S-*, unequivocally recognized that 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225 and 1226(a) do not overlap but describe “different classes of aliens.” 27 I&N Dec. at 516. The Attorney General also held—in an analogous context—that aliens present without admission and placed into expedited removal proceedings are detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225 even if later placed in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings. 27 I&N Dec. at 518-19. In *Matter of Q. Li*, the BIA held that an

alien who illegally crossed into the United States between POEs and was apprehended without a warrant while arriving is detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). 29 I&N Dec. at 71. This ongoing evolution of the law makes clear that all applicants for admission are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). *Cf. Niz-Chavez v. Garland*, 593 U.S. 155, 171 (2021) (providing that “no amount of policy-talk can overcome a plain statutory command”); *see generally Florida v. United States*, 660 F. Supp. 3d 1239, 1275 (N.D. Fla. 2023) (explaining that “the 1996 expansion of § 1225(b) to include illegal border crossers would make little sense if DHS retained discretion to apply § 1226(a) and release illegal border crossers whenever the agency saw fit”).⁴ *Florida’s* conclusion “that § 1225(b)’s ‘shall be detained’ means what it says and . . . is a mandatory requirement . . . flows directly from *Jennings*.” *Florida*, 660 F. Supp. 3d at 1273.

Given 8 U.S.C. § 1225 is the applicable detention authority for all applicants for admission—both arriving aliens and aliens present without admission alike, regardless of whether the alien was initially processed for expedited removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) or placed directly into removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a—and “[b]oth [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2)] mandate detention . . . throughout the completion of applicable proceedings,” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 301–03, IJs do not have authority to redetermine the custody status of an alien present without admission.

⁴ Though not binding, *Camreta v. Greene*, 563 U.S. 692, 709 n.7 (2011) (quoting 18 J. Moore et al., *Moore’s Federal Practice* § 134.02[1] [d], p. 134–26 (3d ed.2011)) (providing that “[a] decision of a federal district court judge is not binding precedent in either a different judicial district, the same judicial district, or even upon the same judge in a different case”); *Evans v. Skolnik*, 997 F.3d 1060, 1067 (9th Cir. 2021) (same), the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Florida’s decision is instructive here. *Florida* held that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) mandates detention of applicants for admission throughout removal proceedings, rejecting the assertion that DHS has discretion to choose to detain an applicant for admission under either 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b) or 1226(a). 660 F. Supp. 3d at 1275. The court held that such discretion “would render mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) meaningless.” *Id.*

Here, Petitioner is an applicant for admission (specifically, an arriving alien without admission), placed directly into removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. He is therefore subject to detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and ineligible for a custody redetermination hearing before an IJ. “It is well established . . . that the Immigration Judges only have the authority to consider matters that are delegated to them by the Attorney General and the [INA].” *Matter of A-W-*, 25 I&N Dec. 45, 46 (BIA 2009). “In the context of custody proceedings, an Immigration Judge’s authority to redetermine conditions of custody is set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(d)” *Id.* at 46. The regulation clearly states that “the [IJ] is authorized to exercise the authority in [8 U.S.C. § 1226].” 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(d); *see id.* § 1003.19(a) (authorizing IJs to review “[c]ustody and bond determinations made by [DHS] pursuant to 8 C.F.R. part 1236”); *see id.* § 1003.19(h)(2)(i)(B) (“[A]n IJ may not redetermine conditions of custody imposed by [DHS] with respect to . . . [a]rriving aliens in removal proceedings, including aliens paroled after arrival pursuant to [8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)].”). “An [IJ] is without authority to disregard the regulations, which have the force and effect of law.” *Matter of L-M-P-*, 27 I&N Dec. 265, 267 (BIA 2018).

