

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
JACKSONVILLE DIVISION

ROBERTO BELTRAN BENITEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

Case No. 3:26-cv-00122-JEP-PDB

PAMELO JO BONDI, U.S. Attorney
General, U.S. Department of Justice;
KRISTI NOEM, Secretary, U.S.
Department of Homeland Security;
GARRETT RIPA, Field Office Director,
U.S. Immigration and Customs
Enforcement, Miami, Florida,¹

Respondents.

RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner Roberto Beltran Benitez (“Petitioner”) challenges his detention by the U.S. States Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”), arguing that he is entitled to a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226. This Court has previously addressed the applicability of § 1225

¹ The individual having physical custody of a petitioner is the only appropriate respondent. 8 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.”); *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). Any relief the Court awards should be fashioned within the power of the immediate custodian or ICE/DHS. *See, e.g., Mirando Bravo v. Noem*, No. 2:25-cv-1046-SPC-DNF, Doc. 8 at *3 (M.D. Fla. Dec. 5, 2025) (ordering ICE *either* to bring petitioner for a bond hearing or release by a specific date).

v. § 1226 to persons such as Petitioner who are subject to mandatory detention by ICE without the possibility of obtaining bond. While reserving all rights—including a right to appeal—the Federal Respondents submit this abbreviated brief in lieu of exhaustive, duplicative briefing on the § 1225(b)(2) v. § 1226 issue. This is an effort to preserve the Federal Respondents’ arguments and conserve scarce judicial resources. Should the Court prefer a fulsome discussion or entertain reconsidering its rulings on § 1226, the Federal Respondents stand ready to submit additional briefing.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

On January 22, 2026, Petitioner filed the Petition, challenging his detention at the Baker Correctional Institution² as unlawful. *See* Doc. 1. By Court Order dated January 26, 2026, this Court ordered service of the Petition and directed Respondents to respond within 30 days of the date of the Order. *See* Doc. 4. Petitioner’s detention is lawful. This Court should deny the writ and dismiss the action.

BACKGROUND

1. Petitioner is a 53-year-old male, who is a national and citizen of Mexico. *See* **Exhibit A** (Notice to Appear (“NTA”). The NTA identifies Petitioner as “an alien present in the United States who has not been admitted or paroled” and unlawfully present in in violation of the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) §

² The North Florida Detention Center (“NFDC”) is operated in the now shuttered Baker Correctional Institution in Sanderson, FL. Based on information and belief, the Facility Administrator of the NFDC is Eric Hall.

212(a)(6)(A)(i) and removable under INA § 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I). Petitioner entered the United States in or about 1995. *See* Doc. 1 at ¶ 8.

2. Petitioner does not have any pending applications with the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (“USCIS”). *See* **Exhibit B** (Petitioner’s I-213). While Petitioner’s I-213 indicates that Petitioner has no criminal history, records show that Petitioner has criminal-traffic convictions for: 1) unlawful tag alteration in 2009, for which he pled guilty and paid a fine, *see* **Exhibit C** (2009 Judgment) and 2) expired driver’s license (more than six months) in 2009, *see* **Exhibit D** (2018 Judgment). *See also*, **Exhibit E** (CCIS Case Information, including a minor violation for improperly transporting citrus in 2010).

3. On or about January 16, 2026, Petitioner was encountered by deputies from the Polk County Sheriff’s Office following a traffic stop. *See* Doc. 1 at ¶ 13.

4. On January 17, 2026, Petitioner was transferred into ICE custody, where he remains at the NFDC. *See* **Exhibit F** (ICE Detention History).

5. To date, Petitioner has been in ICE custody for approximately 39 days.

6. Petitioner’s next scheduled immigration hearing is set for March 4, 2026 at 10:30 A.M. *See* **Exhibit G** (Notice of Internet-Based Hearing).

MEMORANDUM OF LAW

I. LEGAL STANDARD

Federal courts may grant writs of habeas corpus for a petitioner “in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3). Petitioner 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).

II. CERTIFIED HABEAS RETURN

ICE is detaining Petitioner under the mandatory detention provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2243 (stating “[t]he person to whom the writ or order is directed shall make a return certifying the true cause of the detention.”). Petitioner 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).

