

FILED

FEB 17 2026

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BY  DEPUTY CLERK

JOSÉ DE JESÚS MORÁN GONZÁLEZ, §

A-Number: , §

Petitioner, §

v. §

§ CIVIL ACTION NO. SA-26-CV-00053-FB

RENALDO CASTRO, Warden, §

Karnes County Immigration Processing Center; §

FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, §

ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations, §

San Antonio Field Office; §

SECRETARY, §

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY; §

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES; and §

EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW, §

Respondents. §

NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL CUSTODY DEVELOPMENTS
AND CLARIFICATION OF DETENTION AUTHORITY

Petitioner José de Jesús Morán González, proceeding pro se, respectfully submits the following supplemental custody developments for the Court's consideration:

1. Petitioner has now been subjected to approximately 165 days of continuous civil immigration detention since on or about August 29, 2025. Petitioner is not serving a criminal sentence.
2. After filing the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus in this matter, Petitioner retained immigration counsel and requested a custody redetermination hearing before the Immigration Judge.
3. The Immigration Judge denied bond, not on a discretionary flight-risk or dangerousness finding, but for lack of jurisdiction, based on DHS's classification of Petitioner as subject to mandatory detention as an "arriving alien."
4. As a result of DHS's intake classification decision, the Immigration Judge determined that bond jurisdiction was foreclosed. The bond mechanism has therefore been exercised and exhausted.
5. Petitioner is no longer seeking a bond hearing as a remedy in this Court. That avenue has been pursued and denied.
6. Accordingly, the sole question remaining before this Court is whether Petitioner is lawfully subject to mandatory detention as a matter of statutory authority.
7. Petitioner does not seek to challenge any immigration merits, applications for relief, or removal proceedings. Those matters are pending separately and are represented by immigration counsel. The present habeas action concerns only the legality of continued detention.
8. DHS elected at intake to classify Petitioner under a mandatory detention framework. That classification determination foreclosed bond eligibility and fixed the custody posture. The legality of that detention authority is now the central issue.
9. Continued detention under a mandatory classification that eliminates all discretionary custody review presents a pure question of statutory detention authority. If detention is not authorized as a matter of law, continued custody constitutes an ongoing deprivation of liberty.
10. Section 2243 reflects Congress's directive that habeas petitions challenging unlawful detention be resolved expeditiously. Petitioner respectfully submits these developments so the Court may consider the narrowed detention posture in evaluating the legality of continued custody.
11. Because bond jurisdiction has been denied and no other administrative custody remedy remains available, the question before this Court is limited to whether mandatory detention is lawful as applied to Petitioner.

Petitioner submits this Notice to clarify the present custody posture and to assist the Court in focusing on the detention-authority question presented.

Respectfully submitted,

J. M.

José de Jesús Morán González

Petitioner, Pro Se

A-Number: 

Karnes County Immigration Processing Center

409 FM 1144

Karnes City, TX 78118

Dated: February 13, 2026