

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
WAYCROSS DIVISION**

MALDONADO-BANEGAS, Gerardo AKA  
MALDONADO-BANEGAS, German

Petitioner,

v.

Todd LYONS, in his official capacity as  
Acting Director of U.S. Immigration and  
Customs Enforcement; and Ladeon FRANCIS,  
in his official capacity as Field Office Director  
ICE Atlanta Field Office; and Kristi NOEM, in  
her official capacity as Secretary of the U.S.  
Department of Homeland Security; and Pamela  
BONDI, in her official capacity as Attorney  
General of the United States; and Michael  
BRECKON, in his official capacity as Warden,  
Folkston ICE Processing Center, D. Ray James  
Correctional Facility Annex,

Respondents.

Case No.

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
HABEAS CORPUS**

A#:



CV 525-254

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. Petitioner, Mr. Maldonado-Banegas, is a 48-year old native and citizen of Honduras who entered the United States without inspection in 1999 and has resided in the country for the past 26 years.
2. Respondent was detained on or about November 18, 2025, by the Department of Homeland Security.

3. Petitioner now seeks a writ of habeas corpus directing the Respondents to provide Petition with a bond hearing to determine if he may be released on bond under § 1226(a)(2) and the applicable regulations. See 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1 & 1236.1.

## **II. VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

4. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and Article I, § 9, cl. 2 of the Constitution (Suspension Clause).
5. Venue lies in this Division because Petitioner is detained at Folkston ICE Processing Center, within the Waycross Division, and Respondent Breckon is his immediate custodian. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241(d), 1391(e).

## **III. PARTIES**

6. Petitioner, Mr. Maldonado- Banegas, Honduran national who resides in Durham, NC. He is currently detained at the Folkston ICE Processing Center.
7. Respondent Michael Breckon is the Warden of Folkston ICE Processing Center. As such, Respondent Breckon is responsible for the operation of the Detention Center where Petitioner is detained. Because ICE contracts with private prisons such as Folkston Ice Processing Center to house immigration detainees such as Mr. Maldonado-Banegas, Respondent Breckon has immediate physical custody of the Petitioner.
8. Respondent Todd Lyons is the Acting Direction of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (hereinafter "ICE"). As such, Respondent Lyons is being sued in his official capacity.
9. Respondent Ladeon Francis is the Atlanta Field Office Director for Immigration and Customs Enforcement (hereinafter "FOD"). As such, Respondent Francis is responsible

for the oversight of ICE operations at the Folkston ICE Processing Center. Respondent Sterling is being sued in his official capacity.

10. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (hereinafter "DHS"). As Secretary of DHS, Secretary Noem is responsible for the general administration and enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States. Respondent Noem is being sued in her official capacity.

11. Respondent Pamela Bondi is the Attorney General of the United States. She is responsible for the Department of Justice, of which the Executive Office for Immigration Review and the immigration court system it operates is a component agency. She is sued in her official capacity.

#### **IV. EXHAUSTION OF REMEDIES**

12. Petitioner has exhausted his administrative remedies to the extent required by law, and his only remedy is by way of this judicial action.

#### **V. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

13. Petitioner, Mr. Maldonado Banegas native and citizen of Honduras who entered the United States without inspection in 1999 and has resided in the country for the past 26 years. See **Exhibit 1**, *Petitioner's Birth Certificate with an English translation*.

14. Prior to his arrest on or about November 18, 2025, Petitioner had never had any contact with immigration authorities and had never applied for any legal status.

15. On or about November 18, 2025, ICE officers arrested Petitioner at his place of work.

16. On September 5, 2025, the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) issued a decision which proposes that, “[b]ased on the plain language of section 235(b)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) (2018), Immigration Judges lack authority to hear bond requests or to grant bond to aliens who are present in the United States without admission.” See *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).
17. As of November 18, 2025, Petitioner has been detained for 41 days and denied the opportunity to request bond before an IJ.
18. Petitioner’s continued detention is causing irreparable harm, as Petitioner has been separated from his U.S. citizen children and continues to be traumatized by this unlawful restraint on her liberty.

## VI. LEGAL FRAMEWORK

19. The INA prescribes three basic forms of detention for most noncitizens in removal proceedings.
20. First, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 authorizes the detention of noncitizens in standard removal proceedings before an IJ. See 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. This provision applies to “applicants for admission,” defined as those “present in the United States who has not been admitted.” § 1225(a)(1). Individuals in §1226(a) detention are generally entitled to a bond hearing at the outset of their detention, *see* 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19(a), 1236.1(d), while noncitizens who have been arrested, charged with, or convicted of certain crimes are subject to mandatory detention until their removal proceedings are concluded, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c).
21. Second, the INA provides for mandatory detention of noncitizens subject to expedited removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and for other recent arrivals “seeking admission” referred to under § 1225(b)(2).

22. Third, the INA provides for detention of noncitizens who have received a final order of removal from the United States, including individuals in withholding-only proceedings, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1231 (a)-(b).
23. This case concerns the detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2).

## VII. CAUSES OF ACTION

### COUNT I

#### **Violation of 8 U.S.C. 1226(a) Unlawful Denial of Release on Bond**

24. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in the preceding paragraphs.
25. At the time of his arrest, Petitioner was a noncitizen present in the United States who had not been admitted, and thus he falls within the broad definition of “applicant for admission,” which is distinct from an “alien seeking admission,” and his detention is therefore governed by § 1226(a)(2).
26. The BIA has wrongfully construed § 1225(b)(2) as applying to all noncitizens who are found in the United States unlawfully, such as the Petitioner. *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).
27. The BIA’s decision in *Yajure Hurtado* erroneously synonymizes the terms “applicant for admission” and “alien seeking admission” in order to apply mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2) to an entire class of noncitizens for whom it was never intended by Congress.
28. The unlawful application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates his continued detention without a discretionary bond hearing and violates the INA.

**COUNT II**  
**Violation of the Bond Regulations, 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1 and 1003.19**  
**Unlawful Denial of Release on Bond**

29. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations and facts set forth in paragraphs 1-28 as if fully set forth herein.
30. In 1997, after Congress amended the INA through IIRIRA, EOIR and the then-Immigration and Naturalization Service issued an interim rule to interpret and apply IIRIRA. Specifically, under the headings of “Apprehension, Custody, and Detention of [Noncitizens],” the agencies explained that “[d]espite being applicants for admission, [noncitizens] who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as [noncitizens] who entered without inspection) *will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination.*” 62 Fed. Reg. at 10323 (emphasis added). The agencies thus made clear that individuals who had entered without inspection were eligible for consideration for bond and bond hearings before IJs under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and its implementing regulations.
31. Nonetheless, the BIA has asserted that, instead, t § 1225(b)(2) should apply to those noncitizens “present without having been admitted or paroled.”
32. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates his continued detention and violates 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1, 1236.1, and 1003.19.

**COUNT III**  
**Violation of Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause**

33. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations and facts set forth in paragraphs 1-28 as if fully set forth herein.

34. The Fifth Amendment provides that “[n]o person” shall “be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.”
35. “Freedom from imprisonment – from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint – lies at the heart of the liberty that Clause protects.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).
36. Moreover, “[t]he Due Process Clause applies to all ‘persons’ within the United States, including aliens, whether their presence here is lawful, unlawful, temporary, or permanent.” *Id.* at 693.
37. Respondents’ mandatory detention of Petitioner without consideration for release on bond or access to a bond hearing violates his due process rights.

#### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that this Court grant the following relief:

- 1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- 2) Grant Petitioner a writ of habeas corpus directing Respondents to immediately provide Petitioner with a bond hearing to determine if he may be released on bond under § 1226(a)(2) and the applicable regulations. See 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1, 1236.1.
- 3) Order Respondents to refrain from transferring Petitioner out of the jurisdiction of this court during the pendency of these proceedings and while the Petitioner remains in Respondents’ custody;
- 4) Order Respondents to file a response within 3 days of the filing of this petition;
- 5) Award attorneys’ fees to Petitioner; and
- 6) Grant any other and further relief which this Court deems just and proper.

I affirm, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Respectfully submitted this December 29, 2025.

/s/ Matthew O. Boles  
GA Bar # 904287  
LA Bar # 37593  
Manji Law, P.C.  
5745 Lawrenceville Hwy  
Tucker, GA 30084  
Tel. (941) 524-7913  
Matt@manjilaw.com

**Verification**

I declare under penalty of perjury that the facts set forth in the foregoing Verified Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

/s/ Matthew O. Boles

Date: December 29, 2025