

Chief Magistrate Judge Theresa L. Fricke

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE**

Kevin Alexander QUINONEZ TORRES,

Petitioner,

v.

Laura HERMOSILLO et al.,

Respondents.

Case No. 2:26-cv-00076-TLF

**PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION**

Noted for Consideration:
February 18, 2026

INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Kevin Alexander Quinonez Torres respectfully requests that the Court reconsider and narrowly modify the relief ordered in its order granting a writ of habeas corpus.¹ Yesterday, February 17, 2026, the Court granted Mr. Quinonez Torres's petition for a writ of habeas corpus, holding that he is detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and finding that his re-detention without a hearing violated the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. The Court concluded, however, that he was not entitled to immediate release and ordering a post-deprivation hearing where Respondents must bear the burden of justifying his re-detention. Mr. Quinonez Torres respectfully submits that a new hearing is not necessary because the immigration judge (IJ) previously set a \$4,000 alternative bond. The appropriate remedy is thus an order providing that Mr. Quinonez Torres must be released upon payment of that alternative bond, as courts in this district have repeatedly recognized.

¹ Respondents, through counsel, indicated their opposition to the requested relief. *See infra* p.3.

1 The immigration court has already set a new bond hearing for February 24, 2026. Mr.
 2 Quinonez Torres respectfully requests that the Court issue an order as soon as possible in
 3 advance of this bond hearing to ensure that Mr. Quinonez Torres knows whether that hearing will
 4 proceed, and if the Court is inclined to grant this motion, to guarantee that he is released on the
 5 alternative bond amount “forthwith.” 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

6 ARGUMENT

7 I. Standard of Review

8 This Court disfavors motions to reconsider. L. Civ. R. 7(h). Such motions are, however,
 9 appropriate where a party shows a “manifest error of law.” *Chung v. Washington Interscholastic*
 10 *Activities Ass’n*, 550 F. Supp. 3d 920, 924 (W.D. Wash. 2021).

11 II. Established Caselaw Demonstrates That the Appropriate Remedy Is Release on the 12 Alternative Bond Amount.

13 Mr. Quinonez Torres is not asking the Court to reconsider the substance of its analysis.
 14 The Court correctly concluded that Mr. Quinonez Torres is detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a),
 15 and Mr. Quinonez Torres does not ask the Court to reconsider its due process analysis or its
 16 conclusion that immediate release is not warranted. Rather, Mr. Quinonez Torres respectfully
 17 asks the Court to narrowly modify its order to permit release on the alternative bond amount of
 18 \$4,000 set at Mr. Quinonez Torres’s July 9, 2025, bond hearing. Dkt. 11 at 5.

19 In Mr. Quinonez Torres’s case, ordering a post-deprivation hearing rather than release on
 20 this alternative bond amount was a manifest error for three reasons. First, release on the
 21 alternative bond amount is the remedy this Court has consistently ordered for dozens of similarly
 22 situated persons. As this Court explained when granting the writ, Mr. Quinonez Torres is
 23 detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) for the same reasons set forth in in *Rodriguez Vazquez v.*
 24 *Bostock*, 802 F. Supp. 3d 1297 (W.D. Wash. 2025), and *Del Valle Castillo v. Wamsley*, No. 2:25-
 25 CV-02054-TMC, 2025 WL 3524932 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 26, 2025). In both the *Rodriguez Vazquez*
 26 enforcement habeas petitions, *see generally Rodriguez Vazquez v. Hermosillo*, No. 3:25-CV-
 27 05240-TMC, 2026 WL 102461, at *3 & n.2 (W.D. Wash. Jan. 14, 2026), and in *Del Valle*

1 *Castillo*, the remedy that the Court has ordered for people with alternative bond amounts is
 2 release upon payment of that alternative bond amount. *See, e.g., Del Valle Castillo*, 2025 WL
 3 3524932, at *8; *Ortiz Martinez v. Wamsley*, No. 2:25-CV-01822-TMC, 2025 WL 2899116, at *5
 4 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 10, 2025); *Garcia v. Wamsley*, No. 2:25-CV-01980-TMC, 2025 WL 3208777,
 5 at *2 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 21, 2025); *Cantero Garcia v. Wamsley*, No. 2:25-CV-02092-TMC, 2025
 6 WL 3123996, at *2 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 7, 2025). As the Court explained in one of those cases,
 7 once the Court concludes that a person is detained under § 1226(a), “honoring the alternative
 8 bond amounts set by the IJs would correct Respondents’ ongoing violation of the INA as to these
 9 Petitioners.” *Hernandez Ramos v. Hermosillo*, No. 2:25-CV-02273-TMC, 2025 WL 3251159,
 10 at *2 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 21, 2025). The Court should provide the same relief here.²

