UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 26-CV-20642-KMM

ADRIAN BONCULESCU, and
NAHUN ALEXANDER RODRIGUEZ RODRIGUEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

MIAMI ICE FIELD OFFICE
DIRECTOR *et al.*,

Respondents

_____/

RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

The Court has found that the factually unrelated cases of Adrian Bonculescu and Nahun Alexander Rodriguez Rodriguez involve common questions of law and fact. As such, the Court has ordered the consolidation of the case of Rodriguez Rodriguez with the case of Petitioner Bonculescu for all purposes. The Court designated this case as lead and has ordered the respondents to file one consolidated response in the lead case addressing both petitioners. Therefore, the respondents[1], by and through the undersigned Special Assistant United States Attorney, submit this response in opposition to the petitioners' habeas petitions. As demonstrated below, the Court should deny both petitions because the petitioners are subject to mandatory

[1] A writ of habeas corpus must "be directed to the person having custody of the person detained." 28 USC § 2243. In cases involving present physical confinement, the Supreme Court reaffirmed in *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426 (2004), that "the immediate custodian, not a supervisory official who exercises legal control, is the proper respondent." *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 439 (2004). Petitioner Bonculescu is currently detained at the Krome Detention Center. *See* Bonculescu's Petition at ¶ 5. The appropriate respondent is Assistant Field Officer Director Charles Parra. Petitioner Rodriguez-Rodriguez is currently detained at the Miami Federal Detention Center. *See* Rodriguez-Rodriguez's Petition at ¶ 1. The appropriate respondent is E.K. Carlton. All other respondents should be dismissed.

detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) and, therefore, detained pursuant to a valid statutory authority and ineligible for bond. For clarity, this response will refer to the petitioner in the lead case as "Bonculescu" and to the petitioner in the rider case as "Rodriguez".

I. INTRODUCTION

The petitioners challenge the legality of their mandatory detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). Specifically, the petitioners contend that section 1225(b)(2) does not apply to aliens who, like themselves, "previously entered [the United States] and are now residing in the United States." *See* Bonculescu at ¶ 6; *also see* Rodriguez at ¶ 5. Instead, the petitioners argue, such aliens are eligible for release on conditional parole or bond because their detention is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). *Id.* Based on these assertions, the petitioners seek habeas relief in this Court, arguing that the immigration judges incorrectly determined that they are ineligible for bond. *Id.* For support, they argue that their detention violates due process and the Immigration and Nationality Act. *Id.* For the reasons set forth below, their petitions should be denied.

II. BACKGROUND

As the Court has already recognized, the relevant facts of these two cases are similar. They are also not in dispute. Bonculescu, a Romanian citizen, entered the United States without inspection, admission or parole on March 14, 2021, was encountered by the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") the same day, detained, placed in removal proceedings pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a, and released on his own recognizance. *See* Bonculescu at ¶ 1, 28, Exh. 2, 8. He is charged under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i), as an alien present in the United States without being admitted or paroled or who arrived in the United States at any time or place other than as designated by the Attorney General. *See* Bonculescu at Exh. 4. Bonculescu has filed an application for asylum

based on his claimed fear of persecution against his family in Romania.[2] *See* Bonculescu at ¶ 3, Exh. 10. Rodriguez is a Honduran citizen who entered the United States years before Bonculescu, on November 24, 2017, but in same manner as him. *See* Rodriguez at ¶ 42, Exh. C. He was likewise encountered the same day, briefly detained and then released into the custody of his mother[3]. *Id.* at ¶ 44, 45. At the time, Rodriguez was not placed in removal proceedings because, although a Notice to Appear ("NTA") was issued upon his release, it was not filed with the Immigration Court. *Id.* at Exh. C.

Both petitioners had subsequent encounters with law enforcement. Shortly after his entry, Bonculescu was arrested and charged with Domestic Abuse Assault Causes Bodily Injury or Mental Illness, in violation of Iowa Code § 708.2A(2)(b)[4]. *See* Bonculescu at Exh. 9. On August

---

[2] At the time of his entry into the United States, Bonculescu was accompanied by his wife and their four minor children, two of whom were born in Italy and the other two in Germany. *See* Bonculescu at Exh. 6, Exh. 10.

[3] At the time of his entry, Rodriguez was determined to be an Unaccompanied Alien Child ("UAC"). *See* 6 U.S.C. § 279(g)(2), defining the term "unaccompanied alien child" as a child who – (A) has no lawful immigration status in the United States; (B) has not attained 18 years of age; and (C) with respect to whom –(i) there is no parent or legal guardian in the United States; or (ii) no parent or legal guardian in the United States is available to provide care and physical custody.

[4] If this Court disagrees with the respondents and orders an individualized bond hearing before the Immigration Judge pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226, the respondents will argue at that bond hearing that Bonculescu is subject to mandatory detention, pursuant to the Laken Riley Act ("LRA"), Pub. L. No. 119-1, which "mandates detention for noncitizens who (i) 'are inadmissible . . . and (ii) 'have been arrested for, charged with, or convicted of certain crimes.'" *Puga v. Assistant Field Off. Dir., Krome N. Serv. Processing Ctr.* No. 25-CV-24535, 2025 WL 2938369, at *5 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 15, 2025) (citing 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E)(i)–(ii)). In this case, Bonculescu, an alien, was "charged with [or was] arrested for . . . acts which constitute the essential elements of any burglary, theft, larceny, . . ., or any crime that results in death or serious bodily injury to another person." *See* TRA, Pub. L. No. 119-1, 139 Stat. 3. *See* INA § 236(c)(1)(E)(ii). Specifically, Bonculescu was arrested and charged with Domestic Abuse Assault Causes Bodily Injury or Mental Illness in violation of Iowa Code § 708.2A(2)(b). Iowa law defines serious bodily injury as one which does any one of the following: (1) creates a substantial risk of death; (2) causes serious permanent disfigurement; or (3) causes protracted loss or impairment of the function of any bodily member or organ. *See* Iowa Code § 702.18(1)(b). "Serious bodily injury" includes but is not limited to skull fractures or rib fractures. *Id.* at 702.18(2). For these reasons, if this