Arriving aliens present without admission in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings are both applicants for admission under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1) and aliens seeking admission under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). As discussed above, such arriving aliens placed in removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a are applicants for admission as defined in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1), subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), and thus ineligible for a bond redetermination hearing before the IJ. Such aliens are also considered “seeking admission,” as contemplated in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). To be sure, “many people who are not *actually* requesting permission to enter the United States in the ordinary sense are nevertheless deemed to be ‘seeking admission’ under the immigration laws.” *Lemus*, 25 I&N Dec. at 743; *see Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 221; *Q.*

Li, 29 I&N Dec. at 68 n.3; *see also Matter of Valenzuela-Felix*, 26 I&N Dec. 53, 56 (BIA 2012) (explaining that “an application for admission [i]s a continuing one”)

In analyzing 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), the Supreme Court in *Jennings* equated “applicants for admission” with aliens “seeking admission.” *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 289. As noted above, the Supreme Court stated that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) “serves as a catchall provision that applies to all applicants for admission not covered by § 1225(b)(1).” *Id.* at 287. In doing so, it specifically cited 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)—and thus did not appear to consider aliens “seeking admission” to be a subcategory of applicants for admission. *Id.* The Supreme Court also stated that “[a]liens who are instead covered by § 1225(b)(2) are detained pursuant to a different process . . . [and] ‘shall be detained for a [removal] proceeding’” *Id.* at 288 (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)). The Supreme Court considered all aliens covered by 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) to be subject to detention under subparagraph (A)—not just a subset of such aliens. Moreover, *Jennings* found that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) “applies primarily to aliens *seeking entry* into the United States (*‘applicants for admission’ in the language of the statute*).” *Id.* at 297 (emphases added). The Court therefore considered aliens seeking admission and applicants for admission to be virtually indistinguishable; it did not consider them to be merely a subcategory of applicants for admission.

Indeed, the Supreme Court explicitly stated that aliens seeking admission are subject to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) detention: “In sum, U.S. immigration law authorizes the Government to detain certain aliens seeking admission into the country under §§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2).” *Id.* at 289. This was recently reiterated by the BIA in *Matter of Q. Li*, which held that for aliens “seeking admission into the United States who are placed directly in full removal proceedings, [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)] . . . mandates detention ‘until removal proceedings have concluded.’” 29 I&N Dec. At 68 (quoting *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 299).

The structure of the statutory scheme prior to the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA). Pub. L. No. 104-208, div. C, 110 Stat. 3009-546 (1996) bolsters the understanding that under the current statutory scheme, all applicants for admission are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). The broad definition of applicants for admission was added to the INA in 1996. Before 1996, the INA only contemplated inspection of aliens arriving at POEs. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a) (1995) (discussing “aliens arriving at ports of the United States”); *id.* § 1225(b) (1995) (discussing “the examining immigration officer at the port of arrival”). Relatedly, any alien who was “in the United States” and within certain listed classes of deportable aliens was deportable. *Id.* § 1231(a) (1995). One such class of deportable aliens included those “who entered the United States without inspection or at any time or place other than as designated by the Attorney General.” *Id.* § 1231(a)(1)(B) (1995) (former deportation ground relating to entry without inspection). Aliens were excludable if they were “seeking admission” at a POE or had been paroled into the United States. *See id.* §§ 1182(a), 1225(a) (1995). Deportation proceedings (conducted pursuant to former 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b) (1995)) and exclusion proceedings (conducted pursuant to former 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) (1995)) differed and began with different charging documents. *See Sale v. Haitian Ctrs. Council, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 155, 175 (1993) (explaining the “important distinction” between deportation and exclusion); *Matter of Casillas*, 22 I&N Dec. 154, 156 n.2 (BIA 1998) (noting the various forms commencing deportation, exclusion, or removal proceedings). The placement of an alien in exclusion or deportation proceedings depended on whether the alien had made an “entry” within the meaning of the INA. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(13) (1995) (defining “entry” as “any coming of an alien into the United States, from a foreign port or place or from an outlying possession”); *see also Rosenberg v. Fleuti*, 374 U.S. 449, 462 (1963) (concluding that whether a lawful permanent resident has made an “entry” into the

United States depends on whether, pursuant to the statutory definition, he or she has intended to make a “meaningfully interruptive” departure).

Former 8 U.S.C. § 1225 provided that aliens “seeking admission” at a POE who could not demonstrate entitlement to be admitted (“excludable” aliens) were subject to mandatory detention, with potential release solely by means of parole under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5) (1995). 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)-(b) (1995). “Seeking admission” in former 8 U.S.C. § 1225 appears to have been understood to refer to aliens arriving at a POE.⁵ *See id.* The legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service (“INS”) regulations implementing former 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) provided that such aliens arriving at a POE had to be detained without parole if they had “no documentation or false documentation,” 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b) (1995), but could be paroled if they had valid documentation but were otherwise excludable, *id.* § 235.3(c) (1995). With regard to aliens who entered without inspection and were deportable under former 8 U.S.C. § 1231, such aliens were taken into custody under the authority of an arrest warrant, and like other deportable aliens, could request bond. *See* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1231(a)(1)(B), 1252(a)(1) (1995); 8 C.F.R. § 242.2(c)(1) (1995).

