

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Arnoldo Luis Sanchez,

Petitioner,

v.

Miami Field Office Director, Immigration and  
Customs Enforcement and Removal Operations  
("ICE/ERO"); Acting Director of U.S.  
Immigration and Customs Enforcement  
("ICE"); U.S. Immigration and Customs  
Enforcement ("ICE"); U.S. Secretary of  
Homeland Security; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF  
HOMELAND SECURITY ("DHS"); Attorney  
General of the United States; WARDEN,  
Warden of Broward Transitional Center.

Respondents.

Case No.

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
HABEAS CORPUS**

**EXPEDITED HEARING REQUESTED**

A-Number 

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

## INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner, Arnoldo Luis Sanchez, is in the physical custody of Respondents at the Broward Transitional Center in Pompano Beach, Florida. He now faces unlawful detention because the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Executive Office of Immigration Review (EOIR) have concluded Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention.

2. Petitioner is charged with, inter alia, having entered the United States without admission or inspection. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i).

3. Based on this allegation in Petitioner's removal proceedings, DHS denied Petitioner release from immigration custody, consistent with a new DHS policy issued on July 8, 2025, instructing all Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) employees to consider anyone inadmissible under § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i)—i.e., those who entered the United States without admission or inspection—to be subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond.

4. Similarly, on September 5, 2025, the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA or Board) issued a precedent decision, binding on all immigration judges, holding that an immigration judge has no authority to consider bond requests for any person who entered the United States without admission. *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). The Board determined that such individuals are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond.

5. Petitioner's detention on this basis violates the plain language of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Section 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to individuals like Petitioner who previously entered and are now residing in the United States. Instead, such individuals are subject to a different statute, § 1226(a), that allows for release on conditional parole or bond. That statute

1 expressly applies to people who, like Petitioner, are charged as inadmissible for having entered  
2 the United States without inspection.

3 6. Respondents' new legal interpretation is plainly contrary to the statutory framework  
4 and contrary to decades of agency practice applying § 1226(a) to people like Petitioner.

5 7. Accordingly, Petitioner seeks a Writ of Habeas Corpus requiring that he be released  
6 unless Respondents provide a bond hearing under § 1226(a) within seven (7) days.

### 7 JURISDICTION

8 8. Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents. Petitioner is detained at the  
9 Broward Transitional Center, in Pompano Beach, Florida.

10 9. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(5) (habeas corpus), 28  
11 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), and Article I, section 9, clause 2 of the United States  
12 Constitution (the Suspension Clause).

13 10. This Court may grant relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, the Declaratory Judgment  
14 Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*, and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

### 15 VENUE

16 11. Pursuant to *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493-  
17 500 (1973), venue lies in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, the  
18 judicial district in which Petitioner is currently detained.

19 12. Venue is also proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because  
20 Respondents are employees, officers, and agencies of the United States, and because a substantial  
21 part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in the Southern District of Florida.



1 and has authority over the actions of ICE in general. Respondent is therefore a legal custodian of  
2 the Petitioner. Respondent is sued in his official capacity.

3 18. Respondent U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement is the federal agency  
4 responsible for custody decisions relating to non-citizens charged with being removable from the  
5 United States, including the arrest, detention, and custody status of no citizens. Respondent is sued  
6 in his official capacity.

7 19. Respondent is the U.S. Secretary of Homeland Security (DHS) and has authority  
8 over the actions of all other DHS Respondents in this case, as well as all operations of DHS.  
9 Respondent is a legal custodian of Petitioner and is charged with faithfully administering the  
10 immigration laws of the United States. Respondent is sued in her official capacity.

11 20. Respondent U.S. Department of Homeland Security is the federal agency that has  
12 authority over the actions of ICE and all other DHS Respondents. Respondent is sued in his official  
13 capacity.

14 21. Respondent is the Attorney General of the United States, and as such has authority  
15 over the Department of Justice and is charged with faithfully administering the immigration laws  
16 of the United State. She is sued in her official capacity.

17 22. Respondent Warden is the Warden of the Broward Transitional Center,  
18 where Petitioner is currently detained. He has immediate physical custody of Petitioner. He is sued  
19 in his official capacity.

20

21

22

23

24

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**LEGAL FRAMEWORK**

23. The INA prescribes three basic forms of detention for the vast majority of noncitizens in removal proceedings.

24. First, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 authorizes the detention of noncitizens in standard removal proceedings before an IJ. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. Individuals in § 1226(a) detention are generally entitled to a bond hearing at the outset of their detention, *see* 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19(a), 1236.1(d), while noncitizens who have been arrested, charged with, or convicted of certain crimes are subject to mandatory detention, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c).

