

1 Tina Malek, Esq. (CSBN 265543)
MALEK LAW GROUP, APC
2 402 W. Broadway, Ste 1260
San Diego, CA 92101
3 Tel: 619-565-0600
Fax: 619-374-8573
4 tmalek@malek-law.com

5 Attorney for Petitioner

6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8

9 GABRIEL PEREZ VELASQUEZ,

10 Petitioner,

11 v.

12 Patrick, DIVVER, Field Office Director of
Enforcement and Removal Operations, San
13 Diego Field Office, Immigration and Customs
Enforcement; Todd M. LYONS, Acting
14 Director, U.S. Immigration and Customs
Enforcement; Kristi NOEM, Secretary, U.S.
15 Department of Homeland Security; U.S.
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
16 SECURITY; Pamela BONDI, U.S. Attorney
General; EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR
17 IMMIGRATION REVIEW; Christopher J.
LAROSE, Warden of Otay Mesa Detention
18 Facility,

19 Respondents.
20
21
22
23
24

Case No. '26CV0593 GPC JLB

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS**

1 INTRODUCTION

2 1. Petitioner, Gabriel Perez Velasquez, brings this petition for a writ of habeas
3 corpus to seek enforcement of their rights as members of the Bond Denial Class certified in
4 *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM (C.D. Cal.) Petitioner is in the
5 physical custody of Respondents at the Otay Mesa Detention Facility. He now faces unlawful
6 detention because the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Executive Office for
7 Immigration Review (EOIR) have refused to abide by the declaratory judgment issued on behalf
8 of the certified class in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*.

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

18 3. The declaratory judgment held that the Bond Denial Class members are detained
19 under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), and thus may not be denied consideration for release on bond under §
20 1225(b)(2)(A). *Maldonado Bautista*, 2025 WL 3289861, at *11.

21 4. On December 18, 2025, the Central District of California entered a final judgment
22 in *Maldonado Bautista*, certifying the nationwide class and declaring the policy of detaining
23 those individuals that entered the United States without inspection under § 1225(b)(2) unlawful.
24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

5. Nonetheless, the Executive Office for Immigration Review and its subagency the Immigration Court and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) have blatantly refused to abide by the declaratory relief and have unlawfully ordered that Petitioner be denied the opportunity to be released on bond.

6. Petitioner, Gabriel Perez Velasquez, is a member of the Bond Eligible Class, as he:

- a. does not have lawful status in the United States and is currently detained at the Otay Mesa Detention Facility. He was apprehended by immigration authorities On December 2, 2025 after his vehicle was stopped in Carlsbad, California
- b. entered the United States without inspection on or about 2001, nearly 25 years ago and was not apprehended upon arrival, *cf. id.*; and
- c. is not detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231.

7. After apprehending Petitioner on December 2, 2025, the DHS placed him in removal proceedings pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. DHS has charged Petitioner as being inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i), as someone who entered the United States without inspection.

8. The Court should expeditiously grant this petition.

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

10. Immigration judges have informed class members in bond hearings that they have been instructed by “leadership” that the declaratory judgment in *Maldonado Bautista* is not

1 controlling, even with respect to class members, and that instead IJs remain bound to follow the
2 agency's prior decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).

3 11. Because Respondents are detaining Petitioner in violation of the declaratory
4 judgment issued in *Maldonado Bautista*, the Court should accordingly order that within one day,
5 Respondent DHS must release Petitioner.

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

8 JURISDICTION

9 13. Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents. Petitioner is detained at the
10 Otay Mesa Detention Facility in San Diego, California.

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

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

16 VENUE

17 16. Pursuant to *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493-
18 500 (1973), venue lies in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California,
19 the judicial district in which Petitioner currently is detained.

20 17. Venue is also properly in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because
21 Respondents are employees, officers, and agencies of the United States, and because a
22 substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in the Southern
23 District of California.

24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

18. The Court should grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus “forthwith,” as the legal issues have already been resolved for class members in *Maldonado Bautista*.

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

PARTIES

20. Petitioner, Gabriel Perez Velasquez, is a citizen of Mexico who has been in immigration detention since December 2, 2025. After Petitioner was arrested in San Diego, California, ICE did not set bond. Petitioner did not request review of his custody by an IJ as any such request would be futile. The Court in *Maldonado Bautista* entered a final judgment specifically because it found “troubling” evidence that the Department of Justice issued a memorandum instructing Immigration Judges to disregard the federal court’s prior orders and “hold the position that *Yajure-Hurtado* remains good law.” This judicial finding confirms that administrative exhaustion is futile, as the agency has prejudged the issue in bad faith.

21. Respondent Patrick Divver (“Divver”) is the Director of the San Diego Field Office of ICE’s Enforcement and Removal Operations division. As such, Divver is Petitioner’s immediate custodian and is responsible for Petitioner’s detention and removal. He is named in his official capacity.

1 22. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland
2 Security. She is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the Immigration and
3 Nationality Act (INA), and oversees ICE, which is responsible for Petitioner's detention. Ms.
4 Noem has ultimate custodial authority over Petitioner and is sued in her official capacity.

5 23. Respondent Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is the federal agency
6 responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA, including the detention and removal of
7 noncitizens.

8 24. Respondent Pamela Bondi is the Attorney General of the United States. She is
9 responsible for the Department of Justice, of which the Executive Office for Immigration Review
10 and the immigration court system it operates is a component agency. She is sued in her official
11 capacity.

12 25. Respondent Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) is the federal
13 agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA in removal proceedings, including
14 for custody redeterminations in bond hearings.

15 26. Respondent Christopher LaRose ("LaRose") is the Senior Warden at the Otay
16 Mesa Detention Center as Warden of the, where Petitioner is detained. He has immediate
17 physical custody of Petitioner. He is sued in his official capacity.

18 **CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

19 **Violation of the INA:**

20 **Request for Relief Pursuant to *Maldonado Bautista***

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

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

DATED this 29 of January, 2026

Respectfully Submitted:

/s/ Tina Malek
Tina Malek
402 W. Broadway, Ste 1260
619-566-0600
CA Bar No. 265543
Counsel for Petitioner