

1 Erica Sanchez, Of Counsel
2 Shefer Law Firm, P.A.
3 800 SE 4th. Ave #803
4 Hallandale Beach, Florida 33009
5 Telephone: (480) 866-1111
6 erica@shefer.legal
7 Arizona Bar #027107
8 Attorney for Petitioner

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Walter Lopez-Hernandez,
Petitioner,

v.

Kristi Noem, Secretary of the United States Department of Homeland Security, in her official capacity; **Todd Lyons**, Acting Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, in his official capacity; **John Cantu**, Field Office Director for ICE’s Enforcement and Removal Operation’s (“ERO”) Field Office, in his official capacity; **Sirce Owen**, Acting Director of Executive Office for Immigration Review, in her official capacity; **Luis Rosa, Jr.**, Warden of the Florence Service Processing Center, in his official capacity,

Respondents.

Case No.

Agency No. 

**PETITION FOR WRIT
OF HABEAS CORPUS
PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C.
§2241**

INTRODUCTION

The Respondents are unlawfully detaining Petitioner Walter Lopez-Hernandez, at the Florence Service Processing Center, due to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) recently changed its long-standing position with regard to the status of mandatory detention. *See*, ICE Memo: Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for

1 Applications for Admission filed herewith as Exhibit 1. The Bureau of Immigration
2 Appeals (BIA) issued a precedential decision on September 5, 2025, holding that all
3 noncitizens present in the United States without admission – no matter how long they
4 have resided here – are still “applicants for admission” under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a) and
5 not entitled to bond hearings because they are subject to mandatory detention under §
6 1225(b)(2)(A). *See, Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (B.I.A. 2025) filed
7 herewith as Exhibit 2.
8

9
10 But this interpretation of the Immigration and Naturalization Act (INA) violates
11 both procedural and substantive Fifth Amendment protections, ignores the plain
12 statutory language of both § 1225 and § 1226, and is contrary to numerous recent Federal
13 Court decisions in this District that have rejected these exact arguments. *See e.g.*
14 10/3/2025 Order entered in *Francisco Echevarria v. Pam Bondi, et al.*, CV-25-03252-
15 PHX-DWL (ESW), (D. Ariz. 10/3/2025), filed herewith as Exhibit 16.
16

17
18 The Immigration Judge ordered Petitioner removed after determining that his
19 application was abandoned due to a missed filing deadline. Petitioner filed an appeal of
20 that decision on December 19, 2025, which remains pending. *See*, Petitioner’s Filing
21 Receipt for Appeal, filed herewith as Exhibit 6. Petitioner’s removal order is not final
22 because his appeal remains pending. His continued detention therefore falls under the
23 pre-final order detention framework, which provides for the opportunity to seek bond
24 before an Immigration Judge. However, under the prevailing practice applied to
25 individuals in Petitioner’s position, Immigration Judges have declined to exercise
26
27
28

1 jurisdiction over bond requests, rendering such requests futile. As a result, Petitioner has
2 been denied a meaningful opportunity to seek bond, in violation of due process, and
3 habeas relief is warranted to correct that error. In light of the pending appeal, Petitioner
4 should be afforded the opportunity to seek bond and to present his case before an
5 Immigration Judge in a custody redetermination hearing.
6

7 Further, when Respondents issued a Notice to Appear, it identified Petitioner as
8 an “alien present in the United States” despite “arriving alien” being an option. *See*,
9 Petitioner’s Notice to Appear, filed herewith as Exhibit 5. By classifying Petitioner in
10 this manner, the government acknowledged that Petitioner was placed in standard
11 removal proceedings rather than treated as an arriving alien, a distinction that bears
12 directly on detention authority and access to a custody redetermination hearing.
13
14

15 In addition to BIA decisions not being binding precedent upon this Court, the
16 Supreme Court decision last year in *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S.
17 369, 400 (2024), made clear that federal courts must independently interpret statutes and
18 no longer defer under so-called “Chevron deference.” This Court is therefore in the best
19 position to determine whether the Respondents are misinterpreting the relevant federal
20 statutes and improperly denying alien detainees bond hearings on the grounds that they
21 are all subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). The petition for writ of
22 habeas corpus should be granted.
23
24
25