25. Second, the INA provides for mandatory detention of noncitizens subject to expedited removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and for other recent arrivals seeking admission referred to under § 1225(b)(2).

26. Last, the INA also provides for detention of noncitizens who have been ordered removed, including individuals in withholding-only proceedings, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)–(b).

27. This case concerns the detention provisions at §§ 1226(a) and 1225(b)(2).

28. The detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) were enacted as part of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104–208, Div. C, §§ 302–03, 110 Stat. 3009–546, 3009–582 to 3009–583, 3009–585. Section 1226(a) was most recently amended earlier this year by the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No. 119–1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025).

29. Following the enactment of the IIRIRA, EOIR drafted new regulations explaining that, in general, people who entered the country without inspection were not considered detained under § 1225 and that they were instead detained under § 1226(a). *See* Inspection and Expedited

1 Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum  
2 Procedures, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997).

3 30. Thus, in the decades that followed, most people who entered without inspection  
4 and were placed in standard removal proceedings received bond hearings, unless their criminal  
5 history rendered them ineligible pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c). That practice was consistent with  
6 many more decades of prior practice, in which noncitizens who were not deemed “arriving” were  
7 entitled to a custody hearing before an IJ or other hearing officer. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a) (1994);  
8 *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 229 (1996) (noting that § 1226(a) simply “restates” the  
9 detention authority previously found at § 1252(a)).

10 31. On July 8, 2025, ICE, “in coordination with” DOJ, announced a new policy that  
11 rejected well-established understanding of the statutory framework and reversed decades of  
12 practice.

13 32. The new policy, entitled “Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for  
14 Applicants for Admission,”<sup>1</sup> claims that all persons who entered the United States without  
15 inspection shall now be subject to mandatory detention provision under § 1225(b)(2)(A). The  
16 policy applies regardless of when a person is apprehended, and affects those who have resided in  
17 the United States for months, years, and even decades.

18 33. On September 5, 2025, the BIA adopted this same position in a published decision,  
19 *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*. There, the Board held that all noncitizens who entered the United States  
20 without admission or parole are subject to detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A) and are ineligible for  
21 IJ bond hearings.

22  
23  
24 <sup>1</sup> Available at <https://www.aila.org/library/ice-memo-interim-guidance-regarding-detention-authority-for-applications-for-admission>.

1           34. Since Respondents adopted their new policies, dozens of federal courts have  
2 rejected their new interpretation of the INA's detention authorities. Courts have likewise rejected  
3 *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, which adopts the same reading of the statute as ICE.

4           35. Even before ICE or the BIA introduced these nationwide policies, IJs in the  
5 Tacoma, Washington, immigration court stopped providing bond hearings for persons who entered  
6 the United States without inspection and who have since resided here. There, the U.S. District  
7 Court in the Western District of Washington found that such a reading of the INA is likely unlawful  
8 and that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to noncitizens who are not apprehended upon arrival to  
9 the United States. *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239 (W.D. Wash. 2025).

10           36. Subsequently, court after court has adopted the same reading of the INA's detention  
11 authorities and rejected ICE and EOIR's new interpretation. *See, e.g., Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-  
12 CV-11571-JEK, 2025 WL 1869299 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025); *Diaz Martinez v. Hyde*, No. CV 25-  
13 11613-BEM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 2084238 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025); *Rosado v. Figueroa*,  
14 No. CV 25-02157 PHX DLR (CDB), 2025 WL 2337099 (D. Ariz. Aug. 11, 2025), *report and*  
15 *recommendation adopted*, No. CV-25-02157-PHX-DLR (CDB), 2025 WL 2349133 (D. Ariz.  
16 Aug. 13, 2025); *Lopez Benitez v. Francis*, No. 25 CIV. 5937 (DEH), 2025 WL 2371588 (S.D.N.Y.  
17 Aug. 13, 2025); *Maldonado v. Olson*, No. 0:25-cv-03142-SRN-SGE, 2025 WL 2374411 (D. Minn.  
18 Aug. 15, 2025); *Arrazola-Gonzalez v. Noem*, No. 5:25-cv-01789-ODW (DFMx), 2025 WL  
19 2379285 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2025); *Romero v. Hyde*, No. 25-11631-BEM, 2025 WL 2403827 (D.  
20 Mass. Aug. 19, 2025); *Samb v. Joyce*, No. 25 CIV. 6373 (DEH), 2025 WL 2398831 (S.D.N.Y.  
21 Aug. 19, 2025); *Ramirez Clavijo v. Kaiser*, No. 25-CV-06248-BLF, 2025 WL 2419263 (N.D. Cal.  
22 Aug. 21, 2025); *Leal-Hernandez v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-02428-JRR, 2025 WL 2430025 (D. Md.  
23 Aug. 24, 2025); *Kostak v. Trump*, No. 3:25-cv-01093-JE-KDM, 2025 WL 2472136 (W.D. La.