As an “alien present in the United States who has not been admitted or paroled,” *see* **Exhibit A** (Notice to Appear), Petitioner is an “applicant for admission” detention rule in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). Accordingly, pursuant to § 1225(b)(2), Petitioner’s detention pending removal is mandatory because as an “alien shall be detained for a proceeding under section 1229a”—*i.e.*, full removal proceedings—after “the examining immigration officer determines that an alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

Petitioner is free to contend his detention under § 1225 was unlawful or argue he should have instead been detained under § 1226. But § 1225(b)(2)—not § 1226—was the certified basis on which ICE is detaining Petitioner.

III. ARGUMENT

A. Petitioner's Detention Was Lawful Under § 1225(b)(2).

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 § 1225, the INA’s statutory scheme, Supreme Court and BIA precedents, the legislative history of the INA and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, and ICE’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 respondent, who are present in the United States without admission.” 29 I&N Dec. at 225. This Court should rule the same.

Federal Respondents believe that questions of law in this case substantially overlap with this Court’s decision in *Diaz Lopez v. Director of Enforcement and Removal Operations et al.*, Case No. 3:25-cv-1313-JEP-SJH, 2026 WL 261938 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 26, 2026). Thus, the Federal Respondents submit that the same result should be reached in this case. In addition to this Court’s favorable decision in *Lopez*, there is a growing number of district courts that have ruled in the Federal Respondents’ favor

on this issue. *See, E.g., Iraheta Morales v. Noem*, Case No. 25-62598-Civ-Singhal (Doc. 10) (S.D. Fla. Jan 29, 2026).³

³ *See also Cortez v. Lynch*, No. 1:25-CV-822, 2026 WL 82039 (S.D. Ohio Jan. 12, 2026); *Garibay-Robledo v. Noem*, -- F. Supp. 3d --, No. 1:25-CV-177-H, 2026 WL 81679 (N.D. Tex. Jan. 9, 2026); *Singh v. Noem*, No. 2:25-CV-00157-SCM, 2026 WL 74558 (E.D. Ky. Jan. 9, 2026); *Benitez v. Bradford*, No. 4:25-CV-06178, 2026 WL 82235 (S.D. Tex. Jan. 8, 2026); *Cruz Rodriguez v. Olson*, -- F. Supp. 3d --, No. 1:25-CV-12961, 2026 WL 63613 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 8, 2026); *D.M.R.D. v. Andrews*, No. 1:26-CV-00081-WBS-CSK, 2026 WL 61504 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 8, 2026); *Calderon Lopez v. Lyons*, No. 1:25-CV-226-H, 2026 WL 44683 (N.D. Tex. Jan. 7, 2026); *Naikpay v. Sukkar*, No. 2:25-CV-1167-KCD-DNF, 2026 WL 44820 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 7, 2026) (Dudek, J.); *Azizzadeh v. Rhoney*, No. 25-CV-1288 (JLS), 2026 WL 44324 (W.D.N.Y. Jan. 6, 2026); *Gutierrez Sosa v. Holt*, No. CIV-25-1257-PRW, 2026 WL 36344 (W.D. Okla. Jan. 6, 2026); *Parra v. Sec'y, DHS*, No. 2:25-CV-1116-KCD-DNF, 2026 WL 21243 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 5, 2026) (Dudek, J.); *Rodriguez v. Jeffreys*, No. 8:25CV714, 2025 WL 3754411 (D. Neb. Dec. 29, 2025); *Zuniga v. Lyons*, No. 1:25-CV-221-H, 2025 WL 3755126 (N.D. Tex. Dec. 29, 2025); *Montoya v. Holt*, No. CIV-25-01231-JD, 2025 WL 3733302 (W.D. Okla. Dec. 26, 2025); *Pastor v. Dir. of Detroit Field Off.*, No. 4:25-CV-02761, 2025 WL 3746495 (N.D. Ohio Dec. 24, 2025); *Masis Lucero, v. Field Office Director of Enforcement and Removal Operations*, No. 1:25-CV-823, 2025 WL 3718730 (S.D. Ohio Dec. 23, 2025); *A.M. v. Joyce*, No. 2:25-CV-00615-LEW, 2025 WL 3706922 (D. Me. Dec. 22, 2025); *Calderon Lopez v. Lyons*, No. 1:25-CV-226-H, 2025 WL 3683918 (N.D. Tex. Dec. 19, 2025); *Rivera Hernandez v. Noem*, No. 9:25-CV-00326, 2025 WL 3754434 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 19, 2025); *Zapata v. Chestnut*, No. 1:25-CV-01922-WBS-CKD, 2025 WL 3687643 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 19, 2025); *Bartolon v. Bondi*, No. 1:25-CV-747, 2025 WL 3674604 (S.D. Ohio Dec. 18, 2025); *E.R.J.B. v. Wofford*, No. 1:25-CV-01843-WBS-SCR, 2025 WL 3683118 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025); *Romero Rebolledo v. Chestnut*, No. 1:25-CV-01904-WBS-CKD, 2025 WL 3683122 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025); *Padilla v. Galovich*, No. 25-CV-865-JDP, 2025 WL 3640960 (W.D. Wis. Dec. 16, 2025); *Coronado v. Sec'y, DHS*, No. 1:25-CV-831, 2025 WL 3628229 (S.D. Ohio Dec. 15, 2025); *Liang v. Almodovar*, No. 1:25-cv-09322, 2025 WL 3641512 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 15, 2025); *P. B. v. Bergami*, No. 3:25-CV-02978-O, 2025 WL 3632752 (N.D. Tex. Dec. 13, 2025); *Delgado v. Noem*, No. 9:25-CV-00329, 2025 WL 3639439 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 12, 2025); *Garcia v. U.S. Att'y Gen.*, No. 2:25-CV-1053-KCD-DNF, 2025 WL 3537592 (M.D. Fla. Dec. 10, 2025) (Dudek, J.); *Rodriguez v. Noem*, No. 9:25-CV-00320, 2025 WL 3639440 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 10, 2025); *Oliveria v. Albarran*, No. 1:25-CV-01760 WBS AC, 2025 WL 3525923 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 9, 2025); *Ugarte-Arenas v. Olson*, No. 25-C-1721, 2025 WL 3514451 (E.D. Wis. Dec. 8, 2025); *Melgar v. Bondi*, No. 8:25CV555, 2025 WL 3496721 (D. Neb. Dec. 5, 2025); *Candido v. Bondi*, No. 25-CV-867, 2025 WL 3484932 (W.D.N.Y. Dec. 4, 2025); *Chen v. Almodovar*, No. 1:25-cv-08350, 2025 WL 3484855 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 4, 2025); *Topal v. Bondi*, No. 1:25-cv-01612, 2025 WL 3486894 (W.D. La. Dec. 3, 2025); *Cruz v. Noem*, No. 8:25-CV-02566, 2025 WL 3482630 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 2, 2025); *Suarez v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-00202-JMD, 2025 WL 3312168, at *2-3 (E.D. Mo. Nov. 28, 2025); *Cortes Alonzo v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-01519 WBS SCR, 2025 WL 3208284, at

