

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

MANDEEP SINGH,

Petitioner,

v.

No.1:26-cv-210-MIS-JFR

JAMIE RAYE CARNES, et. al.,

Respondents.

RESPONSE TO PETITION

This Office represents Federal Respondents (“Respondents”) in this habeas corpus action, in which Petitioner challenges his detention by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”). On January 30, 2026, Petitioner filed a petition for habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Doc. 1. On January 30, 2026, the Court ordered the government to show cause why the petition should not be granted, with a response due within ten business days.¹ Doc. 4.

Respondents have carefully reviewed this petition and determined that the legal issues presented concern the statutory authority for ICE’s detention of Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(2)(A) or 1226(a), whether Petitioner is entitled to a bond hearing, and whether Petitioner must first exhaust his administrative remedies before applying to this Court. While reserving all rights, including the right to appeal, Respondents respectfully submit this abbreviated response 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 be happy to submit one upon request.

¹ Respondents acknowledge that this Response is not timely according to the Court’s order (Doc. 3). The Court may take judicial notice that the service process has recently changed on habeas matters in the District of New Mexico. Respondents did not willfully disregard the Court’s order for a response and respectfully request that this Response be considered on the merits.

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). However, Respondents acknowledge that this Court recently reached the opposite conclusion in *Duhan v. Noem*, Case No. 2:26-cv-00019-MIS-JFR, 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20895 (D.N.M. Feb. 2, 2026) on facts substantially similar to those currently before the Court. In a decision issued on February 2, 2026, this Court, following the rationale of other courts that have addressed the issue, including others in this District, concluded that the petitioner's detention was not governed by § 1225, and that his detention was instead pursuant to § 1226. *See Duhan v. Noem*. Specifically, the Court stated that "8 U.S.C. §1226(a) governs Petitioner's detention" and that habeas relief was proper because Petitioner's "continued detention without a bond hearing violates his Fifth Amendment right to due process." *Id.* 3.²

On the legal issue of which statute governs Petitioner's detention here—whether it is 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), or 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)—Respondents acknowledge that this Court's decision in *Duhan v. Noem*, would control the result here if the Court adheres to that decision, 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 reserves 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,

² Respondents further acknowledge that this Court entered a ruling in another case involving similar legal issues on January 13, 2026. *See Lopez-Romero v. Lyons*, Case No. 2:25-cv-01113-MIS-JHR, 2026 WL 92873 (D.N.M. Jan. 13, 2026).

the legal arguments presented in *Duhan v. Noem*,³⁴ and the Court can decide this issue without further briefing.

Finally, the government believes that this matter can be decided without a hearing. If, however, the Court determines that a hearing would be helpful, the government will attend and present Respondent's position.

Respectfully submitted,

TODD BLANCHE
Deputy Attorney General
RYAN ELLISON
First Assistant United States Attorney

/s/ Allison Shokes
ALLISON SHOKES
Assistant United States Attorney
201 Third Street NW, Suite 900
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102
(505) 346-7274; Fax (505) 346-7205
allison.shokes@usdoj.gov

³ Specifically, the government incorporates by reference all arguments raised in its opposition brief in *Duhan v. Noem*, Case No. 2:26-cv-00019-MIS-JFR, 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20895 (D.N.M. Feb. 2, 2026).

⁴ The Fifth Circuit recently addressed the same issue in which it held that individuals like the Petitioner are subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). See *Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi et al.*, --- F.4th---, 2026 WL 323330 (5th Cir. 2026). While Respondents recognize that the Fifth Circuit's holding is not binding on this Court, they nonetheless alert the Court to this decision as persuasive authority that may influence the Court to reconsider its position on this issue.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on February 16, 2026, I filed the foregoing pleading electronically through the CM/ECF system, which caused all parties and counsel of record to be served, as more fully reflected on the Notice of Electronic Filing.

/s/ Allison Shokes

ALLISON SHOKES

Assistant United States Attorney