

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
FORT MYERS DIVISION

WILIAN ALEXANDER
VASQUEZ LOPEZ,

Petitioner,

Case No. 2:26-cv-147-JES-NPM

v.

WARDEN, GLADES COUNTY
DETENTION CENTER, et al.,

Respondents.

RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner Wilian Alexander Vasquez Lopez challenges his detention by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, arguing he is entitled to a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226. While reserving all rights, including the right to appeal, Respondents submit this abbreviated brief in lieu of an exhaustive memorandum to preserve the Respondents' arguments and to conserve judicial resources. Should the Court prefer a more exhaustive discussion, Respondents request leave to submit additional briefing.¹

¹ The only appropriate respondent to a habeas case is the official with physical custody of Perera. 28 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."). Accordingly, the only proper respondent in this case is the Warden of Glades County

FACTS

Vasquez Lopez is a national and citizen of Guatemala who last entered the United States at an unknown place and time. (Composite Exhibit, Ex. 1 at 1.) He was placed in immigration custody on November 21, 2025. *Id.* at 2. Vasquez Lopez is currently detained at Glades County Detention Center. On January 26, 2026, Vasquez Lopez filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus alleging his custody violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment and the Immigration and Nationality Act. (Doc. 1.)

CERTIFIED HABEAS RETURN

ICE is detaining Vasquez Lopez under the mandatory detention provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2243 (“The person to whom the writ or order is directed shall make a return certifying the true cause of the detention.”). Vasquez Lopez 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).

ARGUMENT

In *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 Section 1225, the INA’s statutory scheme, Supreme Court and BIA precedent, the legislative history of the

Detention Center in his official capacity. *See e.g., 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).

INA and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (“IIRIRA”), Pub L. No. 104-208, and DHS’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 petitioner, who are present in the United States without admission.” 29 I&N Dec. at 225. This Court should rule the same.

Respondents acknowledge that questions of law in this case, and the challenges to the government’s policy and practice, substantially overlap with *Patel v. Hardin*, No. 2:25-cv-00870-JES-NPM (M.D. Fla.) (Doc. 22) (granting habeas in part). It should be noted, however, that courts have recently ruled against petitioners in similar cases. *See, E.g., Lopez v. Dir. of Enft & Removal Operations*, No. 3:25-CV-1313-JEP-SJH, 2026 WL 261938, at *1 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 26, 2026); *Iraheta Morales v. Noem*, No. 25-62598-CIV-SINGHAL, 2026 WL 236307, at *3-9 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 29, 2026). Some decisions have started recognizing that there is no jurisdiction over this question to begin with. *Munoz Nataren v. Raycraft*, No. 4:26-cv-212, 2026 WL 214368, at *2 (N.D. Ohio Jan. 28, 2026); *Amaya-Velis v. Raycraft*, No. 4:26-cv-73, 2026 WL 100596, at *2-3 (N.D. Ohio Jan. 14, 2026).

Significantly, the Fifth Circuit recently ruled that aliens who have not been admitted to the United States are subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) regardless of whether the alien is already present in the United States. *Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi*, No. 25-20496, 2026 WL 323330 (5th Cir. Feb. 6, 2026).

At least four circuits—including the Eleventh—have active appeals on the matter. *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.); *Hernandez Alvarez v. Warden*, No. 25-14065 (11th Cir.).

Respondents respectfully disagree with the Court's decision in *Patel*. That said, in the interest of judicial economy and to expedite the Court's consideration of this matter, Respondents make the following arguments:

1. Title 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) bars review of Vasquez Lopez's claims. *Patel v. Hardin*, No. 2:25-cv-00870-JES-NPM, Doc. 15 at 4-7 (M.D. Fla. Oct. 22, 2025).²
2. Title 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9) bars review Vasquez Lopez's claims. *Id.* at 7-8.
3. Vasquez Lopez failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. *Id.* at 8-9.
4. Vasquez Lopez is properly detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225. *Id.* at 10-16.

Finally, Respondents contend that should this Court determine that Petitioner's detention is subject to 8 U.S.C. § 1226, outright release is inappropriate. To the extent the Court orders a bond hearing before an Immigration Judge for the purpose of determining whether Petitioner is a flight risk or danger to the community—see, e.g., *Garcia v. Noem*, No. 2:25-CV-00879-SPC-NPM, 2025 WL

² 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 Local Rule 1.01(a) and 1.01(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

3041895, at *6 (M.D. Fla. Oct. 31, 2025)—Respondents aver that such bond hearings are not conducted or managed by ICE, rather by the Executive Office for Immigration Review, which is not a proper party to this suit. *See Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 434-36 (2004) (noting that for habeas petitions challenging detention, “the default rule is that the proper Respondents is the warden of the facility where the prisoner is being held, not the Attorney General or some other remote supervisory official”).

CONCLUSION

Vasquez Lopez’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus should be denied.

DATED this 9th day of February, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

GREGORY W. KEHOE
United States Attorney

By: /s/Chad C. Spraker
CHAD C. SPRAKER
Assistant United States Attorney
USA No. 198
2110 First Street, Ste. 3-137
Fort Myers, Florida 33901
Telephone: 239-461-2200
Fax: 239-461-2219
Email: chad.spraker@usdoj.gov
Lead Counsel

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on February 9, 2026, the foregoing document was sent via U.S. mail to the following:

Willian Alexander Vasquez Lopez
PRO SE
Glades County Detention Center
PO Box 39
Moore Haven, FL 33471

/s/ Chad C. Spraker
Assistant United States Attorney