26 JURISDICTION & CUSTODY

27
28

1 1. Petitioner Walter Lopez-Hernandez, is in the physical custody of
2 Respondents and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), an agency within the
3 Department of Homeland Security.
4

5 2. Petitioner is currently detained at Florence Service Processing Center
6 and is under the direct control of Respondents and their agents.
7

8 3. This action arises under the Constitution of the United States and 8
9 U.S.C. § 1101 et seq.
10

11 4. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, Art. I § 9, cl. 2 of
12 the United States Constitution, 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and the common law. This Court may
13 grant relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §
14 2201 *et seq.*, and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.
15

16 5. Congress has preserved judicial review of challenges to immigration
17 detention. *See Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 122, 130-131 (2018) (holding that 8
18 U.S.C. §§ 1226(e) and 1252(b)(9) do not bar review of challenges to prolonged
19 immigration detention).
20

21 6. The Court must grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus or order
22 Respondents to show cause “forthwith,” unless the petitioner is not entitled to relief. 28
23 U.S.C. § 2243. If an order to show cause is issued, Respondents must file a return
24 “within three days unless for good cause additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is
25 allowed.” *Id.*
26
27
28

1 including those relating to the detention of immigrants during their removal procedures.
2 Respondent Lyons is a legal custodian of Petitioner. Respondent Lyons is sued in his
3 official capacity.
4

5 14. Respondent ICE is a federal law enforcement agency within DHS.
6 Respondent ICE is responsible for the enforcement of immigration laws, including the
7 detention and removal of immigrants. Respondent ICE is a legal custodian of Petitioner.
8

9 15. Respondent John Cantu is Field Office Director for ICE's Enforcement
10 and Removal Operation's ("ERO") Field Office. Respondent Cantu is a legal custodian
11 of Petitioner and is sued in his official capacity.
12

13 16. Respondent Luis Rosa, Jr. is the Warden of the Florence Service
14 Processing Center. Respondent Rosa, Jr. is a legal custodian of Petitioner. Respondent
15 Rosa, Jr. is sued in his official capacity.
16

17 17. Respondent Sirce Owen is the Acting Director of the Executive Office
18 for Immigration Review (EOIR), a federal agency within the U.S. Department of Justice.
19 Respondent EOIR is responsible for the administration of immigration courts, and
20 acceptance of forms and petitions related to adjudication of immigration claims, as well
21 as motions for bond. Respondent Sirce Owen is sued in her official capacity.
22

23 STATEMENT OF FACTS

24 18. Petitioner Walter Lopez-Hernandez's presence in the United States
25 exceeds two years, which is the period during which he could have been subjected to
26 expedited removal.
27
28

1 19. Respondents arrested Petitioner and issued a notice to appear on
2 October 17, 2025. *See*, Petitioner’s Notice to Appear, filed herewith as Exhibit 5.

3
4 20. The Notice to Appear identified him as an “alien present in the United
5 States” even though “arriving alien” was an alternate option. *Id.*

6 21. After Petitioner failed to submit his application within the deadline set
7 by the Immigration Judge, the application was deemed abandoned and an order of
8 removal was entered. Petitioner subsequently filed an appeal on December 19, 2025.
9
10 *See*, Petitioner’s Filing Receipt for Appeal, filed herewith as Exhibit 5.

11 22. Petitioner is detained at the Florence Service Processing Center where
12 he remains in custody. *See* ICE Online Detainee Locator Printout, filed herewith as
13 Exhibit 3.
14

15 23. Petitioner did not request a bond hearing in light of the prevailing
16 jurisdictional determinations applied to similarly situated individuals, which rendered
17 such requests futile.
18

19 LEGAL FRAMEWORK

20 24. The length of time that a petitioner has been living in the United States
21 is a constitutionally relevant consideration, because “once an alien enters the country,
22 the legal circumstance changes, for the Due Process Clause applies to all ‘persons’
23 within the United States, including aliens, whether their presence here is lawful,
24 unlawful, temporary, or permanent.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001). It
25
26
27
28

1 is therefore reasonable to read these statutes “against [that] backdrop.” *See Hewitt v.*
2 *United States*, 605 U.S. —, 145 S. Ct. 2165, 2173 (2025).

