UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 26-cv-60207-EA

SEFERINO RESENDIZ RESENDIZ,

Petitioner,

v.

WARDEN, Broward Transitional Center *et al.*,

Respondents,

_____/

REPLY TO PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE PETITION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED

Respondents[1], by and through the undersigned counsel, submit this response to the Court's order to brief the issue of whether the Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Petitioner's habeas petition under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9), 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g), and/or any other applicable statutory provision. For the reasons set forth below, the habeas petition should be denied for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

BACKGROUND

The relevant facts are not in dispute. Petitioner is a native and citizen of Mexico, who entered the United States without inspection, admission, or parole in 2007. *See* Petition at ¶ 56. In September of 2025, the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") encountered

[1] A writ of habeas corpus must "be directed to the person having custody of the person detained." 28 USC § 2243. In cases involving present physical confinement, the Supreme Court reaffirmed in *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426 (2004), that "the immediate custodian, not a supervisory official who exercises legal control, is the proper respondent." *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 439 (2004). Petitioner is currently detained at the Broward Transitional Center *See* Petition at ¶ 1. Therefore, the proper respondent is Acting Assistant Field Office Director Carlos Nunez. All other respondents should be dismissed.

Petitioner at a local jail following an arrest for driving without a license and charged him with violating 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i), as an alien present in the United States without being admitted or paroled, and 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(7)(A)(i)(I), as alien without a valid entry document at the time of his application for admission. *See* Petition at ¶ 57-63. DHS took Petitioner into custody pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and placed him in removal proceedings pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1229a. *Id.* Petitioner did not request a bond hearing before the Immigration Court.

On January 7, 2026, the Immigration Court denied Petitioner's application for cancellation of removal for certain non-permanent residents under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(b)(1) and ordered his removal to Mexico. *See* Petition at ¶ 67. The Immigration Judge's decision is currently on appeal with the Board of Immigration Appeals. *See* Petition at ¶ 69. Petitioner remains in ICE custody at the Broward Transitional Center, pending the conclusion of his removal proceedings. *Id.* at ¶ 1.

In his habeas petition, Petitioner challenges the legality of his mandatory detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). *Id.* at ¶ 6. Specifically, Petitioner contends that section 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to aliens who, like himself, "have resided in the United States for decades and were not apprehended upon entry at the border." *Id.* at ¶ 72. Instead, Petitioner argues, such aliens are eligible for release on bond because their detention is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). *Id.* Based on this assertion, Petitioner seeks habeas relief in this Court, claiming that his detention violates the Immigration and Nationality Act, the regulations, and due process. *Id.* at ¶ 71-82.

ARGUMENT

A. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9) bars review of Petitioner's claims

Under § 1252(b)(9), "judicial review of all questions of law . . . including interpretation and application of statutory provisions . . . arising from any action taken . . . to remove an alien from the United States" is only proper before the appropriate court of appeals in the form of a petition for review of a final removal order. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9); *Reno v. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 483 (1999) ("*AADC*"). Section 1252(b)(9) is an "unmistakable 'zipper' clause" that "channels judicial review of all [claims arising from deportation proceedings]" to a court of appeals in the first instance. *Id.*; *see Lopez v. Barr*, No. CV 20-1330 (JRT/BRT), 2021 WL 195523, at 2 (D. Minn. Jan. 20, 2021) (citing *Nasrallah v. Barr*, 590 U.S. 573, 579–80 (2020)). Moreover, § 1252(a)(5) provides that a petition for review is the exclusive means for judicial review of immigration proceedings. Notwithstanding any other provision of law (statutory or nonstatutory), . . . a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals in accordance with this section shall be the sole and exclusive means for judicial review of an order of removal entered or issued under any provision of this chapter, except as provided in subsection (e) [concerning aliens not admitted to the United States]. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(5). "Taken together, § 1252(a)(5) and § 1252(b)(9) mean that *any* issue—whether legal or factual—arising from *any* removal-related activity can be reviewed *only* through the [petition-for-review] process." *J.E.F.M. v. Lynch*, 837 F.3d 1026, 1031 (9th Cir. 2016) (emphasis in original); *see id.* at 1035 ("§§ 1252(a)(5) and [(b)(9)] channel review of all claims, including policies-and-practices challenges . . . whenever they 'arise from' removal proceedings"); *accord Ruiz v. Mukasey*, 552 F.3d 269, 274 n.3 (2d Cir. 2009) (only when the action is "unrelated to any removal action or proceeding" is it within

the district court's jurisdiction); *cf. Xiao Ji Chen v. U.S. Dep't of Justice*, 434 F.3d 144, 151 n.3 (2d Cir. 2006) (a "primary effect" of the REAL ID Act is to "limit all aliens to one bite of the apple" (internal quotation marks omitted)).

Critically, "[§] 1252(b)(9) is a judicial channeling provision, not a claim-barring one." *Aguilar v. ICE*, 510 F.3d 1, 11 (1st Cir. 2007). Indeed, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(D) provides that "[n]othing . . . in any other provision of this chapter . . . shall be construed as precluding review of constitutional claims or questions of law raised upon a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals in accordance with this section." *See also Ajlani v. Chertoff*, 545 F.3d 229, 235 (2d Cir. 2008) ("[J]urisdiction to review such claims is vested exclusively in the courts of appeals[.]"). The petition-for-review process before the court of appeals ensures that aliens have a proper forum for claims arising from their immigration proceedings and "receive their day in court." *J.E.F.M.*, 837 F.3d at 1031–32 (internal quotations omitted); *see also Rosario v. Holder*, 627 F.3d 58, 61 (2d Cir. 2010) ("The REAL ID Act of 2005 amended the [INA] to obviate . . . Suspension Clause concerns" by permitting judicial review of "nondiscretionary" BIA determinations and "all constitutional claims or questions of law."). In evaluating the reach of subsections (a)(5) and (b)(9), the Second Circuit explained that jurisdiction turns on the substance of the relief sought. *Delgado v. Quarantillo*, 643 F.3d 52, 55 (2d Cir. 2011). Those provisions divest district courts of jurisdiction to review both direct and indirect challenges to removal orders, including decisions to detain for purposes of removal or for proceedings. *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 294–95 (section 1252(b)(9) includes challenges to the "decision to detain [an alien] in the first place or to seek removal[.]").

