

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
FORT MYERS DIVISION**

JOSIAS DE JESUS RIVAS MEJICANO,

Petitioner,

v.

Case No. 2:26-cv-089-KCD-DNF

FIELD OFFICE DIR., ICE, ET AL.,

Respondents.

RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner Josias De Jesus Rivas Mejicano 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 the Petitioner. 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 Alligator

FACTS

Petitioner is a national and citizen of El Salvador who last entered the United States on or about April 2, 2022 without inspection. Petition, ¶¶ 15, 40. He was apprehended at or near the border, issued a Notice to Appear, and placed in immigration removal proceedings. *Id.* at ¶ 41. He was placed in immigration custody on January 9, 2026. *Id.* at ¶ 44. On January 18, 2026, Petitioner filed a petition for habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. On January 20, 2026, the Court ordered the government to show cause why the petition should not be granted, with a response due by February 20, 2026. ECF No. 4.

CERTIFIED HABEAS RETURN

ICE is detaining Rivas Mejicano 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.”). Rivas Mejicano 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

Alcatraz 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).

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).² 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

² There is one critical distinction. Petitioner was first detained at the border when he illegally entered the United States. Given his detention at or near the border upon entry, Section 1225(b)(2) applies. *See* Petition, ¶¶ 40-42. This Court has consistently explained this reasoning. *Alfonso Parra v. DHS*, No. 2:25-cv-1116-KCD-DNF, 2026 WL 21243, at *2 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 5, 2026); *Aranda Garcia*, 2025 WL 3537592, at *1; *Duenas Garcia*, 2025 WL 3277163, at *2; *Pirto v. Warden*, No. 2:25-cv-966-KCD-DNF, Doc. 13 (M.D. Fla. Nov. 13, 2025).

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 Rivas Mejicano'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 Rivas Mejicano's claims. *Id.* at 7-8.
3. Rivas Mejicano failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. *Id.* at 8.
4. Rivas Mejicano 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

Rivas Mejicano's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus should be denied

DATED:

February 12, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

GREGORY W. KEHOE
United States Attorney

/s/ Amanda Saylor
Amanda Saylor
Assistant United States Attorney
Lead Counsel for Defendants
Florida Bar No. 1031480
400 North Tampa Street
Suite 3200
Tampa, Florida 33602

Telephone: (813) 274-6020

Facsimile: (813) 274-6198

Email: Amanda.Saylor@usdoj.gov