

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 1:26-60133-AHS

DJIBRIL DANSOKO,

Petitioner,

v.

KRISTI NOEM, in her Official Capacity,
Secretary of the U.S. Department of
Homeland Security, in her Official Capacity;

TODD LYONS, Acting Director of the U. S.
Immigration and Customs Enforcement,
in his Official Capacity;

DEREK GORDON, ACTING Executive
Associate Director, Homeland Security
Investigations (HSI), U.S. Immigration
and Customs Enforcement (ICE);

MARCOS CHARLES, Acting Executive
Associate Director, Enforcement and Removal
Operations (ERO), U.S. Immigration and Customs
Enforcement (ICE);

SIRCE OWEN¹, Acting Director, Executive,
Office of Immigration Review (EOIR),

Respondents.

**RESPONDENTS' RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS**

Respondents², by and through the undersigned Assistant United States Attorney, submit the following response in opposition to the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [DE 1], (Petition),

¹ The new EOIR Director is now Daren K. Margolin.

² A writ of habeas corpus must "be directed to the person having custody of the person detained." 28 USC § 2243. In cases involving present physical confinement, the Supreme Court reaffirmed in *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426 (2004), that "the immediate custodian, not a supervisory official who exercises legal control, is the proper

response to the Court's Order to Show Cause [DE 4] and request that it be denied stating in support thereof as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

By way of the Petition, Djibril Dansoko, ("Petitioner"), in relevant part, asks this Court to "[i]ssue a writ of habeas corpus clarifying that the statutory basis for Petitioner's detention is 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to Petitioner. Petition [DE 1, ¶¶ 10, 154.] Petitioner argues that the authority for his detention instead arises under § 1226(a) because it applies to "people charged as being inadmissible, including those who entered without inspection." *See* [DE 1, ¶¶ 6, 14]. Accordingly, this case comes down to a question of statutory interpretation. Specifically, what statutory provision controls Petitioner's detention.

Petitioner's argument overlooks that he falls squarely within the statutory definition of aliens subject to detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A), which is also consistent with the Board of Immigration Appeal's ("BIA") decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).³ Section 1225(b)(2)(A) mandates detention for "an alien who is an applicant for admission." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Pursuant to § 1225(a), "[a]n alien present in the United States who has not been admitted ... shall be deemed for purposes of this chapter an applicant for admission." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1). Petitioner admits that he entered the U.S. *without* inspection or *admission* on or about October 9, 2023. Petition DE 1, ¶¶ 3. Subsequently, Petitioner pursued protection through the affirmative asylum process on April 26, 2024. Petition DE 1, ¶¶ 1, 90. Accordingly, under a plain language reading of § 1225, Petitioner is an applicant for admission

respondent." *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 439 (2004). Petitioner is currently detained at the Broward Transitional Center (BTC). Therefore, the Proper Respondent is acting Assistant Field Office Director Carlos Nunez at BTC and immediate custodian. *See Rumsfeld v. Padilla*. All other respondents should be dismissed.

³ Respondents recognize that courts in this district previously granted a temporary restraining order in *Gil-Paulino v. Sect'y. Dept. Homeland Security, et al.*, No. 25-24292-CV-KMW (S.D. Fla. Oct. 10, 2025) rejecting similar argument. However, Respondents maintain and preserve this argument for the record in light of evolving precedent on this issue.

and is subject to mandatory detention pursuant to § 1225(b)(2)(A). For the reasons explained more fully below, the Petition should be denied.

II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

The Petitioner, Djibril DANSOKO (Petitioner), is a native and citizen of Guinea who last entered the United States without inspection on October 09, 2023. *See* Exh. H, Form I-213, Record of Deportable/Inadmissible Alien, (Form I-213) dated October 09, 2023; Exh. A, Form I-213 dated November 25, 2025. On the same day he illegally entered the United States, he was encountered by Customs and Border Protection (CBP). *See* Exh. C, Form I-286, Notice of Custody Determination.

On October 12, 2023, DHS issued a Notice to Appear (NTA) charging Petitioner with inadmissibility under INA § 212(a)(6)(A)(i), as amended, as an alien present in the United States without being admitted or paroled, or who arrived in the United States at any time or place other than as designated by the Attorney General. *See* Exh. E, NTA. On the same day, he was issued an Order of Release on his own Recognizance (OREC). *See* Exh. B, Form I-220A, Order of Release on Recognizance.