3
4 25. Due process thus requires “adequate procedural protections” to ensure
5 that the government’s asserted justification for a noncitizen’s physical confinement
6 “outweighs the individual’s constitutionally protected interest in avoiding physical
7 restraint.” *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690 (internal quotation marks omitted).

8
9 26. In the immigration context, the Supreme Court has recognized only
10 two valid purposes for civil detention: to mitigate the risks of danger to the community
11 and to prevent flight. *Id.*; *Demore*, 538 U.S. at 528. The government may not detain a
12 noncitizen based on any other justification.

13
14 27. Congress has granted the Attorney General discretion to decide
15 whether to detain or release certain noncitizens pending a removal decision. *See* 8 U.S.C.
16 § 1226(a). The Attorney General has delegated that authority to IJs. 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19,
17 1236.1.

18
19 28. On July 8, 2025, DHS adopted a new policy on mandatory detention
20 for noncitizens who have been residing in the United States. *See*, ICE Memo: Interim
21 Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applications for Admission filed herewith
22 as Exhibit 1.

23
24 29. On September 5, 2025, the BIA entered the precedential decision
25 *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (B.I.A. 2025), filed herewith as Exhibit 2,
26 which holds that all noncitizens who enter without inspection are “applicants for
27

1 admission" under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a) and therefore subject to mandatory detention under
2 § 1225(b)(2), without regard for the length of time they have lived in the United States.

3
4 30. The Ninth Circuit has held that § 1226(a) is the "default" detention
5 statute for aliens in removal proceedings "[8 U.S.C. §1226(a) ("Subsection A")] is the
6 default detention statute for noncitizens in removal proceedings and applies to
7 noncitizens "[e]xcept as provided in [Subsection C]." 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)." *Avilez v.*
8 *Garland*, 69 F. 4th 525, 529-530 (9th Cir. 2022). *Accord, Rodriguez Diaz v. Garland*,
9 83 F. 4th 1177, 1179 (9th Cir. 2023); *Sarr v. Scott*, 765 F. Supp. 3d 1091, 1095 (WD
10 Wash. 2025); *Prieto-Romero v. Clark*, 534 F.3d 1053, 1057 (9th Cir. 2008). *Casas-*
11 *Castrillon v. DHS*, 535 F.3d 942 (9th Cir. 2008).

12
13
14 31. Almost every Federal District Court that has considered the issue has
15 found that DHS's interpretation defies the INA. In Arizona, the following decisions so
16 find and collect the cases from other district courts around the country:

- 17
18 a. 12/12/2025 Order granting habeas in *Gonzalez-Gonzalez v. Noem*, et al.,
19 Case No. 25-cv-04478-DWL (D. Ariz 12-12-25)(The court declined to
20 revisit the conclusion it reached in *Echevarria*).
- 21 b. 11/26/2025 Order granting habeas in *Luna-Gonzalez v. Noem*, et al., Case
22 No. 25-cv-03794-PHX (D. Ariz 11-26-25)(The court rejected the
23 government's argument that the petitioner is an "arriving alien" subject to
24 mandatory detention under § 1225 and agrees instead with the growing
25 majority of courts that people like the petitioner—who were arrested
26 inside the United States long after entering—are detained under § 1226(a),
27 not § 1225.), gathering cases, filed with the Habeas Petition as Exhibit 7;
- 28 c. 11/24/25 Order granting habeas in *Padron-Carreron v. Noem*, et al., Case
No. 25-cv-04204-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-25-25)("Respondents correctly
acknowledge that their view still represents the minority position—in the

1 weeks since the Court considered the issue in Echevarria, dozens of other
2 courts have reached the same conclusion... [that] § 1226(a)'s application
3 for the past three decades supports its application to noncitizens in
4 petitioner's position"), gathering cases, filed with the Habeas Petition as
5 Exhibit 8;

6 d. 11/18/2025 Order granting habeas in *Rodrigues da Silva v. Figueroa*, et
7 al., Case No. 25-cv-04015-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-18-25)("dozens of other
8 district courts have concluded individuals like Petitioner are subject to §
9 1226 and not § 1225 and, therefore, are not subject to mandatory
10 detention"), gathering cases, filed with the Habeas Petition as Exhibit 9;