11 Second, providing a new bond hearing effectively allows Respondents a second bite at
 12 the apple—nearly a year after they re-detained him unlawfully, *see* Dkt. 1 ¶ 3—to request that *no*
 13 bond be set. And it appears that is exactly what Respondents intend to do. Following the Court’s
 14 order, and in light of its ruling that Mr. Quinonez Torres is detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a),
 15 counsel for Mr. Quinonez Torres reached out to counsel for Respondents to inquire whether
 16 Respondents would simply agree to Mr. Quinonez Torres’s release on the alternative bond, as
 17 courts in this district have routinely ordered. Respondents, through counsel, declined this
 18 proposal and indicated that changed circumstances warrant detention. *See* Ex. A (email
 19 correspondence). The Court should not afford Respondents the opportunity to seek vacatur of a
 20 bond determination that was already made on the merits, particularly when the burden would fall
 21 on Respondents at the second hearing, and should instead permit Mr. Quinonez Torres’s release
 22 pursuant to the IJ’s previous determination that a \$4,000 bond is appropriate.

23 Finally, the relief requested here is the relief that Mr. Quinonez Torres requested in his
 24 petition. *See* Dkt. 1 at 14 (requiring that “in the alternative,” the Court “order[] [Petitioner’s]

25
 26 ² In this case, Respondents agreed that if the Court were to grant Mr. Quinonez Torres’s petition,
 27 “the appropriate remedy in this case is not an order of release, as Petitioner requests. Instead, *the appropriate remedy would be to order Petitioner be released upon payment of the bond alternatively ordered by the Immigration Judge.*” Dkt. 7 at 10 (emphasis added).

1 immediate[] release upon payment of the alternative bond set by the IJ.”). That requested relief
2 conforms to the principle that “the scope of . . . relief is dictated by the extent of the violation
3 established.” *Califano v. Yamasaki*, 442 U.S. 682, 702 (1979). While Mr. Quinonez Torres
4 appreciates that the Court has set a new hearing where *Respondents* must bear the burden (rather
5 than Mr. Quinonez Torres, as at the prior hearing before the IJ), *see* Dkt. 11 at 22–23, requiring
6 Respondents to honor the alternative bond is sufficient to remedy the “violation established.”
7 *Califano* 442 U.S. at 702. Release on the alternative bond actually affords more immediate and
8 effective release: it would require Respondents to treat Mr. Quinonez Torres as detained under
9 § 1226(a) and to facilitate his release once that bond is posted, without the need for additional
10 proceedings. By contrast, an additional hearing leaves Mr. Quinonez Torres in detention for
11 another week, even though the logical result of the Court’s order is that as a § 1226(a) detainee,
12 Mr. Quinonez Torres’s alternative bond amount should already be effective. *See supra* pp. 2–3
13 (citing cases).³

14 Similarly, honoring the alternative bond amount ensures that the relief is “no more
15 burdensome to the defendant than necessary to provide complete relief to the plaintiffs.”
16 *Madsen v. Women's Health Ctr., Inc.*, 512 U.S. 753, 765 (1994) (quoting *Califano*, 442 U.S. at
17 702). Because the Court has concluded Mr. Quinonez Torres is detained under § 1226(a),
18 honoring the alternative bond amount provides complete relief. And it also avoids placing an
19 additional burden on all parties by requiring further proceedings that are unnecessary in light of
20 the IJ’s existing bond determination. This principle further demonstrates why narrow
21 modification of the Court’s remedial order is appropriate.

22
23
24
25 ³ Mr. Quinonez Torres acknowledges that Rule 54(b) provides that “[e]very other order or other
26 adjudication should grant the relief to which each party is entitled, even if the party has not
27 demanded that relief in its pleadings.” Here, however, the relief to which Mr. Quinonez Torres is
entitled is release on the alternative bond amount, as the Court has recognized in dozens of
similar cases. Mr. Quinonez Torres respectfully submits that additional process is not necessary.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court should modify the writ of habeas corpus to permit Mr. Quinonez Torres's release on the alternative bond amount, rather than ordering a new bond hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 18th of February, 2026.

s/ Leila Kang
Leila Kang*, WSBA No. 48048
leila@nwirp.org

**I certify that the foregoing contains 1,328 words,
in compliance with the Local Civil Rules.*

s/ Aaron Korthuis
Aaron Korthuis, WSBA No. 53974
aaron@nwirp.org

s/ Matt Adams
Matt Adams, WSBA No. 28287
matt@nwirp.org

s/ Glenda M. Aldana Madrid
Glenda M. Aldana Madrid, WSBA No. 46987
glenda@nwirp.org

s/ Amanda Ng
Amanda Ng, WSBA No. 57181
amanda@nwirp.org

NORTHWEST IMMIGRANT RIGHTS PROJECT
615 Second Ave., Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 957-8611

Counsel for Petitioner