As a result, “[aliens] who had entered without inspection could take advantage of the greater procedural and substantive rights afforded in deportation proceedings,’ while [aliens] who

⁵ Given Congress’s overhaul of the INA, including wholesale revision of the definition of which aliens are considered applying for or seeking admission, Congress clearly did not intend for the former understanding of “seeking admission” to be retained in the new removal scheme. Generally, “[w]hen administrative and judicial interpretations have settled the meaning of an existing statutory provision, repetition of the same language in a new statute indicates . . . the intent to incorporate its administrative and judicial interpretations as well.” *Bragdon v. Abbott*, 524 U.S. 624, 645 (1998). However, the prior construction canon of statutory interpretation “is of little assistance here because, . . . this is not a case in which ‘Congress re-enact[ed] a statute without change.’” *Public Citizen Inc. v. U.S. Dep’t of Health and Human Servs.*, 332 F.3d 654, 668 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (quoting *Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. v. Curran*, 456 U.S. 353, 382 n.66 (1982)). Rather, the presumption “of congressional ratification” of a prior statutory interpretation “applies only when Congress reenacts a statute without relevant change.” *Holder v. Martinez Gutierrez*, 566 U.S. 583, 593 (2012) (citing *Jama v. Immigration and Customs Enforcement*, 543 U.S. 335, 349 (2005)).

actually presented themselves to authorities for inspection were restrained by ‘more summary exclusion proceedings.’” *Martinez v. Att’y Gen.*, 693 F.3d 408, 413 n.5 (3d Cir. 2012) (quoting *Hing Sum v. Holder*, 602 F.3d 1092, 1100 (9th Cir. 2010)). “To remedy this unintended and undesirable consequence, the IIRIRA substituted ‘admission’ for ‘entry,’ and replaced deportation and exclusion proceedings with the more general ‘removal’ proceeding.” *Id.* Consistent with this dichotomy, the INA, as amended by IIRIRA, defines *all* those who have not been admitted to the United States as “applicants for admission.” IIRIRA § 302.

Moreover, Congress’s use of the present participle—seeking—in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) should not be ignored. *United States v. Wilson*, 503 U.S. 329, 333 (1992) (“Congress’ use of a verb tense is significant in construing statutes.”). By using the present participle “seeking,” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) “signal[s] present and continuing action.” *Westchester Gen. Hosp., Inc. v. Evanston Ins. Co.*, 48 F.4th 1298, 1307 (11th Cir. 2022). The phrase “seeking admission” “does not include something in the past that has ended or something yet to come.” *Shell v. Burlington N. Santa Fe Ry. Co.*, 941 F.3d 331, 336 (7th Cir. 2019) (concluding that “having” is a present participle, which is “used to form a progressive tense” that “means presently and continuously” (citing Bryan A. Garner, *Garner’s Modern American Usage* 1020 (4th ed. 2016))). The present participle “expresses present action in relation to the time expressed by the finite verb in its clause,” *Present Participle*, MerriamWebster, <http://www.merriamwebster.com/dictionary/present%20participle> (last visited Dec. 3, 2025), with the finite verb in the same clause of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) being “determines.” Thus, when pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) an “examining immigration officer determines” that an alien “is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted” the officer does so contemporaneously with the alien’s present and ongoing action of seeking admission. Interpreting the present participle “seeking” as denoting an

ongoing process is consistent with its ordinary usage. *See, e.g., Samayoa v. Bondi*, 146 F.4th 128, 134 (1st Cir. 2025) (alien inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) but “seeking to remain in the country lawfully” applied for relief in removal proceedings); *Garcia v. USCIS*, 146 F.4th 743, 746 (9th Cir. 2025) (“USCIS requires all U visa holders seeking permanent resident status under 8 U.S.C. § 1255(m) to undergo a medical examination . . .”). Accordingly, just as the alien in *Samayoa* is not only an alien present without admission but also seeking to remain in the United States, Petitioner in this case is not only an alien present without admission, and therefore an applicant for admission as defined in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1), but also an alien seeking admission under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