11 e. 11/13/2025 Order granting habeas in *Perez Rodriguez v. Noem*, et al., Case
12 No. 25-cv-03921-PHX (D. Ariz. 11/13/2025)("the vast majority of courts
13 concluded individuals like Petitioner are subject to § 1226 and not § 1225
14 and, therefore, are not subject to mandatory detention"), gathering cases,
15 filed with the Habeas Petition as Exhibit 10

16 f. 11/6/25 Order granting habeas in *Gonzalez Rodriguez v. Bondi*, et al., Case
17 No. 25-cv-03917-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-6-25)("dozens of other district courts
18 have concluded individuals like Petitioner are subject to § 1226 and not §
19 1225 and, therefore, are not subject to mandatory detention"), gathering
20 cases, filed with the Habeas Petition as Exhibit 11

21 g. 11/6/2025 Order Granting Habeas in *Abrego-Zarate v. Noem, et al.*, Case
22 No. 25-cv-03564-KML (D. Ariz. 11-6-25)("the great weigh of authority
23 is that individuals like petitioner are not subject to mandatory detention.
24 This court agrees with the majority view. For these reasons, the petition is
25 granted, and petitioner must receive a bond hearing without application of
26 *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N 216 (B.I.A. 2025."), filed herewith as
27 Exhibit 12.

28 h. 11/03/25 Order granting habeas petition in *Lopez-Cruz v. Noem, et al*, No.
2:25-cv-03566-DJH--ASB (D. Ariz. 11/3/2025)("dozens of other district
courts have concluded individuals like Petitioner are subject to § 1226 and
not § 1225 and, therefore, are not subject to mandatory detention. This
Court agrees with this conclusion."), filed herewith as Exhibit 13.

- 1
- 2 i. 10/22/2025 Order granting habeas in *Garcia-Rosales v. Noem, et al.*, No.
- 3 2:25-cv-03391-SHD-DMF at page 2 (D. Ariz. Oct. 22, 2025)(“while
- 4 Respondents point to two district court opinions adopting their
- 5 interpretation of § 1225(b)(2)(A), myriad other district courts have
- 6 reached the same conclusion as *Echevarria* and held individuals like
- 7 Petitioner are not subject to mandatory detention under 1225(b)(2)(A)”),
- 8 filed herewith as Exhibit 14.
- 9 j. 10/17/2025 Order granting habeas corpus in *Benitez-Cornejo v. Cantu, et*
- 10 *al.*, No. 2:25-cv-03672 (D. Arizona Oct. 17, 2025)(“individuals like
- 11 Petitioner are not “arriving aliens” subject to mandatory detention but,
- 12 rather, are subject to the general removal statute, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)”),
- 13 filed herewith as Exhibit 15.
- 14 k. 10/09/2025 Order granting habeas entered in *Hector Lopez-Melo v. Bondi,*
- 15 *et. al.*, Case No. Case 2:25-cv-03394-DJH--JZB (D. Ariz.
- 16 10/9/2025)(“petitioner, who had been present in the United States for
- 17 years, was not an applicant for admission under 1225(b)(2)(A) or subject
- 18 to mandatory detention”), filed herewith as Exhibit 16.
- 19 l. 10/07/2025 Order granting habeas corpus in *Bo Li v. Cantu, et al.*, No.
- 20 CV-25-02989-PHX-SPL (D Arizona 10/07/2025)(“Respondents maintain
- 21 he is subject to mandatory detention under 1225(b)(2). Again,
- 22 Respondents are mistaken.”), filed herewith as Exhibit 17.
- 23 m. 10/3/2025 Order granting habeas corpus in *Echevarria v. Bondi, et al.*, No.
- 24 2:25-cv-03252-PHX-DWL, 2025 WL 2821282 (D. Ariz. Oct. 3,
- 25 2025)(“Court agrees with the majority of courts that have concluded that
- 26 § 1226(a), rather than § 1225(b)(2)(A), applies in this circumstance.”),
- 27 filed herewith as Exhibit 18.
- 28 n. 08/11/2025 Magistrate’s Report and Recommendation in *Rocha Rosado*
- v. Figueroa*, No. CV-25-02157-PHX-DLR 2025 WL 2349133 at *10 (D.
- Ariz. Aug. 13, 2025)(Magistrate’s Report and Recommendation Adopted
- at 2025 WL 2349133)([t]he text of § 1226, the canons of statutory
- interpretation, this section's legislative history, and longstanding agency

1 practice indicate that Rosado is subject to § 1226(a)'s 'default' rule for
2 discretionary detention rather than § 1225's mandatory detention
3 requirement, and that the IJ erred by finding they did not have jurisdiction
4 to consider Rosado's detention.") *report and recommendation adopted sub*
5 *nom.* 2025 WL 2349133 (D. Ariz. Aug. 13, 2025), filed herewith as
Exhibit 19.

