

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No. 26-CV-60243-DSL

MAYCON SOSA-MORALES,

Petitioner,

v.

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, U.S.
Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”)
Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”)
Enforcement and Removal Operations (“ERO”)
Miami Field Office; and DIRECTOR, U.S.
DHS ICE ERO Miami Field Office,

Respondents.

RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Respondents hereby respond to the Court’s Order to Show Cause. [ECF No. 4].

Petitioner Maycon Sosa-Morales (“Petitioner”) challenges his detention by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”). On January 29, 2026, Petitioner filed a petition for habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The Court has ordered Respondents to show cause why the petition should not be granted.

Respondents have carefully reviewed this petition and determined that the legal issues presented concern the statutory authority for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement’s (“ICE”) detention of Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(2)(A) or 1226(a) and whether Petitioner is entitled to a bond hearing. While reserving all rights, including the right to appeal, Respondents respectfully submit this abbreviated response to the Court’s Order to Show Cause in lieu of a formal responsive memorandum of law to preserve the legal issues, to conserve judicial and party

resources, and to expedite the Court's consideration of this matter. If the Court prefers to receive a formal memorandum of law, Respondents will submit one upon request.

It is Respondents' position that Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b), because he was present in the United States without being admitted or paroled. *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216, 228 (BIA 2025); *Morales v. Noem*, et al., No. 25-62598-CIV SINGHAL, ECF No. 10 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 29, 2026). *See Exhibit A*, hereto.

However, the government acknowledges that some Judges in this District have reached the opposite conclusion. *See, e.g., Aguilar Merino v. Ripa*, No. 25-23845-CIV-MARTINEZ, 2025 WL 2941609, at *3, 8 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 15, 2025) (“§ 1226(a), not § 1225(b)(2), governs Petitioner's detention”); *Gil-Paulino v. Sec'y of the U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, 25-24292-CIV-WILLIAMS, ECF No. 41 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 10, 2025) (“§ 1226 governs Petitioner's detention”); *Hernandez Alvarez v. Acting Warden Roger Morris*, et al., Case No. 25-24806-CIV-WILLIAMS, ECF No. 6 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 27, 2025) (agreeing with petitioner that “detention is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), which allows for the release of noncitizens on bond . . . not § 1225(b)(2), applicable to noncitizen “applicant[s] for admission” to the United States.); *Cerro Perez v. Parra*, et al., Case No. 25-24820-CIV-WILLIAMS, ECF No. 9 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 27, 2025) (same); *Alvarez Puga v. Assistant Field Office Director Krome*, et al., No. 25-24535-CIV-ALTONAGA (S.D. Fla. Oct. 15, 2025) (concluding that “prudential exhaustion requirements are excused for futility” and finding that “section 1226(a) and its implementing regulations govern Petitioner's detention, not section 1225(b)(2)(A)”); *Zamora Policarpo v. Parra*, Case No. 25-25236-CIV-COHN, ECF No. 8 (S.D. Fla. Dec. 22, 2025) (finding good cause to excuse Petitioner's failure to exhaust administrative remedies where it is evident the BIA will reject Petitioner's request for a bond hearing or release and that Petitioner is subject to detention under § 1226(a) and entitled to a bond hearing before an

immigration judge); *Penagos Quintero v. Ripa*, et al., Case No. 25-25746-CIV-BECERRA, ECF NO.14 (Jan. 5, 2026) (concluding that jurisdiction is not barred by 8 U.S.C. § 1252, exhaustion was not required, and that the petitioner’s detention is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), not 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)); *Martinez v. Field Off. Dir.*, No. 25-26026-CIV-LEIBOWITZ, ECF No. 7 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 14, 2026) (“Pending the Eleventh Circuit’s resolution of this issue, the Court continues to side with the clear weight of existing authority in finding that Petitioner here is entitled to a prompt, individualized bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)"); *Espinal Encarnacion v. ICE Field Office Director*, et al., Case No. 25-61898-CIV-DAMIAN, ECF No. 29 (Dec. 23, 2025) (“this Court finds that 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and its implementing regulations govern Petitioner’s detention, and not Section 1225(b)"); *Ocegueda Gonzalez v. Noem*, et al., Case No. 25-62261-CIV-MIDDLEBROOKS/AGUSTIN-BIRCH, ECF No. 25 (Dec. 23, 2025) (“Having concluded that Petitioner’s detention is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), Petitioner is entitled to an individualized bond hearing before an immigration judge.”); *Acosta v. Ripa*, et. al., Case No. 25-62360-CIV-DIMITROULEAS, ECF No. 19 at 7 (S.D. Fla. Dec. 26, 2025) (“§ 1226(a) and its implementing regulations govern Petitioner’s detention, not § 1225(b)(2)(A)"); and *Fuentes Granados v. Secretary of Homeland Security*, Case No. 26-60020-CIV-SMITH, ECF No. 7 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 27, 2026) (“Petitioner is being unlawfully detained due to his improper classification as “an alien who is an applicant for admission” pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)[;] . . . Petitioner’s proper classification is a detainee pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)”).

Respondents are appealing the judgment that 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), rather than 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), governs detention under the facts presented in the cases above appealing to the Eleventh Circuit in *Hernandez Alvarez v. Warden, Federal Detention Center Miami*, et al., No. 25-14065 (11th Cir.) and *Cerro Perez v. Assistant Field Office Director*, et al., No. 25-14075 (11th Cir.). Until

the foregoing appeals are resolved, however, Respondents acknowledge that this Court's decision in *Ocampo Fernandez v. Ripa*, 25-24981-CIV-LEIBOWITZ (S.D. Fla. Nov. 25, 2025), among others, would control the result here if the Court adheres to those decisions, as the facts are not materially distinguishable for purposes of the Court's decision on the legal issue of which statutory provision authorizes Petitioner's detention.

Thus, while Respondents do not consent to issuance of the writ and reserve all rights, including the right to appeal, and to conserve judicial and party resources while expediting the Court's consideration of this case, Respondents hereby rely upon, and incorporate by reference, the legal arguments they presented in *Ocampo Fernandez v. Ripa*, 25-24981-CIV-LEIBOWITZ (S.D. Fla. Nov. 25, 2025),¹ and the Court can decide this issue without further briefing. However, as noted above, should the Court prefer to receive a formal opposition brief in this matter, the Respondents will file such a brief upon the Court's request.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON A. REDING QUIÑONES
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

By: /s/ Alicia H. Welch
ALICIA H. WELCH
ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEY
Fla. Bar No. 100431
99 N.E. 4th Street, 3rd Floor
Miami, Florida 33132
Telephone: (305) 961-9455
E-mail: Alicia.Welch@usdoj.gov

Counsel for Respondents

¹ Specifically, Respondents incorporate by reference all arguments raised in its opposition brief in *Ocampo Fernandez v. Ripa*, 25-24981-CIV-LEIBOWITZ, ECF No. 13 (S.D. Fla.).