Elizabeth Hildebrand Matherne, Esq.
Wannamaker Crimmigration
DBA Stern Law, LLC
PO BOX 920005
Peachtree Corners, GA, 30010
(470)749-9996
elizabeth@sternlawfirm.us

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
COLUMBUS DIVISION

MARIA GUADALUPE RAMOS LAZARO,	:	**Case No.:**
	:	
Petitioner,	:	**VERIFIED PETITION**
	:	**FOR WRIT OF**
	:	**HABEAS CORPUS**
v.	:	**UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 2241**
	:	
JASON STREEVAL, Warden, Stewart Detention Center; KRISTEN SULLIVAN, Acting Director, Atlanta Field Office, U.S. Immigration & Customs Enforcement, Enforcement & Removal Operations; TODD M. LYONS, Acting Director, U.S. Immigration & Customs Enforcement; KRISTI NOEM, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; PAMELA BONDI, U.S. Attorney General; and DAREN K. MARGOLIN, Director, Executive Office for Immigration Review,	:	
	:	
Respondents.		

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner Maria Guadalupe Ramos Lazaro has been in the physical custody of Respondents at the Stewart Detention Center in Lumpkin, GA for nearly six months. She is being unlawfully detained because the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) have wrongfully concluded that Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention.

2. Petitioner is charged with, *inter alia*, having entered the United States without admission or inspection. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i).
3. Based on this allegation in Petitioner's removal proceedings, DHS denied Petitioner release from immigration custody, consistent with a new DHS policy issued on July 8, 2025, instructing all Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) employees to consider anyone inadmissible under § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i)—i.e., those who entered the United States without admission or inspection—to be subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and, therefore, ineligible for release on bond.
4. Similarly, on September 5, 2025, the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA or Board) issued a precedent decision, binding on all immigration judges, holding that an immigration judge has no authority to consider bond requests for any person who entered the United States without admission. *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). The Board determined that such individuals are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and, therefore, ineligible for release on bond.
5. Petitioner's detention on this basis violates the plain language of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). Section 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to individuals like Petitioner who previously entered and are now residing in the United States. Instead, such individuals are subject to a different statute, § 1226(a), that allows for release on conditional parole or bond. That statute expressly applies to people who, like Petitioner, are charged as inadmissible for having entered the United States without inspection.
6. And, in fact, Respondents previously provided Petitioner a bond hearing under § 1226(a)--which directly contradicts their current position.

7. Respondents' new legal interpretation is plainly contrary to the statutory framework and contrary to decades of agency practice applying § 1226(a) to people like Petitioner.
8. On November 20, 2025, the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM (C.D. Cal.) granted partial summary judgment on behalf of individual plaintiffs and on November 25, 2025, certified a nationwide class and extended declaratory judgment to the certified class. *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 233085 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2025) (order granting partial summary judgment to named Plaintiffs-Petitioners); *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 231977 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2025) (order certifying nationwide Bond Eligible Class, incorporating and extending declaratory judgment from Order Granting Petitioners' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment).
9. The *Maldonado Baustista* court entered a declaratory judgment that the individual plaintiffs are detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), and thus may not be denied consideration for release on bond under § 1225(b)(2)(A). *Maldonado Bautista*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 233085, at **15-29. In its subsequent ruling, the district court "extend[ed] the same declaratory relief granted to Petitioners to the Bond Eligible Class as a whole." *Maldonado Bautista*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 231977, at *26.
10. On December 18, 2025, the *Maldonado Bautista* court entered final judgment on Counts I through III of the petitioners' Amended Class Complaint, certifying the class and declaring unlawful the DHS policy at issue in this case. *See Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 262265 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025). The *Maldonado*

Baustista court explicitly "declares Respondents' interpretation contrary to law" and "[a]s such, the interpretation in *Yajure-Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216, which contradicts the Court's reasoning is no longer controlling." *Id.* at *35.

11. Petitioner is a member of the Bond Eligible Class in *Maldonado Bautista*, as she:

    a. does not have lawful status in the United States and is currently detained at Stewart Detention Center. She was taken into custody by immigration authorities on July 3, 2025;

    b. entered the United States without inspection over 20 years ago and was not apprehended upon arrival; and

    c. is not detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231.