6 32. Petitioner has located only 6 cases holding to the contrary. In *Vargas*
7 *Lopez v. Trump*, --F. Supp. 3d--, 2025 WL 2780351 (D. Neb. Sept. 30, 2025), the court
8 held that Vargas Lopez failed to meet his burden to show that he falls under § 1226(a),
9 so "his Petition fails regardless of the parties' arguments about the scope of § 1225(b)
10 and § 1226(a)." *Vargas Lopez v. Trump*, 2025 WL 2780351 at *7 (emphasis added). In
11 *Chavez v. Noem*, -- F. Supp. 3d --, 2025 WL 2730228 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2025), the
12 court denied a temporary restraining order on the grounds that the petitioners had "not
13 demonstrated serious questions about the application of Section 1225 to aliens present
14 in the United States." *Chavez v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2730228 at *4. However, the court
15 spent less than 2 pages analyzing the statutory language and caselaw before concluding
16 that "Petitioners have not shown either a likelihood of success or serious questions going
17 to the merits [therefore] we do not address the remaining Winter factors." *Chavez v.*
18 *Noem*, 2025 WL 2730228 at *5. *Mejia Olalde v. Noem*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 221830
19 (E.D. Mo. Nov. 10, 2025) was concerned with whether the habeas petition had been
20 properly filed in that court's jurisdiction and never reached the application of § 1225(b)
21 to the petitioner. *Pipa-Aquise v. Bondi*, No. 25-1094, 2025 WL 2490657 (E.D. Va. Aug.
22 5, 2025) and *Pena v. Hyde*, No. 25-11983, 2025 WL 2108913 (D. Mass. July 28, 2025)
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 were each shorter than two pages long and neither contained any significant analysis.
2 Lastly, in *Lauren-Ayala v. Noem*, No. 25-cv- 04425-KML--JFM (D. Ariz. 12/12/2025).
3 the court did not reach the merits of the habeas claim or analyze the governing statute;
4 instead, it dismissed the petition for lack of jurisdiction, concluding that, because
5 petitioner failed to address the immigration court’s alternative dangerousness finding, it
6 could not order any effective relief. Thus, none of these cases are particularly instructive.
7

8
9 33. In 1997, after Congress amended the INA through the Illegal
10 Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA), EOIR and
11 the then-Immigration and Naturalization Service issued an interim rule to interpret and
12 apply IIRIRA. Specifically, under the heading of “Apprehension, Custody, and
13 Detention of Aliens,” the agencies explained that:
14

15 Despite being applicants for admission, aliens who are
16 present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly
17 referred to as aliens who entered without inspection) *will be*
18 *eligible* for bond and bond redetermination.

19 62 Fed. Reg. at 10323 (emphasis added). The agencies thus made clear that
20 individuals who had entered without inspection *were* eligible for consideration for
21 bond and bond hearings before IJs under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and its implementing
22 regulations.
23

24 34. Thus, for almost 30 years, all participants in the immigration system
25 have understood that people arrested inside the United States generally fall within §
26 1226 for detention purposes and are therefore required to receive a bond hearing upon
27 request—even if they initially entered the country without permission. *See Martinez v.*
28

1 *Hyde*, No. 25-11613, 2025 WL 2084238, at *4 n.9 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025) (citing the
2 United States Solicitor General’s representation to the Supreme Court at oral argument
3 that “DHS’s long-standing interpretation has been that 1226(a) applies to those who
4 have crossed the border between ports of entry and are shortly thereafter apprehended”).
5