On February 20, 2024, Petitioner filed written pleadings with the immigration court admitting the allegations in the NTA and conceding the charge of removability. *See* Exh. J, Written Pleadings. On the same date, he filed an application for relief from removal with the immigration court. *See*, Exh. I, Declaration of Deportation Officer McLaughlin.

On November 25, 2025, Petitioner appeared at his OREC check-in appointment where ICE ERO revoked his OREC consistent with section 236(b) of the INA and took him into ICE custody. *See*, Exh. A, Form I-213 dated November 25, 2025; Exh. G, Form I-200, Warrant for Arrest of Alien.

Petitioner has twice requested a custody redetermination hearing before the immigration court. *See*, Exh. I, Declaration of Deportation Officer McLaughlin. On December 30, 2025, the Immigration Judge took no action on the request. *Id.* On January 07, 2026, the immigration judge denied his request for bond finding that the court did not have jurisdiction to review DHS' bond determination pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). *See* Ex. D, Immigration Judge Order denying bond dated January 07, 2026.

Petitioner is scheduled for a master calendar hearing before the immigration court at the Broward Transitional Center on January 29, 2026. *See*, Notice of Hearing for hearing on January 29, 2026. To date, Petitioner remains in ICE custody at Broward Transitional Center. *See* Exh. F.

III. ARGUMENT

Section 1225(b)(2) Mandates Detention of Aliens, Like Petitioner, Who Are Present in the United States Without Having Been Lawfully Admitted.

Under the plain language of § 1225(b)(2), the Government is required to detain all aliens, like Petitioner, who are present in the United States without admission and are subject to removal proceedings—regardless of how long the alien has been in the United States or how far from the border they ventured. That unambiguous language resolves this case. *See Little Sisters of the Poor Saints Peter & Paul Home v. Pennsylvania*, 591 U.S. 657, 676 (2020) (“Our analysis begins and ends with the text.”).

A. Petitioner is an Applicant for Admission subject to Detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

“As with any question of statutory interpretation, [the] analysis begins with the plain language of the statute. It is well established that, when the statutory language is plain, [courts] must enforce it according to its terms.” *Jimenez v. Quarterman*, 555 U.S. 113, 118 (2009). Section 1225(a) deems all aliens who either “arrive[] in the United States” or who are “present in the United States [and] who ha[ve] not been admitted” to be “applicant[s] for admission.” 8 U.S.C.

§ 1225(a)(1). And “admission” under the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) means lawful entry after inspection by immigration authorities, and not mere physical entry. 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(13)(A). Thus, an alien who enters the country without permission is and remains an applicant for admission, regardless of the duration of the alien’s presence in the United States or the alien’s distance from the border.

By its very definition, the term “applicant for admission” includes two categories of aliens: (1) arriving aliens, and (2) aliens present without admission. *See Dep’t of Homeland Sec. v. Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 140 (2020) (explaining that “an alien who tries to enter the country illegally is treated as an ‘applicant for admission’”); *Matter of Lemus*, 25 I&N Dec. 734, 743 (BIA 2012) (“Congress has defined the concept of an ‘applicant for admission’ in an unconventional sense, to include not just those who are expressly seeking permission to enter, but also those who are present in this country without having formally requested or received such permission”); *Matter of E-R-M- & L-R-M-*, 25 I&N Dec. 520, 523 (BIA 2011) (stating that “the broad category of applicants for admission . . . includes, *inter alia*, any alien present in the United States who has not been admitted”). An arriving alien is defined, in pertinent part, as “an applicant for admission coming or attempting to come into the United States at a port-of-entry [(“POE”)]” 8 C.F.R. §§ 1.2, 1001.1(q). Petitioner does not meet the definition of arriving alien, *see id.*, but he is classified an alien who is present without admission, thus satisfying the “applicant for admission” definition, *see* § 1225(a)(1).

In turn, § 1225(b)(2) provides that “an alien who is an applicant for admission” “shall be detained” pending removal proceedings if the “alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) (emphasis added). The statute’s use of the term “shall” make clear that detention is mandatory, *see Lexecon Inc. v. Milberg Weiss*

Bershad Hynes & Lerach, 523 U.S. 26, 35 (1998), and the statute makes no exception based upon the duration of the alien’s presence in the country or where in the country the alien is located. Therefore, the statute’s plain text mandates that the Government detain all “applicants for admission” who are not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted.