Here, Petitioner challenges the decision and action to detain him, which arises from DHS's decision to commence removal proceedings, and is thus an "action taken . . . to remove

[him] from the United States." *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9); *see also, e.g.*, *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 294–95; *Velasco Lopez v. Decker*, 978 F.3d 842, 850 (2d Cir. 2020) (finding that 8 U.S.C. § 1226(e) did not bar review in that case because the petitioner did not challenge "his initial detention"); *Saadulloev v. Garland*, No. 3:23-CV-00106, 2024 WL 1076106, at 3 (W.D. Pa. Mar. 12, 2024) (recognizing that there is no judicial review of the threshold detention decision, which flows from the government's decision to "commence proceedings"). As such, the Court lacks jurisdiction over this action. The reasoning in *Jennings* outlines why the Petitioner's claims cannot be reviewed by the Court.

While holding that it was unnecessary to comprehensively address the scope of § 1252(b)(9), the Supreme Court in *Jennings* provided guidance on the types of challenges that may fall within the scope of § 1252(b)(9). *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 293–94. The Court found that "§1252(b)(9) [did] not present a jurisdictional bar" in situations where "respondents . . . [were] not challenging the decision to detain them in the first place." *Id.* at 294–95. In this case, the Petitioner *does* challenge the government's decision to detain him in the first place. Though the Petitioner frames her challenge as relating to detention authority, rather than a challenge to DHS's decision to detain him in the first instance, such creative framing does not evade the preclusive effect of § 1252(b)(9).

The fact that the Petitioner is challenging the basis upon which he is detained is enough to trigger § 1252(b)(9) because "detention *is* an 'action taken . . . to remove' an alien." *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 319 (Thomas, J., concurring); 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9). The Court should dismiss the Petitioner's claims for lack of jurisdiction under § 1252(b)(9). The Petitioner must present his claims before the appropriate court of appeals because he challenges the

government's decision or action to detain him, which must be raised before a court of appeals, not this Court. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9).

B. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) bars review of Petitioner's claims

Section 1252(g) of Title 8, United States Code, categorically bars jurisdiction over "any cause or claim by or on behalf of any alien arising from the decision or action by the [Secretary of Homeland Security] to commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders against any alien." 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g). The Secretary of Homeland Security's decision to adjudicate cases, including the decision to detain an alien pending such removal proceedings, squarely falls within this jurisdictional bar. In other words, detention clearly "aris[es] from" the decision to commence and adjudicate removal proceedings against an alien. *See Alvarez v. ICE*, 818 F.3d 1194, 1203 (11th Cir. 2016) ("By its plain terms, [§ 1252(g)] bars us from questioning ICE's discretionary decisions to commence removal" and also to review "ICE's decision to take [plaintiff] into custody and to detain him during removal proceedings"); *Tazu v. Att'y Gen. U.S.*, 975 F.3d 292, 298 (3d Cir. 2020) ("The text of § 1252(g)... strips us of jurisdiction to review... [T]o perform or complete a removal, the [Secretary of Homeland Security] must exercise [her] discretionary power to detain an alien for a few days. That detention does not fall within some other part of the deportation process.") (cleaned up) (internal quotations and citations omitted); *Valencia-Mejia v. United States*, No. CV 08–2943 CAS (PJWx), 2008 WL 4286979, at 4 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2008) ("The decision to detain plaintiff until his hearing before the Immigration Judge *arose from* this decision to commence proceedings[.]") (emphasis added); *Wang v. United States*, No. CV 10-0389 SVW (RCx), 2010 WL 11463156, at 6 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 18, 2010) (citing *Khorrami v. Rolince*, 493 F. Supp. 2d 1061 (N.D. Ill. 2007) ("[Plaintiff's] detention necessarily *arises from* the decision to initiate

removal proceedings against him.") (emphasis added); *Herrera-Correra v. United States*, No. CV 08-2941 DSF (JCx), 2008 WL 11336833, at 3 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2008) (citing *Sissoko v. Rocha*, 509 F.3d 947, 949 (9th Cir. 2007) ("The [Secretary] may arrest the alien against whom proceedings are commenced and detain that individual until the conclusion of those proceedings. ... Thus, an alien's detention throughout this process *arises from* the [Secretary]'s decision to commence proceedings[]" and review of claims arising from such detention is barred under § 1252(g)) (emphasis added). Put in the Supreme Court's words, detention pending removal is a "specification" of the decision to commence proceedings. *See Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.* ("*AADC*"), 525 U.S. 471, 485 n.9 (1999) ("§ 1252(g) covers" a "specification of the decision to 'commence proceedings'").

As such, judicial review of the Petitioner's claims is barred by § 1252(g).

C. CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, the Petition should be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON A. READING QUIÑONES
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

By: **/s/ Liviu Lungu**
LIVIU LUNGU
SPECIAL ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEY
Fla. Bar. No. 69683
99 N.E. 4th Street
Miami, Florida 33132
Telephone: (305)961-9011
Email: Liviu.Lungu@usdoj.gov