

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
WAYCROSS DIVISION

MARTINEZ ZALAYA, Marvin Joel

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; EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW; 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#:



I. INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner, Mr. Martinez Zalaya is a 35-year-old native and citizen of Honduras who entered the United States without inspection approximately ten years ago and has resided in the country since that time.
2. Respondent was detained on or about December 13, 2025, by the Department of Homeland Security.
3. Petitioner now seeks a writ of habeas corpus directing the Respondents to 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.

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. Martinez Zalaya, is a 35-year-old Honduran national who resides in Huffman, TX. 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. Martinez Zalaya, Respondent Breckon has immediate physical custody of the Petitioner.
8. Respondent Todd Lyons is the Acting Director 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 Francis 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. Martinez Zalaya, native and citizen of Honduras, who entered the United States without inspection approximately ten years ago and has continuously resided in the country since that time.
14. Prior to his arrest on or about December 13, 2025, Petitioner had never had any contact with immigration authorities and had never applied for any legal status.
15. On or about December 13, 2025, Petitioner was taken into custody by ICE officers while en route to his home
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 December 13, 2025, Petitioner has been detained for 23 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 family and continues to be traumatized by this unlawful restraint on his 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 as if fully set forth herein.
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 the preceding paragraphs 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, § 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 the preceding paragraphs 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 January 6, 2026.

/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: January 6, 2026