Petitioner falls squarely within the statutory definition. He was “present in the United States,” and there is no dispute that he has “not been admitted.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a); Petition DE I, ¶¶ 1. Moreover, Petitioner cannot establish—and has not even alleged that he can establish—that he is “clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Therefore, § 1225(b)(2)(A) mandates Petitioner “be detained for a proceeding under [8 U.S.C. § 1229a].” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

B. Applicants for Admission under § 1225(b)(2) are seeking to be legally admitted into the United States.

As explained above, Petitioner is an “applicant[] for admission” under § 1225(b)(2) and is, therefore, seeking to be legally admitted into the United States. The statute itself makes clear that an alien who is an “applicant for admission” *is* necessarily “seeking admission.” Moreover, an alien like Petitioner, who is identified by immigration authorities as unlawfully present, and who does not choose to withdraw their application for admission under section 1225(a)(4) and to depart from the United States voluntarily, is “seeking admission,” i.e., seeking legal authority to remain in the United States.

1. The “seeking admission” clause does not negate or otherwise limit the statutorily defined term “applicant for admission”.

Section 1225(b)(2) requires the detention of an “applicant for admission, if the examining officer determines that [the] alien *seeking admission* is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) (emphasis added). The statutory text and context show that being an “applicant for admission” is a means of “seeking admission”—no additional

affirmative step is necessary. In other words, every “applicant for admission” is inherently and necessarily “seeking admission,” at least absent a choice to pursue voluntary withdrawal of the application for admission.

For example, § 1225(a) provides that “[a]ll aliens ... who are applicants for admission *or otherwise* seeking admission or readmission ... shall be inspected.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3) (emphasis added). The word “[o]therwise” means “in a different way or manner[.]” *Texas Dep’t of Hous. & Cmty. Affs. v. Inclusive Communities Project, Inc.*, 576 U.S. 519, 535 (2015) (quoting Webster’s Third New International Dictionary 1598 (1971)); *see also Villarreal v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.*, 839 F.3d 958, 963-64 (11th Cir. 2016) (en banc) (“or otherwise” means “the first action is a subset of the second action”). Being an “applicant for admission” is thus a particular “way or manner” of seeking admission, such that an alien who is an “applicant for admission” is “seeking admission” for purposes of § 1225(b)(2)(A).⁴ No separate affirmative act is necessary. *See Matter of Lemus-Losa*, 25 I & N. Dec. 734, 743 (BIA 2012) (“[M]any people who are not *actually* requesting permission to enter the United States in the ordinary sense are nevertheless deemed to be ‘seeking admission’ under the immigration laws”). Accordingly, § 1225(b) unambiguously provides that an alien who is an “applicant for admission” is “seeking admission,” even if the alien is not engaged in some separate, affirmative act to obtain lawful admission.

2. Any perceived redundancy in the statute cannot serve as a basis to avoid the clear language of the statute.

⁴ As § 1225 shows, being an “applicant for admission” is only *one* “way or manner” of “seeking admission,” not the exclusive way. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3). For example, lawful permanent residents returning to the United States are not “applicants for admission” because they are already admitted, but they still may be deemed to be “seeking admission” in some circumstances. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1103(A)(13)(C).

As explained above, an “applicant for admission” is “seeking admission” under § 1225. To the extent this reading results in some redundancy in § 1225(b)(2)(A), that “is not a license to rewrite” § 1225 “contrary to its text.” *Barton v. Barr*, 590 U.S. 222, 239 (2020); see *Heyman v. Cooper*, 31 F.4th 1315, 1322 (11th Cir. 2022) (“sometimes drafters *do* repeat themselves and *do* include words that add nothing of substance” especially when “the arguably redundant words that the drafters employed ... are functional synonyms” (alterations accepted and emphasis in original)).

“The canon against surplusage is not an absolute rule.” *Marx v. Gen. Revenue Corp.*, 568 U.S. 371, 385 (2013). “Redundancies are common in statutory drafting—sometimes in a congressional effort to be doubly sure, sometimes because of congressional inadvertence or lack of foresight, or sometimes simply because of the shortcomings of human communication.” *Barton*, 590 U.S. at 239. “[R]edundancy in one portion of a statute is not a license to rewrite or eviscerate another portion of the statute contrary to its text.” *Id.* Thus, as the Supreme Court explained in *Barton*, “[s]ometimes the better overall reading of a statute contains some redundancy.” *Id.*

Moreover, “the surplusage canon ... must be applied with statutory context in mind” and should not be employed to undermine congressional intent. *United States v. Bronstein*, 849 F.3d 1101, 1110 (D.C. Cir. 2017). As explained in greater detail below, in 1996, Congress passed the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act (“IIRIRA”), Pub. L. 104-208, 110 Stat. 3009 (Sept. 30, 1996), with the goal of ensuring that aliens who enter the United States unlawfully do not receive greater privileges and benefits than aliens who lawfully present themselves for inspection at a port of entry. The canon against surplusage should not be employed to re-write the statute in contravention of this statutory context.

