

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
JACKSONVILLE DIVISION

**ELEAZER UBALDO FELIX-
DOMINGO,**

Petitioner,

Case No. 3:26-cv-00141-MMH-SJH

v.

GARRETT RIPA, Field Office Director
of Enforcement and Removal
Operations, Miami, Field Office,
Immigration and Customs Enforcement;
KRISTI NOEM, Secretary, U.S.
Department of Homeland Security; **U.S.**
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY; **PAMELA BONDI**, U.S.
Attorney General; **EXECUTIVE**
OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION
REVIEW; **RONNIE WOODALL**,
Warden¹ of Baker Correctional
Institution,

Respondents.

RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner Eleazer Ubaldo Felix-Domingo challenges his detention by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") and the U.S. Immigration and Customs

¹ Ronnie Woodall was the warden at the Baker Correctional Institution when it was operated by the State of Florida as a men's prison in Sanderson, FL. *See* www.fdle.state.fl.us. Ronnie Woodall was not and is not the warden or facility administrator at the North Florida Detention Center (NFDC) 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. **Thus, Petitioner is in the custody of Eric Hall**, not Ronnie Woodall.

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 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 Respondents² 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 24, 2026, Petitioner filed the Petition, challenging his detention at the Baker Correctional Institute as unlawful. *See* Doc. 1. By Order dated January 27, 2026, this Court ordered service of the Petition and directed Respondents to respond within 30 days of the date of the Order. *See* Doc. 3. Petitioner’s detention is lawful. This Court should deny the writ and dismiss the action.

² 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).

BACKGROUND

1. Petitioner is a 24-year-old male, national and citizen of Guatemala, who entered the United States without inspection on May 3, 2018. *See Exhibit A* (Notice to Appear); *see also*, Doc. 1 at ¶ 15 & 42. Petitioner was an unaccompanied minor. *See Exhibit B* (Petitioner's I-213).

2. On June 20, 2023, Petitioner applied for asylum and for withholding of removal and/or protection under the Convention Against Torture Act ("CAT"). *See* Doc. 1 at ¶ 43 & 45; *see also*, Doc. 1-4.

3. On December 7, 2025, Petitioner was arrested by the Saint John's County Sheriff's Office following a traffic stop. Doc. 1 at ¶ 43.

4. On December 8, 2025, the day after Petitioner's traffic stop, Petitioner was placed into ICE custody. *See Exhibit C* (Detention History).

5. On December 30, 2025, Petitioner requested a bond redetermination hearing before the Immigration Court. Doc. 1 at ¶ 47. That request was granted and the hearing noticed. *See Exhibit D* (Notice of Custody Redetermination Hearing).

6. On January 21, 2026, an Immigration Judge ("IJ") issued an order denying bond due to lack of standing. *See Exhibit E* (IJ Order Denying Bond); *see also*, Doc. 1-5. Upon information and belief, Petitioner did not appeal.

7. To date, Petitioner has been detained for 80 days.

8. Petitioner is scheduled for an immigration hearing on March 13, 2026. *See Exhibit F* (EOIR Case Information).

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 Is 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.

The Federal Respondents acknowledge that questions of law in this case substantially overlap with *Juan Miguel Gomez-Pena v. Secretary, DHS*, No. 3:25-cv-1287-MMH-MCR (Doc. 13), 2026 WL 83980 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 12, 2026), and *Hector Gutierrez Ortiz v. Kristi Noem*, No. 3:25-cv-1386-MMH-MCR (Doc. 14), 2025 WL 3653217 (M.D. Fla. Dec. 17, 2025). While the Federal Respondents acknowledge that their position is the minority in this District and around the country, it should be noted, however, that a growing number of courts have ruled in the Federal

Respondents' favor on this issue. See, E.g., *Iraheta Morales v. Noem*, Case No. 25-62598-Civ-Singhal, 2026 WL 236307 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 29, 2026); *Andres 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).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. Attn'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

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 several 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 decided in favor of the

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 *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); *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).

Federal Respondents in *Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi*, No. 25-20496 (5th Cir. Feb. 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 respectfully disagree with the Court’s decision in *Gomez-Pena* and *Gutierrez Ortiz* and believe appeals on this legal question will be in their favor. That said, in the interest of judicial economy and to expedite the Court’s consideration of this matter, Federal Respondents make the following arguments for preservation purposes:

1. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) bars review of Petitioner’s claims. *See Gomez-Pena*, No. 3:25-cv-1287-MMH-MCR (Doc. 11 at p. 4-7) (M.D. Fla.).⁷
2. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9) bars review of these claims. *Id.* at 8.
3. Petitioner failed to exhaust administrative remedies. *Id.* at 9-10.
4. Petitioner is properly detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225. *Id.* at 10-17.

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

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.

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.

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, this Court should deny the instant Petition (Doc. 1) and dismiss this action.

Dated: February 26, 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 26, 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:

Joel Alexis Caminero, *Esquire*
Florida Bar No.: 127294
Caminero Law, PLLC
5728 Major Blvd., Ste. 750
Orlando, FL 32819
Tel: (407) 409-2529
Email: joel@caminerolawfirm.com
Attorney for Petitioner

/s/ Mai Tran
MAI TRAN
Assistant United States Attorney