As the battle of the string cites builds, there is clearly a split amongst district courts across the country on applying § 1225 or § 1226. Currently, there are active appeals regarding this issue in the Eleventh Circuit, *see Hernandez Alvarez v. Warden, Federal Detention Center Miami et al.*, No. 25-14065 (11th Cir.) and *Cerro Perez v. Assistant Field Office Director, Krome North Service Processing Center, et al.*, No. 25-14075 (11th Cir.),⁴ and active appeals in at least four other circuits, *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.).⁵ Also, the appeal in the Fifth Circuit was recently decided in favor of the Federal Respondents in *Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi*, No. 25-20496 (5th Cir. Feb.

*1-5 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2025); *Manzo Valencia v. Chestnut*, No. 1:25-cv-01550 WBS JDP, 2025 WL 3205133, at *1-4 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2025); *Altamirano Ramos v. Lyons*, No. 2:25-cv-09785-SVW-AJR, 2025 WL 3199872, at *4-9 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2025); *Montoya Cabanas v. Bondi*, No. 4:25-cv-04830, 2025 WL 3171331, at *3-7 (S.D. Tex. Nov. 13, 2025); *Olalde v. Noem*, No. 1:25-CV-00168-JMD, 2025 WL 3131942, at *2-5 (E.D. Mo. Nov. 10, 2025); *Oliveira v. Patterson*, No. 6:25-cv-01463-DCJ-DJA, 2025 WL 3095972, at *2-6 (W.D. La. Nov. 4, 2025); *Sandoval v. Acuna*, No. 6:25-cv-01467, 2025 WL 3048926, *2-6 (W.D. La. Oct. 31, 2025); *Rojas v. Olson*, No. 25-cv-1437-bhl, 2025 WL 3033967, at *2-10 (E.D. Wis. Oct. 30, 2025); *Garibay-Robledo v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-00177-H (Doc. 9) (N.D. Tex. Oct. 24, 2025); *Kum v. Ross*, No. 6:25-cv-00451-DCJ-CBW, 2025 WL 3113646, at *1-2 (W.D. La. Oct. 22, 2025); *Vargas v. Lopez*, No. 25-CV-526, 2025 WL 2780351, at *4-9 (D. Neb. Sept. 30, 2025); *Chavez v. Noem*, No. 25-CV-23250CAB-SBC, 2025 WL 2730228 at *4-5 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2025).