C. Section 1226 Does Not Support Petitioner’s Argument.

Petitioner’s reliance upon, and reference to, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 is unavailing. Petitioner’s detention is controlled by § 1225(b)(2), not § 1226. Sections 1225 and 1226 are separate statutory provisions that provide independent bases for detention and, generally, apply to different groups of aliens. While, as explained below, there is some overlap between the aliens subject to detention under the two detention provisions, that overlap does not create a redundancy because the two statutes provide for different bases for release.

Section 1226(a) authorizes the Executive to “arrest[] and detain[]” *any* “alien” pending removal proceedings. Section 1226(a) provides the detention authority for the significant group of aliens who are *not* deemed “applicants for admission” subject to § 1225(b)(2)(A)—specifically, aliens who have been admitted to the United States but are now removable, like those who overstay a visa or lawful permanent residents who engage in conduct that renders them removable.⁵ Thus, section 1225(b)(2) is the more specific detention provision. *See RadLAX Gateway Hotel, LLC v. Amalgamated Bank*, 566 U.S. 639, 645 (2012) (“the specific governs the general”). Accordingly, § 1226(a) does not control Petitioner’s detention.

In early 2025, Congress passed the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No. 119-1, 139 Stat. 2 (2025), which amended portions of § 1226(c). While that amendment adds some overlap between aliens subject to detention under § 1225(b)(2) and § 1226(c), that overlap does not apply to Petitioner, and as explained below, it does not create a redundancy as the amendment does independent work. Accordingly, Petitioner is not being detained under Section 1226.

⁵ The detention of any of the millions of aliens who have overstayed their visas is governed by § 1226(a), because those aliens (unlike Petitioner) *were* lawfully admitted to the United States.

D. The Government's Reading Comports with Congressional Intent.

Before 1996, federal immigration laws required the detention of aliens who presented at a port of entry but allowed aliens who were already unlawfully present in the United States to obtain release pending removal proceedings. In 1996, Congress passed the IIRIRA specifically to stop conferring greater privileges and benefits on aliens who enter the United States unlawfully as compared to those who lawfully present themselves for inspection at a port of entry. Accordingly, the Government's reading of the statute is not only supported by the express language of § 1225, but it also comports with congressional intent. See *King v. Burwell*, 576 U.S. 473, 492 (2015) (rejecting interpretation that would lead to a result "that Congress designed the Act to avoid"); *New York State Dep't of Soc. Servs. v. Dublino*, 413 U.S. 405, 419-20 (1973) ("We cannot interpret federal statutes to negate their own stated purposes.").

The INA, as amended, contains a comprehensive framework governing the regulation of aliens, including the creation of proceedings for the removal of aliens unlawfully in the United States and requirements for when the Executive is obligated to detain aliens pending removal.

Prior to 1996, the INA treated aliens differently based on whether the alien had physically "entered" the United States. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216, 222-223 (BIA 2025) (citing 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(a), 1251 (1994)); see *Hing Sum v. Holder*, 602 F.3d 1092, 1099-1100 (9th Cir. 2010) (same). "Entry" referred to "any coming of an alien into the United States," 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(13) (1994), and whether an alien had physically entered the United States (or not) "dictated what type of [removal] proceeding applied" and whether the alien would be detained pending those proceedings, *Hing Sum*, 602 F.3d at 1099. Accordingly, the INA's prior framework, which distinguished between aliens based on physical "entry," had

the 'unintended and undesirable consequence' of having created a statutory scheme where aliens who entered without inspection 'could take advantage of the greater procedural and substantive rights afforded in deportation proceedings,' *including*

the right to request release on bond, while aliens who had ‘actually presented themselves to authorities for inspection ... were subject to mandatory custody.

Hurtado, 29 I. & N. Dec. at 223 (emphasis added) (quoting *Martinez v. Att’y General of U.S.*, 693 F.3d 408, 413 n.5 (2012)); see also *Hing Sum*, 602 F.3d at 1100 (similar); H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 225 (1996) (“House Rep.”) (“illegal aliens who have entered the United States without inspection gain equities and privileges in immigration proceedings that are not available to aliens who present themselves for inspection”).