12. Respondents are bound by the judgment in *Maldonado Bautista*, as it has the full "force and effect of a final judgment." 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a). *See, e.g., Mendes v. Hyde*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 251341, at *6 (D.R.I. Dec. 5, 2025) (holding that petitioner was entitled to the same relief ordered by Judge Sykes in *Maldonado Baustista*); *Maclas v. Raycraft*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 254271, at **6-7 (N.D. Ohio Dec. 9, 2025) (same); *Santuario v. Bondi*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 254006, at *4 (D. Minn. Dec. 2, 2025) (same).

13. Nevertheless, Respondents continue to flagrantly defy the judgment in that case. Indeed, immigration judges have informed class members in bond hearings that they have been instructed by "leadership" that *Maldonado Bautista* is not controlling, even with respect to class members, and that instead immigration judges remain bound to follow the agency's prior decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).

14. Therefore, Respondents are detaining Petitioner in violation of the INA, the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, and *Maldonado Bautista*.

15. Accordingly, Petitioner seeks a writ of habeas corpus requiring that she be released unless Respondents provide a bond hearing under § 1226(a) within seven days.

JURISDICTION

16. This action arises under the U.S. Constitution and the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1101 *et seq.*

17. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), and Article I, section 9, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution (the Suspension Clause).

18. This Court may grant relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*, and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

VENUE

19. Pursuant to *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493-500 (1973), venue lies in the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, the judicial district in which Petitioner currently is detained.

20. Venue is also properly in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because Respondents are employees, officers, and agencies of the United States, and because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this District.

REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

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

22. Habeas corpus is "perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law . . . affording as it does a *swift* and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or

confinement." *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963) (emphasis added). "The application for the writ usurps the attention and displaces the calendar of the judge or justice who entertains it and receives prompt action from him within the four corners of the application." *Yong v. I.N.S.*, 208 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted).

PARTIES

23. Petitioner is a native and citizen of Mexico. She has no current, lawful status in the United States. She has been in immigration detention since July 3, 2025. ICE did not set bond and Petitioner is unable to obtain review of her custody by an immigration judge (IJ), pursuant to the Board's decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). Petitioner is in custody and under the direct control of Respondents and their agents.

24. Respondent Jason Streeval is Warden of the Stewart Detention Center, where Petitioner is detained. Respondent Streeval has immediate physical custody of Petitioner and he is sued in his official capacity.

25. Respondent Kristen Sullivan is the Acting Director of the Atlanta Field Office of ICE's Enforcement and Removal Operations division. As such, she is a legal custodian of Petitioner, is responsible for Petitioner's detention and removal, and has authority to release her. She is named in her official capacity.

26. Respondent Todd M. Lyons is the Acting Director of ICE, which is the federal agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA, including the detention and removal of noncitizens. Respondent Lyons has control over the actions of Respondent Sullivan and ICE in general. Respondent Lyons is a legal custodian of Petitioner and is sued in his official capacity.

27. Respondent Kristi Noem is the DHS Secretary. She is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the INA, and oversees ICE, which is responsible for Petitioner's detention. Respondent Noem is a legal custodian of Petitioner and is sued in her official capacity.

28. Respondent Pamela Bondi is the Attorney General of the United States. She is responsible for the Department of Justice (DOJ), of which EOIR and the immigration court system it operates is a component agency. Respondent Bondi is a legal custodian of Petitioner and is sued in her official capacity.

29. Respondent Daren K. Margolin is the Director of EOIR, which is the federal agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA in removal proceedings, including for custody redeterminations in bond hearings. Respondent Margolin is sued in his official capacity.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

30. The INA prescribes three basic forms of detention for the vast majority of noncitizens in removal proceedings.

31. First, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 authorizes the detention of noncitizens in standard removal proceedings before an IJ. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. 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, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c).

32. 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).

33. Last, the INA also provides for detention of noncitizens who have been ordered removed, including individuals in withholding-only proceedings, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)–(b).

34. This case concerns the detention provisions at §§ 1226(a) and 1225(b)(2).

35. The detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) were enacted as part of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104–208, Div. C, §§ 302–03, 110 Stat. 3009–546, 3009–582 to 3009–583, 3009–585. Section 1226(a) was most recently amended earlier this year by the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No.119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025).

