

---

**3:26-cv-00109-BJC-DDL** Garcia-Rodriguez v. Noem et al  
Benjamin J. Cheeks, presiding  
David D. Leshner, referral  
**Date filed:** 01/08/2026  
**Date of last filing:** 01/16/2026

## History

| Doc.<br>No. | Dates                                  | Description                                                                                                          |
|-------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>1</u>    | <i>Filed &amp; Entered:</i> 01/08/2026 |  Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus |
| <u>2</u>    | <i>Filed &amp; Entered:</i> 01/12/2026 |  Order                              |
| <u>3</u>    | <i>Filed &amp; Entered:</i> 01/14/2026 |  Notice of Appearance               |
| <u>4</u>    | <i>Filed &amp; Entered:</i> 01/16/2026 |  Return to Petition                 |



MURRAY D. HILTS, ESQ. (CA Bar No. 169690)  
LAW OFFICES OF MURRAY D. HILTS  
3020 MEADE AVE.  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92116  
TEL: (619) 688-1174  
FAX: (619) 285-1977  
*Attorney for Petitioner*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN DIEGO DIVISION

JULIO ARTURO GARCIA-RODRIGUEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

Kristi NOEM, in her official capacity as Secretary  
of Homeland Security, Christopher J. LAROSE,  
in his official capacity as Warden of Otay Mesa  
Detention Center, Gregory J. ARCHAMBEAULT,  
in his official capacity as San Diego Field Office  
Director, ICE Enforcement Removal Operations;  
Todd LYONS, in his official capacity as Acting Director  
of ICE; and Pamela BONDI, U.S.  
Attorney General; IMMIGRATION AND  
CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT; DEPARTMENT OF  
HOMELAND SECURITY,

Respondents.

'26CV109 BJC DDL

PETITION FOR WRIT  
OF HABEAS CORPUS

A# 

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner JULIO ARTURO GARCIA-RODRIGUEZ, ("Petitioner")  
is a 47-year-old Mexican national who last entered the United States in 1999.
2. On December 31, 2025, Petitioner was detained by Respondents at the  
Otay Mesa Detention Center.

1       3.     Petitioner has not requested a custody redetermination as the impact  
2 of the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) decision in *Matter of Yajure*  
3 *Hurtado*, 28 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025) and the Central District of California’s  
4 decision in *Lazaro Maldonado Bautista, et al v. Ernesto Santacruz Jr, et al.*, 5:cv-  
5 01873 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2025) has meant that all requests for custody  
6 redetermination under Petitioner’s circumstances have been dismissed for lack  
7 of jurisdiction.  
8

9       4.     Petitioner therefore seeks a writ of habeas corpus directing his  
10 immediate release.  
11

## 12                               II. VENUE AND JURISDICTION

13       5.     This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus),  
14 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), and Article I, § 9, cl. 2 of the Constitution  
15 (Suspension Clause), as Petitioner is presently in custody under the authority  
16 of the United States and challenging his detention as in violation of the  
17 Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.  
18

19       6.     The federal district courts have jurisdiction under Section 2241 to  
20 hear habeas claims by individuals challenging the lawfulness of their detention  
21 by ICE. *See Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 290-92 (2018).  
22

23       7.     Venue is proper because Petitioner is detained in the Otay Mesa  
24 Detention Center, within the San Diego Division, and Respondent LaRose is his  
25 immediate custodian. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241(d), 1391(e).  
26  
27  
28

### III. PARTIES

8. Petitioner is a 47-year-old Mexican national who resides in San Diego, California. He is currently detained by Respondents at the Otay Mesa Detention Center in San Diego, California, pending removal proceedings.

9. Respondent Christopher J. LaRose is the Warden of Otay Mesa Detention Center. Respondent La Rose is responsible for the operation of the Detention Center where Petitioner is detained. As such, Respondent LaRose has immediate physical custody of the Petitioner. He is being sued in his official capacity.

10. Respondent Gregory J. Archambeault is the San Diego Field Office Director ("FOD") for ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations. Respondent Archambeault is responsible for the oversight of ICE operations at the Otay Mesa Detention Center. Respondent Archambeault is being sued in his official capacity.

11. Respondent Todd Lyons is the Acting Director of ICE. Respondent Lyons is responsible for the administration of ICE and the implementation and enforcement of the immigration laws, including immigrant detention. As such, Respondent Lyons is a legal custodian of Petitioner and is being sued in his official capacity.

12. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS"). As Secretary of DHS, Secretary Noem is responsible for the general administration and enforcement of the immigration



1 laws of the United States. Respondent Secretary Noem is being sued in her  
2 official capacity.

3 **IV. EXHAUSTION OF REMEDIES**

4  
5 13. No statutory exhaustion requirement applies. *See* 8 § U.S.C. 2241;  
6 *Laing v. Ashcroft*, 370 F.3d 994, 998 (9th Cir. 2004). Therefore, exhaustion is not  
7 jurisdictionally required.

8  
9 14. Additionally, further agency steps will be futile. Recently, the BIA  
10 published *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 28 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). In its decision,  
11 the BIA adopted DHS' reading of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), finding individuals  
12 similarly situated to Petitioner ineligible for release on bond.

13  
14 15. In Petitioner's case, any request for custody redetermination will be  
15 dismissed by the Immigration Court for lack of jurisdiction and any appeal to  
16 the BIA will be dismissed. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* and *Lazaro Maldonado*  
17 *Bautista, et al v. Ernesto Santacruz Jr, et al.*, 5:cv-01873 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 20,  
18 2025) currently controls in Petitioner's case and any attempt to request agency  
19 evaluation of his detention will be futile.

20  
21 **V. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

22  
23 16. Petitioner is a Mexican national born on . He last  
24 entered the United States in 1999.

25  
26 17. On or about December 31, 2025, Petitioner was detained by  
27 Respondents at the Otay Mesa Detention Center.

1 18. Petitioner has remained in Respondents' custody since that time.

2 19. Petitioner's next master hearing is scheduled for January 12, 2026,  
3 at 8:30 a.m. before Immigration Judge Eugene H. Robinson JR. at 7488  
4 Calzada de la Fuente, San Diego, California.  
5

6 20. Petitioner now seeks habeas relief because continuing his detention  
7 exceeds statutory authority and violates the Fifth Amendment.  
8

9  
10 **VI. LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR RELIEF SOUGHT**

11 21. Habeas corpus relief extends to a person "in custody under or by color  
12 of the authority of the United States" if the person can show he is "in custody  
13 in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28  
14 U.S.C. § 2241 (c)(1), (c)(3); see also *Antonelli v. Warden, U.S.P. Atlanta*, 542  
15 F.3d 1348, 1352 (11th Cir. 2008) (holding a petitioner's claims are proper under  
16 28 U.S.C. section 2241 if they concern the continuation or execution of  
17 confinement).  
18

19 22. "[H]abeas corpus is, at its core, an equitable remedy," *Schlup v.*  
20 *Delo*, 513 U.S. 298, 319 (1995), that "[t]he court shall ... dispose of [] as law  
21 and justice require," 28 U.S.C. § 2243. "[T]he court's role was most extensive  
22 in cases of pretrial and noncriminal detention." *Boumediene v. Bush*, 553  
23 U.S. 723, 779–80 (2008). "[W]hen the judicial power to issue habeas corpus  
24 properly is invoked the judicial officer must have adequate authority to make  
25 a determination in light of the relevant law and facts and to formulate and  
26  
27  
28

1 issue appropriate orders for relief, including, if necessary, an order directing  
2 the prisoner's release." *Id.* at 787.

## 3 4 VII. CAUSES OF ACTION

### 5 COUNT ONE

#### 6 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), NOT 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), APPLIES TO PETITIONER

7  
8 23. Petitioner incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 as if fully set out  
9 herein.

10 24. Recently, Respondents began arguing that those in situations similar  
11 to Petitioner are detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), which mandates  
12 the detention of an "applicant for admission" throughout the entirety of  
13 removal proceedings.

14  
15 25. Respondents' newly formulated definition of "applicant for  
16 admission," which would include any noncitizen who has not been formally  
17 admitted regardless of years of residence in the United States, directly  
18 contradicts both the plain text of the statute and controlling Ninth Circuit  
19 precedent.

20  
21 26. As the Ninth Circuit explained in interpreting the phrase "applicant  
22 for admission" under § 1225(b)(1), "*an immigrant submits an 'application for*  
23 *admission' at a distinct point in time,*" and stretching that phrase to apply  
24 "*potentially for years or decades ... would push the statutory text beyond its*  
25 *breaking point.*" *United States v. Gambino-Ruiz*, 91 F.4th 981, 988–89 (9th Cir.  
26 2024) (citing *Torres v. Barr*, 976 F.3d 918, 922–26 (9th Cir. 2020) (en banc)).  
27  
28



1        27. Because Petitioner has resided continuously in the United States  
2 since 1999, his period as an “applicant for admission” has long since closed.