Lastly, Congress’s significant amendments to the immigration laws in IIRIRA support DHS’s position that such aliens are properly detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)—specifically, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Congress, for example, eliminated certain anomalous provisions that favored aliens who illegally entered without inspection over aliens arriving at POEs. A rule that treated an alien who enters the country illegally, such as Petitioner, more favorably than an alien detained after arriving at a POE would “create a perverse incentive to enter at an unlawful rather than a lawful location.” *Gambino-Ruiz*, 91 F.4th at 990 (quoting *Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. at 140) (rejecting such a rule as propounded by the defendant). Such a rule reflects “the precise situation that Congress intended to do away with by enacting” IIRIRA. *Id.* “Congress intended to eliminate the anomaly ‘under which illegal aliens who have entered the United States without inspection gain equities and privileges in immigration proceedings that are not available to aliens who present themselves for inspection at a [POE]’” by enacting IIRIRA. *Ortega-Lopez v. Barr*, 978 F.3d 680, 682 (9th Cir. 2020) (quoting *Torres*, 976 F.3d at 928); *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 225–29 (1996).

As discussed by the BIA in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 222-24, during IIRIRA’s legislative drafting process, Congress asserted the importance of controlling illegal immigration and securing the land borders of the United States. *See* H.R. Rep. 104-469, pt. 1, at 107 (noting a “crisis at the land border” allowing aliens to illegally enter the United States). As alluded to above, one goal of IIRIRA was to “reform the legal immigration system and facilitate legal entries into the United States” H.R. Rep. No. 104-828, at 1 (1996). Nevertheless, after the enactment of IIRIRA, the DOJ took the position—consistent with pre-IIRIRA law—that “despite being applicants for admission, aliens who are present without being admitted or paroled . . . will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination.” 62 Fed. Reg. at 10,323. Affording aliens present without admission, who have evaded immigration authorities and illegally entered the United States bond hearings before an IJ, but not affording such hearings to arriving aliens, who are attempting to comply with U.S. immigration law, is anomalous with and runs counter to that goal. *Cf.* H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 225 (noting that IIRIRA replaced the concept of “entry” with “admission,” as aliens who illegally enter the United States “gain equities and privileges in immigration proceedings that are not available to aliens who present themselves for inspection at a [POE]”).

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, Petitioner, as an arriving alien in removal proceedings in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a removal proceedings, is an applicant for admission and an alien seeking admission and is therefore subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and ineligible for a bond redetermination hearing before an IJ.

D. Applicants for Admission May Only Be Released from Detention on an 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5) Parole.

Importantly, applicants for admission may only be released from detention if DHS invokes its discretionary parole authority under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5). DHS has the exclusive authority to

temporarily release on parole “any alien applying for admission to the United States” on a “case-by-case basis for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit.” 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5); *see* 8 C.F.R. § 212.5(b). In *Jennings*, the Supreme Court placed significance on the fact that 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5) is the specific provision that authorizes release from detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), at DHS’s discretion. *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 300. Specifically, the Supreme Court emphasized that “[r]egardless of which of those two sections authorizes . . . detention, [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) or (b)(2)(A)], applicants for admission may be temporarily released on parole” *Id.* at 288.

Parole, like an admission, is a factual occurrence. *See Hing Sum*, 602 F.3d at 1098; *Matter of Roque-Izada*, 29 I&N Dec. 106 (BIA 2025) (treating whether an alien was paroled as a question of fact). The parole authority under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5) is “delegated solely to the Secretary of Homeland Security.” *Matter of Castillo-Padilla*, 25 I&N Dec. 257, 261 (BIA 2010); *see* 8 C.F.R. § 212.5(a). Thus, neither the BIA nor IJs have authority to parole an alien into the United States under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5). *Castillo-Padilla*, 25 I&N Dec. at 261; *see also Matter of Arrabally and Yerrabelly*, 25 I&N Dec. 771, 777 n.5 (BIA 2002) (indicating that “parole authority [under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)] is now exercised exclusively by the DHS” and “reference to the Attorney General in [8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)] is thus deemed to refer to the Secretary of Homeland Security”); *Matter of Singh*, 21 I&N Dec. 427, 434 (BIA 1996) (providing that “neither the [IJ] nor th[e] Board has jurisdiction to exercise parole power”). Further, because DHS has exclusive jurisdiction to parole an alien into the United States, the manner in which DHS exercises its parole authority may not be reviewed by an IJ or the BIA. *Castillo-Padilla*, 25 I&N Dec. at 261; *see Matter of Castellon*, 17 I&N Dec. 616, 620 (BIA 1981) (noting that the BIA does not have authority to review the way DHS exercises its parole authority).

Importantly, parole does not constitute a lawful admission or a determination of admissibility, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1101(a)(13)(B), 1182(d)(5)(A), and an alien granted parole remains an applicant for admission, *id.* § 1182(d)(5)(A); *see* 8 C.F.R. §§ 1.2 (providing that “[a]n arriving alien remains an arriving alien even if paroled pursuant to [8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)], and even after any such parole is terminated or revoked”), 1001.1(q) (same). Parole does not place the alien “within the United States.” *Leng May Ma*, 357 U.S. at 190. An alien who has been paroled into the United States under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5) “is not . . . ‘in’ this country for purposes of immigration law” *Abebe*, 16 I&N Dec. at 173 (citing, *inter alia*, *Leng May Ma*, 357 U.S. at 185; *Kaplan*, 267 U.S. at 228). Following parole, the alien “shall continue to be dealt with in the same manner as that of any other applicant for admission to the United States,” 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A), **including that they remain subject to detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).** (emphasis added).

E. Section 1226 Does Not Impact the Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission.

Section 1226(a) is the applicable detention authority for aliens who have been admitted and are deportable who are subject to removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1226, 1227(a), and 1229a, and does not impact the directive in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) that “if the examining immigration officer determines that an alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, the alien shall be detained for a proceedings under [8 U.S.C. § 1229a],” *id.* § 1225(b)(2)(A).⁶ As the Supreme Court explained, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)

⁶ The specific mandatory language of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) governs over the general permissive language of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). “[I]t is a commonplace of statutory construction that the specific governs the general” *Morales v. Trans World Airlines, Inc.*, 504 U.S. 374, 384 (1992); *see RadLAX Gateway Hotel, LLC v. Amalgamated Bank*, 566 U.S. 639, 645 (2012) (explaining that the general/specific canon is “most frequently applied to statutes in which a general permission or prohibition is contradicted by a

“applies to aliens already present in the United States” and “creates a default rule for those aliens by permitting—but not requiring—the [Secretary] to issue warrants for their arrest and detention pending removal proceedings.” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 289, 303; *Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. at 70; *see also M-S-*, 27 I&N Dec. at 516 (describing 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) as a “permissive” detention authority separate from the “mandatory” detention authority under 8 U.S.C. § 1225).⁷

Generally, such aliens may be released on bond or their own recognizance, also known as “conditional parole.” 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a); *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 303, 306. Section 1226(a) does not, however, confer the *right* to release on bond; rather, both DHS and IJs have broad discretion in determining whether to release an alien on bond as long as the alien establishes that he or she is not a flight risk or a danger to the community. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1(c)(8), 1236.1(c)(8); *Matter of Guerra*, 24 I&N Dec. 37, 39 (BIA 2006); *Matter of Adeniji*, 22 I&N Dec. 1102 (BIA 1999). Further, ICE must detain certain aliens due to their criminal history or national security concerns

specific prohibition or permission” and in order to “eliminate the contradiction, the specific provision is construed as an exception to the general one”); *Perez-Guzman v. Lynch*, 835 F.3d 1066, 1075 (9th Cir. 2016) (discussing, in the context of asylum eligibility for aliens subject to reinstated removal orders, this canon and explaining that “[w]hen two statutes come into conflict, courts assume Congress intended specific provisions to prevail over more general ones”). Here, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) “does not negate [8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)] entirely,” which still applies to admitted aliens who are deportable, “but only in its application to the situation that [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)] covers.” A. Scalia & B. Garner, *Reading Law: The Interpretation of Legal Texts* 185 (2012).

