

District Judge Tiffany M. Cartwright

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

ALONDRA BERENICE MEDINA
ROMERO,

Petitioner,

v.

LAURA HERMOSILLO, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Case No. 2:26-cv-00118-TMC

FEDERAL RESPONDENTS'
RETURN MEMORANDUM

Noted for Consideration:
February 2, 2026

Petitioner seeks habeas relief from her mandatory immigration detention. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement detains Petitioner pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). Federal Respondents acknowledge that in *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, this Court granted summary judgment and found that detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) of the Bond Denial Class is unlawful. *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, No. 3:25-cv-05240-TMC, 2025 WL 2782499 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 30, 2025). That decision is presently on appeal. *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, No. 3:25-cv-05240-TMC, Dkt. 71. Additionally, in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, the district court found the same, and extended declaratory relief to a similarly defined and certified

1 nationwide Bond Eligible Class. *See Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-
2 BFM, 2025 WL 3288403 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2025).

3 **A. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)**

4 Congress established the expedited removal process in 8 U.S.C. § 1225 to ensure that the
5 Executive could “expedite removal of aliens lacking a legal basis to remain in the United States.”
6 *Kucana v. Holder*, 558 U.S. 233, 249 (2010); *see also Dep’t of Homeland Sec. v. Thuraissigiam*,
7 591 U.S. 103, 106 (2020) (“[Congress] crafted a system for weeding out patently meritless claims
8 and expeditiously removing the aliens making such claims from the country.”). The inspection,
9 detention, and removal of aliens who have not been admitted is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1225.
10 Section 1225 defines an applicant for admission as “[a]n alien present in the United States who
11 has not been admitted or who arrives in the United States” whether or not at a designated port of
12 arrival. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1). Applicants for admission “fall into one of two categories, those
13 covered by § 1225(b)(1) and those covered by § 1225(b)(2)[.]” *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S.
14 281, 287 (2018).

15 Section 1225(b)(1) applies to “arriving aliens” and “certain other” noncitizens “initially
16 determined to be inadmissible due to fraud, misrepresentation, or lack of valid documentation.”
17 *Id.*; 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(1)(A)(i), (iii). Separately, Section 1225(b)(2) is “broader” and “serves
18 as a catchall provision” that applies to all applicants for admission not covered by Section
19 1225(b)(1) (with specific exceptions not relevant here). *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287.

20 Congress has determined that all noncitizens subject to Section 1225(b) are subject to
21 mandatory detention. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii), (iii)(IV); 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A); *see also*
22 *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 299 (interpreting the “plain meaning” of sections 235(b)(1) and (2) to mean
23 that applicants for admission be mandatorily detained for the duration of their immigration
24 proceedings). Regardless of whether a noncitizen falls under Section 1225(b)(1) or (b)(2), the

1 sole means of release is “temporary parole from § 1225(b) detention ‘for urgent humanitarian
2 reasons or significant public benefit,’ § 1182(d)(5)(A).” *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 283.

3 Further, several provisions at 8 U.S.C. § 1252 preclude review. First, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) bars
4 review of Petitioner’s claims because they arise from the government’s decision to commence
5 removal proceedings. Second, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9) bars the Court from hearing Petitioner’s
6 claims because his claims challenge the decision and action to detain him, which arises from the
7 government’s decision to commence removal proceedings, thus an “action taken . . . to remove
8 an alien from the United States.” Third and lastly, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(e)(3) applies and limits
9 “[j]udicial review of determinations under section 1225(b) of this title and its implementation.”
10 The plain language of the statute precludes judicial review for noncitizens determined to be
11 detained pursuant to Section 1225(b)(2) and applies to a “determination under section 1225(b)”
12 and to its implementation.

13 **B. *Rodriguez Vazquez* Bond Denial Class Membership**

14 Through this habeas action, Petitioner argues they are unlawfully detained pursuant to §
15 1225(b), and instead, they are properly detained under § 1226(a). Dkt. 1, Pet. ¶ 25. While not
16 explicitly stated in the petition, it appears that Petitioner seeks relief as a member of the Bond
17 Denial Class in *Rodriguez Vazquez*. Again, Federal Respondents do not agree with the *Rodriguez*
18 *Vazquez* and *Maldonado Bautista* decisions. However, in the alternative, Federal Respondents do
19 not oppose Petitioner being considered a member of the *Rodriguez Vazquez* Bond Denial Class¹
20 for purposes of this litigation.

21
22
23 ¹ “Bond Denial Class: All noncitizens without lawful status detained at the Northwest ICE Processing Center who
24 (1) have entered or will enter the United States without inspection, (2) are not apprehended upon arrival, (3) are not
or will not be subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231 at the time the noncitizen is
scheduled for or requests a bond hearing.” *Rodriguez*, 2025 WL 2782499, at *6.

1 If the Court were to grant the habeas, the appropriate relief is not release. Rather, this
2 Court should order the Immigration Judge to provide Petitioner a bond hearing pursuant to 8
3 U.S.C. §1226(a), consistent with the Court's judgement in *Rodriguez*, 2025 WL 2782499, at *27.

4 DATED this 27th day of January, 2026.

5 Respectfully submitted,

6 CHARLES NEIL FLOYD
7 United States Attorney

8 s/ Katherine G. Collins

KATHERINE G. COLLINS, CA #315903

Assistant United States Attorney

United States Attorney's Office

Western District of Washington

700 Stewart Street, Suite 5220

Seattle, Washington 98101-1271

Phone: 206-553-7970

Fax: 206-553-4067

Email: katherine.collins@usdoj.gov

13 *Attorneys for Federal Respondents*

14 *I certify that this memorandum contains 722*
15 *words, in compliance with Local Civil Rules*