36. Following the enactment of the IIRIRA, EOIR drafted new regulations explaining that, in general, people who entered the country without inspection were not considered detained under § 1225 and that they were instead detained under § 1226(a). *See* Inspection and Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum Procedures, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997).

37. Thus, in the decades that followed, most people who entered without inspection and were placed in standard removal proceedings received bond hearings, unless their criminal history rendered them ineligible pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c). That practice was consistent with many more decades of prior practice, in which noncitizens who were not deemed "arriving" were entitled to a custody hearing before an IJ or other hearing officer. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a) (1994); *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 229 (1996) (noting that § 1226(a) simply "restates" the detention authority previously found at § 1252(a)).

38. On July 8, 2025, ICE, "in coordination with" DOJ, announced a new policy that rejected well-established understanding of the statutory framework and reversed decades of practice.

39. The new policy, entitled "Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission," claims that all persons who entered the United States without inspection shall now be subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). The policy applies regardless of when a person is apprehended, and affects those who have resided in the United States for months, years, and even decades.

40. On September 5, 2025, the BIA adopted this same position in a published decision, *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*. There, the Board held that all noncitizens who entered the United States without admission or parole are subject to detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A) and are ineligible for IJ bond hearings.

41. Since Respondents adopted their new policies, dozens of federal courts have rejected their new interpretation of the INA's detention authorities. Courts have likewise rejected *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, which adopts the same reading of the statute as ICE.

42. Even before ICE or the BIA introduced these nationwide policies, IJs in the Tacoma, Washington, immigration court stopped providing bond hearings for persons who entered the United States without inspection and who have since resided here. There, the U.S. District Court in the Western District of Washington found that such a reading of the INA is likely unlawful and that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to noncitizens who are not apprehended upon arrival to the United States. *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239 (W.D. Wash. 2025).

43. Subsequently, courts have adopted the same reading of the INA's detention authorities and rejected ICE and EOIR's new interpretation. *See, e.g.*, *Vasquez Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02180-DMS-MM, 2025 WL 2549431 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025); *Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11571-JEK, 2025 WL 1869299 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025); *Diaz Martinez v. Hyde*, No. CV 25-11613-BEM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 2084238 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025); *Rosado v. Figueroa*, No. CV 25-02157 PHX DLR (CDB), 2025 WL 2337099 (D. Ariz. Aug. 11, 2025), *report and recommendation adopted*, No. CV-25-02157-PHX-DLR (CDB), 2025 WL 2349133 (D. Ariz. Aug. 13, 2025); *Lopez Benitez v. Francis*, No. 25 CIV. 5937 (DEH), 2025 WL 2371588 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2025); *Maldonado v. Olson*, No. 0:25-cv-03142-SRN-SGE, 2025 WL 2374411 (D. Minn. Aug. 15, 2025); *Arrazola-Gonzalez v. Noem*, No. 5:25-cv-01789-ODW (DFMx), 2025 WL 2379285 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2025); *Romero v. Hyde*, No. 25-11631-BEM, 2025 WL 2403827 (D. Mass. Aug. 19, 2025); *Samb v. Joyce*, No. 25 CIV. 6373 (DEH), 2025 WL 2398831 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 19, 2025); *Ramirez Clavijo v. Kaiser*, No. 25-CV-06248-BLF, 2025 WL 2419263 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2025); *Leal-Hernandez v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-02428-JRR, 2025 WL 2430025 (D. Md. Aug. 24, 2025); *Kostak v. Trump*, No. 3:25-cv-01093-JE-KDM, 2025 WL 2472136 (W.D. La. Aug. 27, 2025); *Jose J.O.E. v. Bondi*, No. 25-CV-3051 (ECT/DJF), --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 2466670 (D. Minn. Aug. 27, 2025) *Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft*, No. 2:25-cv-12486-BRM-EAS, 2025 WL 2496379 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025); *Zaragoza Mosqueda v. Noem*, No. 5:25-CV-02304 CAS (BFM), 2025 WL 2591530 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2025); *Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft*, No. 25-CV-12546, 2025 WL 2609425 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9, 2025); *Sampiao v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11981-JEK, 2025 WL 2607924 (D. Mass. Sept. 9, 2025); *see also, e.g.*, *Palma Perez v. Berg*,

No. 8:25CV494, 2025 WL 2531566, at *2 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025) (noting that "[t]he Court tends to agree" that § 1226(a) and not § 1225(b)(2) authorizes detention); *Jacinto v. Trump*, No. 4:25-cv-03161-JFB-RCC, 2025 WL 2402271 at *3 (D. Neb. Aug. 19, 2025) (same); *Anicasio v. Kramer*, No. 4:25-cv-03158-JFB-RCC, 2025 WL 2374224 at *2 (D. Neb. Aug. 14, 2025) (same).

