

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

ANTONIO MONJARAZ
CABALLERO,

Petitioner,

v.

LADON FRANCIS, Field Office
Director of Enforcement and Removal
Operations, Atlanta Field Office,
TODD LYONS, in his official capacity
as Acting director of 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;
JASON STREEVAL, Warden of
STEWART DETENTION CENTER,

Respondents.

Case No. 26-153

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS**

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

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner ANTONIO MONJARAZ CABALLERO brings this petition for a writ of habeas corpus to seek enforcement of his rights as member of the Bond Denial Class certified in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM (C.D. Cal.) Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents at the STEWART DETENTION CENTER He now faces unlawful detention because the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) have refused to abide by the declaratory judgment issued on behalf of the certified class in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*.

2. On November 20, 2025, the district court granted partial summary judgment on behalf of individual plaintiffs and on November 25, 2025, certified a nationwide class and extended declaratory judgment to the certified class. *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 3289861, at *11 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2025) (order granting partial summary judgment to named Plaintiffs-Petitioners); *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 3288403, at *9 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2025) (order certifying Plaintiffs-Petitioners' proposed nationwide Bond Eligible Class, incorporating and extending declaratory judgment from Order Granting Petitioners' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment).

3. The declaratory judgment held that the Bond Denial Class members are detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), and thus may not be denied consideration for release on bond under § 1225(b)(2)(A). *Maldonado Bautista*, 2025 WL 3289861, at *11.

4. Nonetheless, the Executive Office for Immigration Review and its subagencies the

1 Immigration Court and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) have blatantly refused to
2 abide by the declaratory relief and have unlawfully ordered that Petitioner be denied the
3 opportunity to be released on bond.

4 5. Petitioner ANTONIO MONJARAZ CABALLERO is a member of the Bond Eligible
5 Class, as he:

6 a. does not have lawful status in the United States and is currently detained at the
7 STEWART DETENTION CENTER. He was apprehended by immigration
8 authorities on December 15, 2025;

9 b. entered the United States without inspection over twenty years ago and was not
10 apprehended upon arrival; and

11 c. is not detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231.

12 6. After apprehending Petitioner on December 15, 2025, the DHS placed
13 him in removal proceedings pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. DHS has charged Petitioner inter alia
14 as being inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i), as someone who entered the United States
15 without inspection.

16 7. The Court should expeditiously grant this petition.

17 8. Respondents are bound by the judgment in *Maldonado Bautista*, as it has the full “force
18 and effect of a final judgment.” 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a). Nevertheless, Respondents continue to
19 flagrantly defy the judgment in that case and continue to subject Petitioner to unlawful detention
20 despite his clear entitlement to consideration for release on bond as a Bond Eligible Class member.

21 9. Immigration judges have informed class members in bond hearings that they
22 have been instructed by “leadership” that the declaratory judgment in *Maldonado Bautista* is not
23 controlling, even with respect to class members, and that instead IJs remain bound to follow the
24 agency’s prior decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). Because
25 Respondents are detaining Petitioner in violation of the declaratory judgment issued in *Maldonado*

1 *Bautista*, the Court should accordingly order that within one day, Respondent DHS must release
2 Petitioner.

3 10. Alternatively, the Court should order Petitioner's release unless Respondents provide
4 a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven days.

5 **JURISDICTION**

6 11. Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents. Petitioner is detained at the
7 STEWART DETENTION CENTER in Lumpkin, GEORGIA.

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

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

13 **VENUE**

14 14. Pursuant to *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493- 500
15 (1973), venue lies in the United States District Court for the MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
16 GEORGIA, the judicial district in which Petitioner currently is detained.

17 15. Venue is also properly in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because
18 Respondents are employees, officers, and agencies of the United States, and because a
19 substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in the MIDDLE
20 DISTRICT OF GEORGIA.

21 **REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243**

22 16. The Court should grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus "forthwith," as the legal
23 issues have already been resolved for class members in *Maldonado Bautista*.

1 17. Habeas corpus is “perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law . . .
2 affording as it does a *swift* and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or
3 confinement.” *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963) (emphasis added). “The application for the
4 writ usurps the attention and displaces the calendar of the judge or justice who entertains it and
5 receives prompt action from him within the four corners of the application.” *Yong v. I.N.S.*, 208
6 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted).

7 **PARTIES**

8 18. Petitioner ANTONIO MONJARAZ CABALLERO (“Mr. Caballero”) is a citizen of
9 Mexico who has been in immigration detention since the 15th of December of 2025. After arresting
10 Petitioner in Brookhaven, Georgia and transferring him to Stewart Detention Center, ICE did not
11 set bond and Petitioner is unable to obtain review of his custody by an IJ, pursuant to the Board’s
12 decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). Due to this erroneous
13 decision, it would be futile for Petitioner to apply to EOIR without the intervention of this
14 honorable Court.

15 19. Respondent Ladeon Francis is the Director of the Atlanta Field Office of ICE’s
16 Enforcement and Removal Operations division; however, on information and belief, the DHS is
17 rotating their Field Office Director without publishing a schedule of rotation. As such, Ladeon
18 Francis or his unknown, unannounced provisional replacement is Petitioner’s immediate custodian
19 and is responsible for Petitioner’s detention and removal. He or his acting counterpart is named in
20 his or her official capacity. Respondent Francis’s address is 180 Ted Turner Dr Se, Ste 522. Atlanta
21 GA 30303.

