

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
FORT MYERS DIVISION

ALEJANDRO AMAYA-ORELLANA,

Petitioner,

Case No. 2:26-cv-00073-KCD-NPM

v.

SHERIFF DAVID HARDIN et al.,

Respondents.

RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner Alejandro Amaya-Orellana challenges his detention by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, arguing he is entitled to a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226. While reserving all rights, including the right to appeal, Respondents submit this abbreviated brief in lieu of an exhaustive memorandum to preserve the Respondents' arguments and to conserve judicial resources. Should the Court prefer a more exhaustive discussion, Respondents request leave to submit additional briefing.¹

¹ The only appropriate respondent to a habeas case is the official with physical custody of Amaya-Orellana. 28 U.S.C. § 2243 ("The writ, or order to show cause shall be directed to the person having custody of the person detained."); *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 434-36 (2004) ("[T]he default rule is that the proper respondent is the warden of the facility where the prisoner is being held, not the Attorney General or some other remote supervisory official."). Accordingly, the only proper respondent in this case is the Warden of Glades County Detention Center in his official capacity. See e.g., *Vandersnick v. Sec'y, Fla. Dep't of Corr.*, No. 5:18-cv-603-SPC-PRL, 2021 WL 1020914, at *1 n.3 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 17, 2021).

FACTS

Amaya-Orellana is a national and citizen of Honduras who last entered the United States at an unknown location on or about February 1, 2005. (Composite Exhibit, Ex. 1 at 1.) He was placed in immigration custody on or about December 4, 2025, after an arrest for driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol and refusal to submit to DUI testing. *Id.* at 2-4. He was served with a Notice to Appear the same day. *Id.* at 5. Amaya-Orellana is currently detained at Glades County Detention Center. On January 15, 2026, Amaya-Orellana filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus alleging his custody violates the Immigration and Nationality Act, and the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. (Doc. 1.)

CERTIFIED HABEAS RETURN

ICE is detaining Amaya-Orellana under the mandatory detention provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2243 (“The person to whom the writ or order is directed shall make a return certifying the true cause of the detention.”). Amaya-Orellana bears the burden to prove his custody violates federal law. *Whitfield v. U.S. Sec’y of State*, 853 F. App’x 327, 329 (11th Cir. 2021).

ARGUMENT

In *In re Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (B.I.A. 2025) the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) examined the plain language of Section 1225, the INA’s

statutory scheme, Supreme Court and BIA precedent, the legislative history of the INA and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (“IIRIRA”), Pub L. No. 104-208, and DHS’s prior practices. After doing so, the BIA held that “under a plain language reading of section 235(b)(2)(A) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), Immigration Judges lack authority to hear bond requests or to grant bond to aliens, like the petitioner, who are present in the United States without admission.” 29 I&N Dec. at 225. This Court should rule the same.

Respondents acknowledge that questions of law in this case, and the challenges to the government’s policy and practice, substantially overlap with *Hernandez-Lopez v. Hardin, et al.*, No. 2:25-CV-830-KCD-NPM, 2025 WL 3022245 (M.D. Fla. Oct. 29, 2025). It should be noted, however, that courts have recently ruled against petitioners in similar cases. *See, E.g., Lopez v. Dir. of Enft & Removal Operations*, No. 3:25-CV-1313-JEP-SJH, 2026 WL 261938, at *1 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 26, 2026); *Iraheta Morales v. Noem*, No. 25-62598-CIV-SINGHAL, 2026 WL 236307, at *3-9 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 29, 2026). Some decisions have started recognizing that there is no jurisdiction over this question to begin with. *Munoz Nataren v. Raycraft*, No. 4:26-cv-212, 2026 WL 214368, at *2 (N.D. Ohio Jan. 28, 2026); *Amaya-Velis v. Raycraft*, No. 4:26-cv-73, 2026 WL 100596, at *2-3 (N.D. Ohio Jan. 14, 2026).

Significantly, the Fifth Circuit recently ruled that aliens who have not been admitted to the United States are subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) regardless of whether the alien is already present in the United States.

Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi, No. 25-20496, 2026 WL 323330 (5th Cir. Feb. 6, 2026). At least four circuits—including the Eleventh—have active appeals on the matter. *Martinez v. Hyde*, No. 25-1902 (1st Cir.); *Pizzaro Reyes v. ERO*, No. 25-1982 (6th Cir.); *Cortes Alonzo v. Noem*, No. 25-7348 (9th Cir.); *Hernandez Alvarez v. Warden*, No. 25-14065 (11th Cir.).

Respondents respectfully disagree with the Court’s decision in *Hernandez-Lopez*. That said, in the interest of judicial economy and to expedite the Court’s consideration of this matter, Respondents make the following arguments for preservation purposes:

1. Title 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) bars review of Amaya-Orellana’s claims. *Hernandez-Lopez v. Hardin, et al.*, No. 2:25-CV-830-KCD-NPM (M.D. Fla. Oct. 29, 2025) (Doc. 19 at 5-6).
2. Title 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9) bars review of Amaya-Orellana’s claims. *Id.* at 7-8.
3. Amaya-Orellana failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. *Id.* at 8.
4. Amaya-Orellana is properly detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225. *Id.* at 8-14.

Finally, Respondents contend that should this Court determine that Petitioner’s detention is subject to 8 U.S.C. § 1226, outright release is inappropriate. To the extent the Court orders a bond hearing before an Immigration Judge for the purpose of determining whether Petitioner is a flight risk or danger to the community—see, e.g., *Hernandez-Lopez*, 2025 WL 3022245, at *5—Respondents aver

that such bond hearings are not conducted or managed by ICE, rather by the Executive Office for Immigration Review, which is not a proper party to this suit. *See Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 434-36 (2004) (noting that for habeas petitions challenging detention, “the default rule is that the proper respondent is the warden of the facility where the prisoner is being held, not the Attorney General or some other remote supervisory official”).

CONCLUSION

Amaya-Orellana’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus should be denied

DATED this 19th day of February, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

GREGORY W. KEHOE
United States Attorney

By: /s/Chad C. Spraker
CHAD C. SPRAKER
Assistant United States Attorney
USA No. 198
2110 First Street, Ste. 3-137
Fort Myers, Florida 33901
Telephone: 239-461-2200
Email: chad.spraker@usdoj.gov
Lead Counsel