44. Courts have uniformly rejected DHS's and EOIR's new interpretation because it defies the INA. As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court and others have explained, the plain text of the statutory provisions demonstrates that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to people like Petitioner.

45. Section 1226(a) applies by default to all persons "pending a decision on whether the [noncitizen] is to be removed from the United States." These removal hearings are held under § 1229a, to "decid[e] the inadmissibility or deportability of a[] [noncitizen]."

46. The text of § 1226 also explicitly applies to people charged as being inadmissible, including those who entered without inspection. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E). Subparagraph (E)'s reference to such people makes clear that, by default, such people are afforded a bond hearing under subsection (a). As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court explained, "[w]hen Congress creates 'specific exceptions' to a statute's applicability, it 'proves' that absent those exceptions, the statute generally applies." *Rodriguez Vazquez*, 779 F. Supp. 3d at 1257 (citing *Shady Grove Orthopedic Assocs., P.A. v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 559 U.S. 393, 400 (2010)); *see also Gomes*, 2025 WL 1869299, at *7.

47. Section 1226 therefore leaves no doubt that it applies to people who face charges of being inadmissible to the United States, including those who are present without admission or parole.

48. By contrast, § 1225(b) applies to people arriving at U.S. ports of entry or who recently entered the United States. The statute's entire framework is premised on inspections at the border of people who are "seeking admission" to the United States. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Indeed, the Supreme Court has explained that this mandatory detention scheme applies "at the Nation's borders and ports of entry, where the Government must determine whether a[] [noncitizen] seeking to enter the country is admissible." *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287 (2018).

49. Accordingly, the mandatory detention provision of § 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to people like Petitioner, who have already entered and were residing in the United States at the time they were apprehended.

FACTS

50. Petitioner entered the United States in 1999 and, since then, she has resided in the country.

51. Petitioner has deep roots here in this country. She has resided here for nearly thirty years and has three U.S. citizen children, including one child who has a learning disability and another child who has serious medical issues that prevent her from being able to work or drive. Prior to her detention, Petitioner had been regularly employed as a painter in South Carolina, where she maintained a fixed address. Petitioner is an integral part of her family and community.

52. In January 2021, Petitioner was arrested for simple possession of marijuana and assault/assault and battery 2nd degree. Both charges were dismissed. Petitioner has been cited several times for driving without a license and operating a vehicle without

registration. Other than these non-violent, traffic offenses, Petitioner has no criminal history. Petitioner is neither a danger to the community nor a flight risk.

53. Following Petitioner's arrest in January 2021, DHS issued Petitioner a Notice to Appear, placing her in removal proceedings pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. ICE charged Petitioner with being inadmissible under, *inter alia*, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) as someone who entered the United States without inspection. ICE took her into custody and made a determination to continue Petitioner's detention at Stewart Detention Center.

54. In March 2021, Petitioner requested a custody redetermination hearing before an IJ. The IJ exercised jurisdiction but denied bond, finding that Petitioner failed to show that she was not a danger. ***(Please see Exhibit 1).***

55. However, on May 7, 2021, ICE released Petitioner on her own recognizance. ***(Please see Exhibit 2).***

56. On July 2, 2025, Petitioner was arrested for driving without a license and driving a vehicle in violation of state window tint regulations.

57. Following Petitioner's arrest in July 2025, ICE took Petitioner into custody on July 3, 2025, and made a determination to re-detain Petitioner, despite ICE having previously released Petitioner on her own recognizance.

58. In October 2025, Petitioner requested a custody redetermination before an IJ.

59. Pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, the immigration judge denied bond, holding that he lacked jurisdiction to consider Petitioner's bond request. ***(Please see Exhibit 3).***

60. As a result, Petitioner has been detained at the Stewart Detention Center for nearly six months. Without relief from this court, she faces the prospect of more months, or even years, in immigration custody, separated from her family and community.