3        28. Numerous courts across the United States have considered this issue  
4 subsequent to Respondents’ new policy of treating the vast majority of  
5 immigrants in their custody as being detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §  
6 1225(b)(2) and the BIA’s decision supporting this interpretation in *Matter of*  
7 *Yajure Hurtado*, 28 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).  
8

9        29. This Court, joining the general consensus with other courts across  
10 this country, has previously held those similarly situated to Petitioner are  
11 being held under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and therefore are not subject to mandatory  
12 detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). *See e.g., Martinez Lopez v. Noem, et al.*, No:  
13 25-cv-2717-JES-AHG, 2025 WL 3030457 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2025).  
14  
15

16  
17                    **COUNT TWO**  
18                    **(PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS)**

19        30. Petitioner incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 as if fully set out  
20 herein.

21        31. The Fifth Amendment forbids deprivation of liberty without notice  
22 and a meaningful opportunity to be heard before a neutral decision-maker. Due  
23 process protects “all ‘persons’ within the United States, including [non-  
24 citizens], whether their presence here is lawful, unlawful, temporary, or  
25 permanent.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 698 (2001).  
26

27        32. Subsection 1003.19(i)(2) strips Petitioner of that protection by  
28

1 allowing the prosecuting agency—after losing at the bond hearing—to veto the  
2 Immigration Judge’s order with a one-page notice that requires no showing of  
3 danger, flight risk, or likelihood of success on appeal.

4  
5 33. Applying the *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976), test,  
6 Petitioner’s liberty interest is paramount; the risk of erroneous deprivation is  
7 extreme considering the Immigration Judge’s determination that Petitioner is  
8 not subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c) and does not pose  
9 a danger to the community. Likewise, the risk of erroneous deprivation of  
10 liberty is great due to the lack of a non-independent adjudicator. *Marcello v.*  
11 *Bonds*, 39 U.S. 302, 305-306 (1955). In filing Form EOIR-43, ICE is acting as  
12 both the prosecutor as well as the adjudicator.  
13

14 34. While the government has discretion to detain individuals under 8  
15 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and to revoke custody decisions under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(b), this  
16 discretion is not “unlimited” and must comport with constitutional due process.  
17  
18 *See Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 698.

19  
20 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

- 22  
23 1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;  
24 2) Grant Petitioner a writ of habeas corpus directing the Respondents to  
25 immediately release him from custody, under reasonable conditions of  
26 supervision;  
27  
28

- 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 business 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 8th day of January, 2026.

/s/ Murray D. Hilts

The Law Offices of Murray D. Hilts  
3020 Meade Ave.  
San Diego, CA 92116  
CA Bar # 2169690

*Attorney for Petitioner*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN DIEGO DIVISION**

---

JULIO ARTURO GARCIA-RODRIGUEZ,

Agency No. 

*Petitioner,*

v.

KRISTI NOEM, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, et. al.,

*Respondents.*

---

**PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS**

Murray D. Hilts  
Law Offices of Murray D. Hilts  
3020 Meade Ave.  
San Diego, CA 92116  
(619) 688-1174 (office)  
(619) 285-1977 (fax)  
murrayhilts@murrayhiltslaw.com

Attorneys for Petitioner,

JULIO ARTURO GARCIA-RODRIGUEZ,





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW  
OTAY MESA IMMIGRATION COURT

Respondent Name:

[REDACTED]

A-Number:

[REDACTED]

To:

Hilts, Murray David  
3020 Meade Avenue  
San Diego, CA, CA 92116

Riders:

In Custody Redetermination Proceedings

Date:

12/11/2025

ORDER OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE

The respondent requested a custody redetermination pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 1236. After full consideration of the evidence presented, the respondent's request for a change in custody status is hereby ordered:

☒ Denied, because

The Respondent has been charged as being present without admission or parole, accordingly, the Court lacks jurisdiction to set a bond pursuant to Matter of Yajure Hurtado, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). Lazaro Maldonado Bautista, et al v. Ernesto Santacruz Jr, et al., 5:cv-01873 (CD CA Nov. 20, 2025), does not bind the Court as a final order has not been issued in that case.

☐ Granted. It is ordered that Respondent be:

- ☐ released from custody on his own recognizance.
- ☐ released from custody under bond of \$
- ☐ other:

☐ Other: