

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

ZULEIMA A. QUISHPI MOROCHO,

Petitioner,

v.

No. 26-cv-00135-SMD-KK

DORA CASTRO, et. al.,

Respondents.

**RESPONSE TO PETITION**

This Office represents Federal Respondents (“Respondents”) in this habeas corpus action, in which Petitioner challenges his detention by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”). On January 23, 2026, Petitioner filed a petition for habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Doc. 1. On January 29, 2026, the Court ordered the government to file a response due by February 12, 2026. Doc. 5.

Respondents have carefully reviewed this petition and determined that the legal issues presented concern the statutory authority for ICE’s detention of Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(2)(A) or 1226(a), whether Petitioner is entitled to a bond hearing, and whether Petitioner must first exhaust his administrative remedies before applying to this Court. While reserving all rights, including the right to appeal, Respondents respectfully submit this abbreviated response in lieu of a formal responsive memorandum of law to preserve the legal issues, to conserve judicial and party resources, and to expedite the Court’s consideration of this matter. If the Court prefers to receive a formal memorandum of law, Respondents will be happy to submit one upon request.

It is Respondents’ position that Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b), because she was present in the United States without being admitted or paroled. *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216, 228 (BIA 2025). However, Respondents

acknowledge that this Court recently reached the opposite conclusion in *Martin Ramirez v. Noem*, Case No. 2:26-cv-00063, (D.N.M. Feb. 11, 2026) on facts similar to those currently before the Court. In a decision issued on February 11, 2026, this Court, following the rationale of other courts that have addressed the issue, including others in this District, concluded that the petitioner’s detention was not governed by § 1225, and that his detention was instead pursuant to § 1226.<sup>1</sup> *See Martin Ramirez v. Noem*. Specifically, the Court stated that “Petitioner is not subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A).” *Id.*

On the legal issue of which statute governs Petitioner’s detention here—whether it is 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), or 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)—Respondents acknowledge that this Court’s decision in *Martin Ramirez v. Noem*, would control the result here if the Court adheres to that decision, as the facts are not materially distinguishable for purposes of the Court’s decision on the legal issue of which statutory provision authorizes Petitioner’s detention.

Thus, while Respondents do not consent to issuance of the writ and reserves all rights, including the right to appeal, and to conserve judicial and party resources while expediting the Court’s consideration of this case, Respondents hereby rely upon, and incorporate by reference, the legal arguments presented in *Martin Ramirez v. Noem*, and the Court can decide this issue without further briefing.

Finally, the government believes that this matter can be decided without a hearing. If, however, the Court determines that a hearing would be helpful, the government will attend and present Respondent’s position.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Fifth Circuit recently addressed the same issue in which it held that individuals like the Petitioner are subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). *See Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi et al.*, --- F.4th---, 2026 WL 323330 (5th Cir. 2026). While Respondents recognize that the Fifth Circuit’s holding is not binding on this Court, they nonetheless alert the Court to this decision as persuasive authority that may influence the Court to reconsider its position on this issue.

Respectfully submitted,

TODD BLANCHE  
Deputy Attorney General  
RYAN ELLISON  
First Assistant United States Attorney

*/s/ Allison Shokes*  
ALLISON SHOKES  
Assistant United States Attorney  
201 Third Street NW, Suite 900  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102  
(505) 346-7274; Fax (505) 346-7205  
allison.shokes@usdoj.gov

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on February 12, 2026, I filed the foregoing pleading electronically through the CM/ECF system, which caused all parties and counsel of record to be served, as more fully reflected on the Notice of Electronic Filing.

*/s/ Allison Shokes*  
ALLISON SHOKES  
Assistant United States Attorney