⁷ Importantly, a warrant of arrest is not required in all cases. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1357(a). For example, an immigration officer has the authority “to arrest any alien who in his presence or view is entering or attempting to enter the United States in violation of any law or regulation” or “to arrest any alien in the United States, if he has reason to believe that the alien so arrested is in the United States in violation of any such law or regulation and is likely to escape before a warrant can be obtained for his arrest” *Id.* § 1357(a)(2); 8 C.F.R. § 287.3(a), (b) (recognizing the availability of warrantless arrests); *see Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. at 70 n.5. Moreover, DHS may issue a warrant of arrest within 48 hours (or an “additional reasonable period of time” given any emergency or other extraordinary circumstances), 8 C.F.R. § 287.3(d); doing so does not constitute “post-hoc issuance of a warrant,” *Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. at 69 n.4. While the presence of an arrest warrant is a threshold consideration in determining whether an alien is subject to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) detention authority under a plain reading of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), there is nothing in *Jennings* that stands for the assertion that aliens processed for arrest under 8 U.S.C. § 1225 cannot have been arrested pursuant to a warrant. *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 302.

under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c). *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1), (c)(2); 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1(c)(1)(i), 1236.1(c)(1)(i); *see also id.* § 1003.19(h)(2)(i)(D). Release of such aliens is permitted only in very specific circumstances. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(2).

Notably, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c) references certain grounds of inadmissibility, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(A), (D)-(E), and the Supreme Court in *Barton v. Barr*—after issuing its decision in *Jennings*—recognized the possibility that aliens charged with certain grounds of inadmissibility could be detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226. 590 U.S. 222, 235 (2020); *see also Nielsen v. Preap*, 586 U.S. 392, 416-19 (2019) (recognizing that aliens who are inadmissible for engaging in terrorist activity are subject to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)). However, in interpreting provisions of the INA, the Board does not view the language of statutory provisions in isolation but instead “interpret[s] the statute as a symmetrical and coherent regulatory scheme and fit[s], if possible, all parts into an harmonious whole.” *Matter of C-T-L-*, 25 I&N Dec. 341, 345 (BIA 2010) (internal quotation marks omitted) (quoting *FDA v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*, 529 U.S. 120, 133 (2000)). As the Supreme Court in *Barton* also noted, “redundancies are common in statutory drafting—sometimes in a congressional effort to be doubly sure, sometimes because of congressional inadvertence or lack of foresight, or sometimes simply because of the shortcomings of human communication.” *Barton*, 590 U.S. at 239. “Redundancy in one portion of a statute is not a license to rewrite or eviscerate another portion of the statute contrary to its text” *Id.*; *see also Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 222 (“Interpreting the provisions of section [1226(c)] as rendering null and void the provisions of section [1225](b)(2)(A) (or even the provisions of section... 1225(b)(1)), would be in contravention of the ‘cardinal principle of statutory construction,’ which is that courts are to give effect, if possible, to every clause and word of a statute, rather than to emasculate an entire section.”) (quoting *United States v. Menasche*, 348 U.S. 528, 538–39 (1955)). The statutory

language of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)—including the most recent amendment pursuant to the Laken Riley Act, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E), merely reflects a “congressional effort to be doubly sure” that certain aliens are detained, *Barton*, 590 U.S. at 239.

To reiterate, to interpret 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) as not applying to all applicants for admission would render it meaningless. As explained above, Congress expanded 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) in 1996 to apply to a broader category of aliens, including those aliens who crossed the border illegally. IIRIRA § 302. There would have been no need for Congress to make such a change if 8 U.S.C. § 1226 was meant to apply to aliens present without admission. Thus, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 does not have any controlling impact on the directive in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) that “if the examining immigration officer determines that an alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, the alien shall be detained for a proceeding under [8 U.S.C. § 1229a].” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

F. Petitioner’s Detention is Does Not Run Afoul of the Due Process Clause.

Petitioner’s claims that his detention without a bond hearing violates the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution is without merit. (Petition, ECF 1, PageID 12-14, ¶¶53-62.) He is claiming that his bond denial is futile based on the administration’s new guidance issued on July 8, 2025 and the BIA’s decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). (Petition, ECF 1, PageID 11, ¶¶44-45; Bond Denial, Ex. A.)

First, Petitioner has received a constitutionally required bond hearing. On January 14, 2026, Mr. Safari was given a custody redetermination by an Immigration Judge, who determined that he was without authority to redetermine bond in the case. (Dec. 17, 2025, Bond Denial, Ex. D.) Just because Petitioner was denied bond for lack of jurisdiction, doesn’t mean it violates due process. Indeed, he was provided notice of his detention and had an opportunity to object. He has

not appealed this denial to the BIA. Instead, he filed this petition before the custody redetermination hearing. (Petition, ECF 1; Bond Denial, Ex. B.)