Congress discarded that regime through enactment of IIRIRA. Among other things, that law had the goal of “ensur[ing] that all immigrants who have not been lawfully admitted, regardless of their legal presence in the country, are placed on equal footing in removal proceedings under the INA.” *Torres v. Barr*, 976 F.3d 918, 928 (9th Cir. 2020) (en banc). To that end, IIRIRA replaced the prior focus on physical “entry” and instead made lawful “admission” the governing touchstone. IIRIRA defined “admission” to mean “the *lawful* entry of the alien into the United States after inspection and authorization by an immigration officer.” 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(13)(A) (emphasis added). In other words, the immigration laws would no longer distinguish aliens based on whether they had managed to evade detection and enter the country without permission. Instead, the “pivotal factor in determining an alien’s status” would be “whether or not the alien has been *lawfully* admitted.” House Rep., *supra*, at 226 (emphasis added); *Hing Sum*, 602 F.3d at 1100 (similar).

Petitioner’s interpretation would restore the regime Congress sought to discard: It would require detention for those who present themselves for inspection at the border in compliance with law yet grant bond hearings to aliens who evade immigration authorities, enter the United States unlawfully, and remain here unlawfully for years, or even decades, until an involuntary encounter with immigration authorities. That is *exactly* the perverse preferential treatment for illegal entrants

that IIRIRA sought to eradicate. Accordingly, this Court should reject Petitioner's interpretation. *King*, 576 U.S. at 492 (rejecting "petitioners' interpretation because it would ... create the very [thing] that Congress designed the Act to avoid").

The Government's reading, on the other hand, is true to Congress's intent and should be adopted

E. Petitioner's Due Process Claims Fail.

Petitioner's constitutional claims fail as a matter of law. Mandatory detention under § 1225(b) has repeatedly been upheld as constitutionally permissible. *See Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. at 299–301. The Fifth Amendment does not require bond hearings for noncitizens detained pursuant to valid statutory authority, nor does Petitioner possess a protected liberty interest in release on bond where Congress has mandated detention. The Due Process Clause does not prohibit Congress from imposing categorical detention rules in the immigration context. *See Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 528 (2003).

Petitioner's reliance on *Zadvydas v. Davis* is misplaced. To the extent that Petitioner argues that his detention violates his Due Process rights, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001) (ECF No. 1 at ¶¶ 75-81), this Court should reject that claim because *Zadvydas* governs post-removal-order detention under § 1231, not pre-removal detention under § 1225.

F. Petitioner Does Not Have Standing to Bring a Due Process Claim.

Lastly, Petitioner does not have standing to bring their APA claim. By the APA's terms, it is available only for final agency action "for which there is no other adequate remedy in court." 5 U.S.C. § 704. Thus, Petitioner's APA claim is independently barred by this limitation in 5 U.S.C. § 704.

In *Trump v. J.G.G.*, the Supreme Court held that where the claims for relief, as here, “necessarily imply the invalidity of their confinement” those claims “must be brought in habeas.” 145 S. Ct. 1003, 1005 (2025) (cleaned up) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). As noted by Justice Kavanaugh in his concurrence in *J.G.G.*, “given 5 U.S.C. § 704, which states that claims under the APA are not available when there is another adequate remedy in court, I agree with the Court that habeas corpus, not the APA, is the proper vehicle here.” *Id.* at 1007 (Kavanaugh, J. concurring). Here, as in *J.G.G.*, habeas is an “adequate remedy” through which Petitioner can challenge his detention. Even if Petitioner’s APA claim had merit, which it does not, the result would be the same as that in habeas – release from detention. The Supreme Court’s holding is consistent with well-established law that habeas is generally the only possible district court vehicle for challenges brought pursuant to the immigration statutes. *Id.* (citing *Heikkila v. Barber*, 345 U.S. 229, 234-35 (1953)).

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON REDING QUIÑONES
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

By: **Alexander N. DerGarabedian**
ALEXANDER N. DERGARABEDIAN
Court ID A5503439
United States Attorney’s Office
500 East Broward Blvd., Suite 700
Fort Lauderdale FL 33394
Office: (954) 660-5792
Cell: (786)-239-4247
E-Mail: Alexander.DerGarabedian@usdoj.gov

Counsel for Respondents