1 Aug. 27, 2025); *Jose J.O.E. v. Bondi*, No. 25-CV-3051 (ECT/DJF), --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL  
2 2466670 (D. Minn. Aug. 27, 2025) *Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft*, No. 2:25-cv-12486-BRM-EAS,  
3 2025 WL 2496379 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025); *Vasquez Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02180-DMS-  
4 MM, 2025 WL 2549431 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025); *Zaragoza Mosqueda v. Noem*, No. 5:25-CV-  
5 02304 CAS (BFM), 2025 WL 2591530 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2025); *Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft*, No.  
6 25-CV-12546, 2025 WL 2609425 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9, 2025); *Sampiao v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-  
7 11981-JEK, 2025 WL 2607924 (D. Mass. Sept. 9, 2025); *see also, e.g., Palma Perez v. Berg*, No.  
8 8:25CV494, 2025 WL 2531566, at \*2 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025) (noting that “[t]he Court tends to  
9 agree” that § 1226(a) and not § 1225(b)(2) authorizes detention); *Jacinto v. Trump*, No. 4:25-cv-  
10 03161-JFB-RCC, 2025 WL 2402271 at \*3 (D. Neb. Aug. 19, 2025) (same); *Anicasio v. Kramer*,  
11 No. 4:25-cv-03158-JFB-RCC, 2025 WL 2374224 at \*2 (D. Neb. Aug. 14, 2025) (same).

12 37. Courts have uniformly rejected DHS’s and EOIR’s new interpretation because it  
13 defies the INA. As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court and others have explained, the plain text of the  
14 statutory provisions demonstrates that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to people like Petitioner.

15 38. Section 1226(a) applies by default to all persons “pending a decision on whether  
16 the [noncitizen] is to be removed from the United States.” These removal hearings are held under  
17 § 1229a, to “decid[e] the inadmissibility or deportability of a[] [noncitizen].”

18 39. The text of § 1226 also explicitly applies to people charged as being inadmissible,  
19 including those who entered without inspection. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E). Subparagraph (E)’s  
20 reference to such people makes clear that, by default, such people are afforded a bond hearing  
21 under subsection (a). As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court explained, “[w]hen Congress creates  
22 ‘specific exceptions’ to a statute’s applicability, it ‘proves’ that absent those exceptions, the statute  
23 generally applies.” *Rodriguez Vazquez*, 779 F. Supp. 3d at 1257 (citing *Shady Grove Orthopedic*  
24

1 *Assocs., P.A. v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 559 U.S. 393, 400 (2010)); *see also Gomes*, 2025 WL 1869299,  
2 at \*7.

3 40. Section 1226 therefore leaves no doubt that it applies to people who face charges  
4 of being inadmissible to the United States, including those who are present without admission or  
5 parole.

6 41. By contrast, § 1225(b) applies to people arriving at U.S. ports of entry or who  
7 recently entered the United States. The statute's entire framework is premised on inspections at  
8 the border of people who are "seeking admission" to the United States. 8 U.S.C.  
9 § 1225(b)(2)(A). Indeed, the Supreme Court has explained that this mandatory detention scheme  
10 applies "at the Nation's borders and ports of entry, where the Government must determine whether  
11 a[] [noncitizen] seeking to enter the country is admissible." *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281,  
12 287 (2018).

13 42. Accordingly, the mandatory detention provision of § 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply  
14 to people like Petitioner, who have already entered and were residing in the United States at the  
15 time they were apprehended.

#### 16 **FACTS**

17 43. Petitioner is a forty (40) year old citizen of Guatemala.

18 44. Petitioner entered the United States without inspection on or about May 30, 2003.