22 20. Respondent Todd Lyons is named in his official capacity as the Acting Director of the

1 Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”). As the senior Official Performing the duties of
2 the Director of ICE, he is responsible for the administration and enforcement of the immigration
3 laws of the United States; routinely transacts business in the Southern District of Georgia; is legally
4 responsible for any effort to detain Petitioner; and as such is a custodian of the Petitioner. His
5 address is ICE, Office of the Principal Legal Advisor, 500 12th St. SW, Mail Stop 5900,
6 Washington DC 20536-5900.

7 21. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security.
8 She is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act
9 (INA), and oversees ICE, which is responsible for Petitioner’s detention. Ms. Noem has ultimate
10 custodial authority over Petitioner and is sued in her official capacity. Respondent Noem’s address
11 is U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office of the General Counsel, 2707 Martin Luther
12 King Jr Ave Se Washington DC 20528-0525.

13 22. Respondent Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is the federal agency
14 responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA, including the detention and removal of
15 noncitizens.

16 23. Respondent Pamela Bondi is the Attorney General of the United States. She is
17 responsible for the Department of Justice, of which the Executive Office for Immigration Review
18 and the immigration court system it operates is a component agency. She is sued in her official
19 capacity. Respondent Bondi’s address is U.S. Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue,
20 NW, Washington, DC 20530-0001.

21 24. Respondent Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) is the federal agency
22 responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA in removal proceedings, including for custody
23 redeterminations in bond hearings.

1 25. Respondent, Jason Streeval is employed by the private, for-profit detention
2 corporation contracted by the Government as an agent to confine immigrants at Stewart Detention
3 Center, where Petitioner is detained. He has immediate physical custody of Petitioner. He is sued
4 in his official capacity. Respondent Warden's address is Warden, Stewart Detention Center, 1116 S
5 Washington Ave, Lumpkin, GA 39862.

6 **FACTS**

7 26. Mr. Caballero is a forty-nine-old citizen and national of Mexico.

8 27. Mr. Caballero entered the United States in 2001 and has been physically present for
9 over twenty years.

10 28. On December 15, 2025, Mr. Caballero's husband was driving Mr. Caballero to work
11 when they were targeted and pulled over by ICE officials.

12 29. Mr. Caballero's husband was informed that his vehicle was under investigation which
13 initiated the stop. The ICE officials requested identification documents from the driver and
14 subsequently Mr. Caballero as the passenger.

15 30. Mr. Caballero was then detained and transferred to the Stewart Detention Center where
16 he remains detained.

17 31. Mr. Caballero's detention has inflicted profound harm on his U.S. citizen family.
18 Particularly his United States citizen husband and children—whom are experiencing emotional
19 hardship in his absence.

20 32. Mr. Caballero is a devoted father and husband whose presence is essential to his
21 family's well-being and stability.

22 33. Pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, the immigration judge is unable to consider

1 Petitioner's bond request, and his unlawful detention cannot be litigated before that body, who
2 collaborated with the DHS – who is a party to these contested proceedings – to adopt the DHS
3 position wholesale, because such efforts would be futile.

4 34. On November 25, 2025, the district court certified a nationwide class and extended
5 declaratory judgment to the certified class which Petitioner is a member of. *Maldonado Bautista*
6 *v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 3289861, at *11 (C.D.
7 Cal. Nov. 20, 2025) (order granting partial summary judgment to named Plaintiffs-Petitioners);
8 *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL
9 3288403, at *9 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2025). Despite this Immigration Judges continue to deny bond
10 for class members citing to a lack of jurisdiction.

11 35. Petitioner remains in detention. Without relief from this court, he faces the
12 prospect of months, or even years, in immigration custody, separated from his family and
13 community while his relief remains pending.

14 **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**
15 **COUNT I**

16
17 **Violation of the INA:**
18 **Request for Relief Pursuant to *Maldonado Bautista***

19
20 36. Petitioner repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each and every allegation
21 in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

22 37. As a member of the Bond Eligible Class, Petitioner is entitled to consideration for
23 release on bond under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).

24 38. The order granting partial summary judgment in *Maldonado Bautista* holds that
25 Respondents violate the INA in applying the mandatory detention statute at § 1225(b)(2) to class
26 members.

27 39. The order granting class certification in *Maldonado Bautista* further orders that

1 “[w]hen considering this determination with the MSJ Order, the Court extends the same
2 declaratory relief granted to Petitioners to the Bond Eligible Class as a whole.”

3 40. Respondents are parties to *Maldonado Bautista* and bound by the Court’s declaratory
4 judgment, which has the full “force and effect of a final judgment.” 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a).

5 41. By denying Petitioner a bond hearing under § 1226(a) and asserting that he is subject
6 to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2), Respondents violate Petitioner’s statutory rights under
7 the INA and the Court’s judgment in *Maldonado Bautista*.

8
9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

- 11 a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- 12 b. Issue a writ of habeas corpus requiring that within one day, Respondents release
13 Petitioner;
- 14 c. Alternatively, issue a writ of habeas corpus requiring Respondents to release
15 Petitioner unless they provide a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within
16 seven days;
- 17 d. Award Petitioner attorney’s fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act
18 (EAJA), as amended, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and on any other basis justified under law;
19 and
- 20 e. Grant any other and further relief that this Court deems just and proper.
21
22
23
24
25
26

1 DATED this 27th of January 2026.

2 /s/ Peter Tadeo, Esq.

3 Peter Tadeo, Esq.

4 Attorney for Petitioner

5 Georgia Bar No. 505253

6 Tadeo and Silva Law

7 P.O. Box 921249

8 Peachtree Corners, Georgia 30010

9 Telephone: (404)993-8941

10 Email: Peter@tadeosilvalaw.com

11

12 *Attorney for Petitioner*

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