6 35. Despite the overwhelming number of federal cases that have ruled
7 against the government’s position, DHS and DOJ are continuing to systemically
8 misclassify people and unlawfully deny them access to bond hearings and release on
9 bond during the pendency of their immigration proceedings.
10

11 **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**
12 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
13 **Violation of Fifth Amendment – Substantive Due Process**

14 36. Petitioner realleges and incorporates herein the allegations contained
15 in the preceding paragraphs of the petition as if fully set forth herein.
16

17 37. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment forbids the
18 government from depriving any “person” of liberty “without due process of law,”
19 including noncitizens. U.S. Const. amend. V.
20

21 38. Substantive due process asks whether a person’s life, liberty, or
22 property is deprived without sufficient purpose. There is no question that Petitioner has
23 been deprived of his liberty in this case.
24

25 39. The government’s continued detention of Petitioner is not supported
26 by any special interest or compelling justification that outweighs his liberty interest.
27
28

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

VERIFICATION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2242

I represent Petitioner Walter Lopez-Hernandez and submit this verification on his behalf. I hereby verify that the factual statements made in the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated this 23rd day of December, 2025.

By: /s/ *Erica Sanchez*
Erica Sanchez, Esq.

LIST OF EXHIBITS	
Exhibit 1	<u>ICE Memo: Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applications for Admission</u> (last visited September 8, 2025).
Exhibit 2	<i>Matter of Yajure Hurtado</i> , 29 I&N Dec. 216 (B.I.A. 2025).
Exhibit 3	ICE Online Detainee Locator Printout
Exhibit 4	Declaration of Counsel in Support of Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus
Exhibit 5	Notice to Appear
Exhibit 6	Petitioner's Filing Receipt for Appeal
Exhibit 7	Order granting habeas in <i>Gonzalez-Gonzalez v. Noem</i> , et al., Case No. 25-cv-04478-DWL (D. Ariz. 12-12-25)
Exhibit 8	Order granting habeas in <i>Luna-Gonzalez v. Noem</i> , et al., Case No. 25-cv-03794-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-26-25)
Exhibit 9	Order granting habeas in <i>Padron-Carreron v. Noem</i> , et al., Case No. 25-cv-04204-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-24-25)
Exhibit 10	Order granting habeas in <i>Rodrigues da Silva v. Figueroa</i> , et al., Case No. 25-cv-04015-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-18-25)
Exhibit 11	Order entered <i>Perez Rodriguez v. Noem</i> , et al., Case No. 25-cv-03921-PHX (D. Ariz. 11/13/2025)
Exhibit 12	Order entered <i>Gonzalez Rodriguez v. Bondi</i> , et al., Case No. 25-cv-03917-PHX (D. Ariz. 11-6-25)
Exhibit 13	Order entered in <i>Abrego-Zarate v. Noem</i> , et al., Case No. 25-cv-03564-KML (D. Ariz. 11-6-25)
Exhibit 14	Order entered in <i>Lopez-Cruz v. Noem</i> , et al., No. 2:25-cv-03566-DJH--ASB (D. Ariz. 11/3/2025)
Exhibit 15	Order entered in <i>Garcia-Rosales v. Noem</i> , et al., No. 2:25-cv-03391-SHD—DMF (D. Ariz. Oct. 22, 2025)
Exhibit 16	Order granting habeas corpus in <i>Benitez-Cornejo v. Cantu</i> , et al., No. 2:25-cv-03672 (D. Arizona Oct. 17, 2025)
Exhibit 17	Order entered in <i>Hector Lopez-Melo v. Bondi</i> , et. al., Case No. Case 2:25-cv-03394-DJH--JZB [docket no. 11] (D.C. Ariz. 10/9/2025)
Exhibit 18	Order granting habeas corpus in <i>Bo Li v. Cantu</i> , et al., No. CV-25-02989-PHX-SPL (D Arizona 10/07/2025)

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

Exhibit 19	Order entered in <i>Francisco Echevarria v. Pam Bondi, et al.</i> , CV-25-03252-PHX-DWL (ESW), (D. Ariz. 10/3/2025)
Exhibit 20	Magistrate's Report and Recommendation in <i>Rocha Rosado v. Figueroa</i> , No. CV-25-02157-PHX-DLR (CDB), 2025 WL 2349133 (D. Ariz. Aug. 13, 2025)