⁴ *See Hernandez Alvarez v. Warden, Federal Detention Center Miami, et al.*, Case No. 1:25-cv-24806-KMW (S.D. Fla. Oct. 27, 2025); *Cerro Perez v. Assistant Field Office Director, Krome North Service Processing Center, et al.*, Case No. 1:25-cv-24820-KMW (S.D. Fla. Oct. 27, 2025).

⁵ *See Martinez v. Hyde*, 792 F. Supp. 3d 211 (D. Mass. 2025); *Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi*, No. H-25-3726, 2025 WL 2886346 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 7, 2025); *Pizzaro Reyes v. ERO*, No. 25-cv-12546, 2025 WL 2609425 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9, 2025); *Cortes Alonzo v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-01519 WBS SCR, 2025 WL 3208284 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2025).

6, 2026) concluding “the government’s position is correct,” reversing “the district courts’ orders to provide petitioners with bond hearings or release them.”⁶

The Federal Respondents believe that the Court’s decision in *Lopez* should guide its decision here, and that the instant Petition should be denied. As a result, in the interest of judicial economy and to expedite the Court’s consideration of this matter, the Federal Respondents make the following arguments for preservation purposes:

1. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) bars review of Petitioner’s claims. *Diaz Lopez*, Case No. 3:25-cv-1313-JEP-SJH (Doc. 7, p. 4-7).⁷
2. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9) bars review of these claims. *Id.* at 7.
3. Petitioner is properly detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225. *Id.* at 8-20.

Should the Court determine Petitioner’s detention is subject to § 1226, the only appropriate remedy is to begin the process for a bond hearing—not outright release—during which an IJ can determine whether Petitioner is a flight risk or danger to the community. *See, e.g., Vasquez Carcamo*, 2025 WL 3119263, at *5-6. Again, only EOIR can provide a bond hearing. That said, if ordered, ICE would do what is in its power to facilitate a hearing. *See Mirando Bravo*, No. 2:25-cv-1046, Doc. 8 at *3.

⁶ *Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi*, No. H-25-3726, 2025 WL 2886346 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 7, 2025)

⁷ Federal Respondents acknowledge Local Rule 3.01(h) prohibits incorporation by reference of any other motion, legal memorandum, or brief. To achieve the purpose of efficiency, Respondents respectfully request the Court to suspend application of the rule in this instance. *See* M.D. Fla. Local R. 1.01(a)-(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

B. No Violation of Due Process.

Petitioner is in removal proceedings. The Supreme Court has held that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) “mandate[s] detention of aliens throughout the completion of applicable proceedings [for removal] and not just until the moment those proceedings begin.” *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 302 (2018). Because § 1225(b)(2) is the proper basis for detention, there is no Fifth Amendment violation caused by detaining Petitioner or denying a bond hearing to Petitioner.

Based on the foregoing reasons and citations of authority, the Court should deny the instant Petition and dismiss this action.

Dated: February 25, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

GREGORY W. KEHOE
United States Attorney

/s/ Mai Tran

MAI TRAN
Assistant United States Attorney
Florida Bar No. 100982
300 North Hogan Street, Suite 700
Jacksonville, FL 32202-4270
Telephone No. (904) 301-6358/6300
Email: Mai.Tran2@usdoj.gov
Attorneys for Federal Respondents

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on February 25, 2026, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system, which will send a notice of electronic filing to the following CM/ECF participant:

David Stoller, Esquire
Florida Bar No.: 92797
Law Offices of David Stoller, P.A.
4445 Conway Road
Orlando, FL 32812
Phone: 407-999-0088
Fax: 407-382-9916
Email: david.stoller@davidstollerlaw.com
Attorney for Petitioner

/s/ Mai Tran

MAI TRAN
Assistant United States Attorney