19 45. Since then, Petitioner has resided in the United States in liberty for approximately  
20 twenty-two (22) years and lives in Immokalee, Florida, with his family.

21 46. On or about December 16, 2025, Petitioner was arrested by ICE at a general raid at  
22 his place of employment. Petitioner is now detained at the Broward Transitional Center in  
23 Pompano Beach, Florida.

1 47. DHS placed Petitioner in removal proceedings pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. ICE  
2 has charged Petitioner with, *inter alia*, being inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) as  
3 someone who entered the United States without inspection.

4 48. Petitioner is married with three (3) US citizen children, ages 14, 17, and 18, and is  
5 the head provider and caretaker of the family. He maintains stable employment and has minor  
6 criminal history. Petitioner is neither a flight risk nor a danger to the community.

7 49. Following Petitioner's arrest and transfer to Broward Transitional Center, ICE  
8 issued a custody determination to continue Petitioner's detention without an opportunity to post  
9 bond or be released on other conditions.

10 50. Petitioner had a bond hearing on or about January 16, 2026, and was denied bond for  
11 lack of jurisdiction by the Immigration Judge.

12 51. Pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, the Immigration Judge is unable to consider  
13 Petitioner's bond request.

14 52. As a result, Petitioner remains in detention. Without relief from this court, he faces  
15 the prospect of months, or even years, in immigration custody, separated from his family and  
16 community.

17 **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

18 **COUNT I**  
19 **Violation of the INA**

20 53. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in the preceding  
21 paragraphs.

22 54. The mandatory detention provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to all  
23 noncitizens residing in the United States who are subject to the grounds of inadmissibility. As  
24 relevant here, it does not apply to those who previously entered the country and have been residing

1 in the United States prior to being apprehended and placed in removal proceedings by  
2 Respondents. Such noncitizens are detained under § 1226(a), unless they are subject to  
3 § 1225(b)(1), § 1226(c), or § 1231.

4 55. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates his  
5 continued detention and violates the INA.

6 **COUNT II**  
7 **Violation of the Bond Regulations**

8 56. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in preceding  
9 paragraphs.

10 57. In 1997, after Congress amended the INA through IIRIRA, EOIR and the then-  
11 Immigration and Naturalization Service issued an interim rule to interpret and apply IIRIRA.  
12 Specifically, under the heading of "Apprehension, Custody, and Detention of [Noncitizens]," the  
13 agencies explained that "[d]espite being applicants for admission, [noncitizens] who are present  
14 without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as [noncitizens] who entered without  
15 inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination." 62 Fed. Reg. at 10323 (emphasis  
16 added). The agencies thus made clear that individuals who had entered without inspection were  
17 eligible for consideration for bond and bond hearings before IJs under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and its  
18 implementing regulations.

19 58. Nonetheless, pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, EOIR has a policy and practice  
20 of applying § 1225(b)(2) to individual like Petitioner.

21 59. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates his continued  
22 detention and violates 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1, 1236.1, and 1003.19.  
23  
24

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**COUNT III**

**Violation of Due Process**

60. Petitioner repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

61. The government may not deprive a person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. U.S. Const. amend. V. "Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that the Clause protects." *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001). 8 U.S.C. § 1226

62. Petitioner has a fundamental interest in liberty and being free from official restraint.

63. The government's detention of Petitioner without a bond redetermination hearing pursuant 8 U.S.C. § 1226 to determine whether he is a flight risk or danger to others violates his right to due process.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that this Court grant the following relief:

- a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- b. Order that Petitioner shall not be transferred outside the Southern District of Florida while this Habeas Petition is pending;
- c. Issue an Order to Show Cause ordering Respondents to show cause why this Petition should not be granted within three (3) days;
- d. Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus requiring that Respondents release Petitioner or, in the alternative, provide Petitioner with a bond hearing pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven (7) days;
- e. Declare that Petitioner's detention is unlawful;

1 f. Award Petitioner attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act  
2 ("EAJA"), as amended, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and on any other basis justified under  
3 law; and

4 g. Grant any other and further relief that this Court deems just and proper.

5 DATED January 23rd, 2026.

6 Respectfully Submitted,

7 */s/ Allison Rub, Esq.*

8 Allison Rub, Esq.

9 Allison Rub, P.A.

10 Attorney for Petitioner

11 3301 Ponce de Leon Blvd., Suite 200

12 Coral Gables, FL 33134

13 Fla. Bar No.: 105529

14 (305) 461-5757

15 allison@repinespa.com