61. Petitioner has filed applications for cancellation of removal and asylum, both of which remain pending. She was granted an Employment Authorization Document based on her pending application for cancellation of removal. Additionally, Petitioner is prima facie eligible for a T-visa as a victim of human trafficking and she filed a T-visa application with USCIS in June 2025. ***(Please see Exhibit 4).***

62. While she has been detained for nearly six months, Petitioner has been denied the ability to meaningfully participate in her T-visa application and her claims for cancellation of removal and asylum, and to communicate with the attorney representing her in the removal proceedings, gather relevant documents, and locate key witnesses.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I
Violation of the INA

63. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs.

64. The mandatory detention provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to all noncitizens residing in the United States who are subject to the grounds of inadmissibility. As relevant here, it does not apply to those who previously entered the country and have been residing in the United States prior to being apprehended and placed in removal proceedings by Respondents. Such noncitizens are detained under § 1226(a), unless they are subject to § 1225(b)(1), § 1226(c), or § 1231.

65. Indeed, Respondents previously provided Petitioner a bond hearing under § 1226(a) and, therefore, have no lawful basis to now assert that she is detained under § 1225(b)(2).

66. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates her continued detention and violates the INA.

COUNT II
Violation of the INA:
Request for Relief Pursuant to *Maldonado Baustista*

67. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs.

68. As a member of the Bond Eligible Class, Petitioner is entitled to consideration for release on bond under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).

69. The final judgment in *Maldonado Bautista* declares unlawful the DHS policy at issue in this case and holds that Respondents violate the INA in applying the mandatory detention statute at § 1225(b)(2) to class members.

70. Respondents are parties to *Maldonado Bautista* and bound by the Court's final judgment.

71. By denying Petitioner a bond hearing under § 1226(a) and asserting that she is subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2), Respondents violate Petitioner's statutory rights under the INA and the Court's judgment in *Maldonado Bautista*.

COUNT III
Violation of the Bond Regulations

72. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs.

73. 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 heading of "Apprehension, Custody, and Detention of Aliens," the agencies explained 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 10323. The agencies thus made clear that individuals who had entered without inspection were eligible for consideration for bond and bond hearings before immigration judges under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and its implementing regulations.

74. Nonetheless, pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, Respondents have a policy and practice of applying § 1225(b)(2) to individuals like Petitioner.

75. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates her continued detention and violates 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1, 1236.1, and 1003.19.

COUNT IV
Violation of Fifth Amendment Due Process

76. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs.

77. The government may not deprive a person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. U.S. Const. amend. V. "Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that the Clause protects." *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).

78. Petitioner has a fundamental interest in liberty and being free from official restraint.

79. The government's detention of Petitioner without a bond redetermination hearing to determine whether she is a flight risk or danger to others violates her right to due process.

80. Additionally, being denied the right to pursue her pending applications for a T-visa, cancellation of removal and asylum in a non-detained setting where she is free to gather evidence and locate witnesses, Petitioner would be deprived of the freedom to pursue her legal rights and would violate her right to due process.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;

b. Order that Petitioner shall not be transferred outside this District while this habeas petition is pending;

c. Issue an Order to Show Cause ordering Respondents to show cause why this Petition should not be granted within three days;

d. Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus requiring that Respondents release Petitioner or, in the alternative, provide Petitioner with a bond hearing pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven days;

e. Declare that Petitioner's detention is unlawful;

f. Award Petitioner's attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA), as amended, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and on any other basis justified under law; and

g. Grant any other and further relief that this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully Submitted,

//s//Elizabeth Hildebrand Matherne
Elizabeth Hildebrand Matherne, Esq.
Wannamaker Crimmigration
DBA Stern Law, LLC
P.O. BOX 92005
Peachtree Corners, GA 30010
Phone: 470-749-9996

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

I represent Petitioner, Maria Guadalupe Ramos Lazaro, and submit this verification on her behalf. I 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 2nd day of January 2026.

Respectfully Submitted,

//s//Elizabeth Hildebrand Matherne
Elizabeth Hildebrand Matherne, Esq.
Wannamaker Crimmigration
DBA Stern Law, LLC
P.O. BOX 92005
Peachtree Corners, GA 30010
Phone: 470-749-9996