Second, in considering whether to require bond hearings where aliens are subject to mandatory detention, the Sixth Circuit has already declined to require a bond hearing where it is not required under 8 U.S.C. § 1231. *Martinez v. Larose*, 968 F.3d 555, 565-66 (6th Cir. 2020) (citing *Padilla v. Immigration & Customs Enf't* (“ICE”), 953 F.3d 1134, 1143 (9th Cir. 2020) (“*Padilla I*”). In declining to follow the *Padilla I* decision, the Sixth Circuit recognized that, “a bond requirement would be out of place in a post-*Jennings* world.” *Id.* at 566. This is because our Court of Appeals is “reluctant to graft a bond-hearing requirement onto a statute absent language supporting such a requirement.” *Id.* (citing *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 298 (2018) (“Spotting a constitutional issue does not give a court the authority to rewrite a statute as it pleases.”); *Hamama v. Adducci*, 912 F.3d 869, 879 (6th Cir. 2018) (criticizing the district court for “creat[ing] out of thin air a requirement for bond hearings that does not exist in the statute”); *cf. Azalyar v. Raycraft*, No. 1:25-CV-916, 2026 WL 30741, at *3 (S.D. Ohio Jan. 2, 2026) (citing *Padilla v. United States Immigr. & Customs Enf't*, 704 F.Supp.3d 1163, 1172 (W.D. Wash. 2023) (“*Padilla II*”) (mandatory detention under §1225(b)(2) lacked “adequate procedural protections” or “a special justification” outweighing a petitioner’s liberty interest)).

The primary issue in *Jennings* was the “proper interpretation of §§ 1225(b), 1226(a), and 1226(c).” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 289. The Ninth Circuit was reversed for erroneously finding periodic bond hearings under §§ 1225(b), 1226(c), and 1226(a) were required. *Id.* at 312. In reversing, the Supreme Court observed that, “§§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2) mandate detention of aliens throughout the completion of applicable proceedings and not just until the moment those proceedings begin.” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 302. As a result, bond hearings are not required.

Petitioner's detention is of limited duration and will end at the conclusion of his immigration proceedings. As such, the due process clause is not violated.

Finally, because Mr. Safari is subject to mandatory detention during immigration proceedings, the proper test for whether his due process have been violated is pursuant to *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001), not *Mathews v. Eldridge*. As this Court explained in *Masis Lucero*, "If the resulting detention were to become unreasonably long, due process concerns may emerge." *Masis Lucero v. Field Office Director ICE ERO*, No. 1:25-cv-823, 2025 WL 3718730, *6 (S.D. Ohio Dec. 23, 2025). Even so, detention weighs in favor of the United States.

The Respondents agree that Mr. Safari has a liberty interest in remaining free from detention, but he is inadmissible and subject to mandatory detention for the duration of his removal proceedings. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii), (iii)(IV); § 1225(b)(2)(A); (Petition, ECF 1, PageID 1, ¶1; NTA, ECF 1-9, PageID 63-66; I-213, Ex. B.) The risk of erroneous deprivation of liberty is minimal because Mr. Safari is subject to mandatory detention by law as an arriving alien and detention pending removal proceedings is constitutionally permissible. *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 305-306. Further, he has already had a custody redetermination to endure there was no mistake as to his status. Moreover, the interest of the United States is significant because Petitioner's detention is required by law and there is a significant interest in encouraging legal immigration.

As a result, Mr. Safari's due process rights have not been violated.

CONCLUSION

This Court lacks jurisdiction over Petitioner's claims. Petitioner is in the wrong court to if he is, in fact, a member of the Bond Eligible Class in *Maldonado Bautista*. Petitioner has failed to exhaust administrative remedies. Additionally, Petitioner is properly detained 8 U.S.C. §

1225(b)(1)(B)(ii), (iii)(IV) and § 1225(b). Accordingly, the Court should deny Petitioner's habeas petition and dismiss it.

Respectfully submitted,

DOMINICK S. GERACE II
United States Attorney

s/William B. King II

WILLIAM B. KING II (094046)
Assistant United States Attorney
Attorney for Respondent
221 East Fourth Street, Suite 400
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Office: (513) 684-3711
Fax: (513) 684-6972
E-mail: Bill.King@usdoj.gov