4, 2021, he pled guilty to and was convicted of a lesser offense of Disorderly Conduct. *Id.* Notwithstanding, Bonculescu did not come into DHS custody until November 29, 2025, following a traffic stop. *See* Exh. A (Form I-213). As for Rodriguez, he was encountered at a local jail following an arrest for Trespass Structure, Conveyance and Resisting/Obstruct Officer without Violence, in violation of Florida law.[5] *See* Exh. B (Criminal Record) On October 1, 2025, Rodriguez was convicted as charged. *Id.* Upon his release from local jail, DHS took Rodriguez into custody and this time placed him in removal proceedings pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. *See* Exh. C (Notice to Appear). The NTA charges Rodriguez both as an alien present in the United States without being admitted or paroled, under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A), and as an applicant for admission without valid entry documents, under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(7)(A)(i)(I). *Id.*

Lastly, their requests for bond redetermination were denied for lack of jurisdiction under *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). *See* Bonculescu at ¶ 6; Rodriguez at ¶ 49. Both remain detained pending removal proceedings; Boculescu is detained at the Krome Service processing Center, and Rodriguez at the Miami Federal Detention Center. *See* Bonculescu at ¶ 5; Rodriguez at ¶ 48. Bonculescu's habeas petition was filed on January 30, 2026, and Rodriguez's on February 3, 2026.

III. ARGUMENT[6]

Court finds that 8 U.S.C. § 1226 applies, the respondents will be seeking Bonculescu's detention before the Immigration Judge, pursuant to the LRA.

[5] Although Rodriguez's petition is silent on this arrest and charge, the respondents assume he does not dispute his criminal record.

[6] The government submits the following arguments in good faith, supported by decisions previously rendered in other cases in this District. *See, e.g., Morales v. Noem*, et al., Case No. 25-62598-CIV-SINGHAL, ECF No. 10 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 29, 2026) (concluding that habeas petitioner who entered the United States without inspection in 2004 is an "applicant for admission" governed by 8 U.S.C.

A. The Petitioners are Applicants for Admission subject to Detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and discretionary detention under § 1226(a) is Inapplicable as Clarified in the BIA's Decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*.

---

§ 1225(b) and rejecting petitioner's argument the government must grant a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226)); *Binzha Banchi v. Diaz et at.,* 25-62341-CIV (S.D. Fla. Feb. 2, 2026) (also concluding that a habeas petitioner in a similar fact pattern can be detained under § 1225(b)(2)). Nevertheless, the government acknowledges that Judges in this District have reached the opposite conclusion on the legal issues presented. *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., 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., 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)").

The petitioners are properly detained as applicants for admission subject to mandatory detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). *See, e.g., Iraheta Morales v. Noem*, et al., Case No. 25-62598-CIV-SINGHAL, ECF No. 10 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 29, 2026) (concluding that habeas petitioner who entered the United States without inspection in 2004 is an "applicant for admission" governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) and rejecting petitioner's argument the government must grant a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226)). "As with any question of statutory interpretation, [the] analysis begins with the plain language of the statute." *Jimenez v. Quarterman*, 555 U.S. 113, 118 (2009) (citing *Lamie v. U.S. Tr.*, 540 U.S. 526, 534 (2004)). Section 1225(a)(1) defines an "applicant for admission" as an "alien present in the United States who has not been admitted or who arrives in the United States (whether or not at a designated port of arrival . . .) . . . ." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1); *see Matter of Velasquez-Cruz*, 26 I&N Dec. 458, 463 n.5 (BIA 2014) ("[R]egardless of whether an alien who illegally enters the United States is caught at the border or inside the country, he or she will still be required to prove eligibility for admission.").

By its very definition, the term "applicant for admission" includes two categories of aliens: (1) arriving aliens, and (2) aliens present without admission. *See Dep't of Homeland Sec. v. Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 140 (2020) (explaining that "an alien who tries to enter the country illegally is treated as an 'applicant for admission'"); *Matter of Lemus*, 25 I&N Dec. 734, 743 (BIA 2012) ("Congress has defined the concept of an 'applicant for admission' in an unconventional sense, to include not just those who are expressly seeking permission to enter, but also those who are present in this country without having formally requested or received such permission . . . ."); *Matter of E-R-M- & L-R-M-*, 25 I&N Dec. 520, 523 (BIA 2011) (stating that "the broad category of applicants for admission . . . includes, *inter alia*, any alien present in the United States who has

not been admitted"). An arriving alien is defined, in pertinent part, as "an applicant for admission coming or attempting to come into the United States at a port-of-entry [("POE")] . . .." 8 C.F.R. §§ 1.2, 1001.1(q).

All aliens who are applicants for admission "shall be inspected by immigration officers." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 235.1(a) ("Application to lawfully enter the United States shall be made in person to an immigration officer at a U.S. [POE] when the port is open for inspection . . .."). An applicant for admission at a United States POE "must present whatever documents are required and must establish to the satisfaction of the inspecting officer that the alien is not subject to removal . . . and is entitled, under all of the applicable provisions of the immigration laws . . . to enter the United States." 8 C.F.R. § 235.1(f)(1); *see also* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(2)(A) (explaining that an applicant for admission has the burden to establish that he or she is clearly and beyond doubt entitled to be admitted and is not inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182 in removal proceedings pursuant to § 1229a). "An alien present in the United States who has not been admitted or paroled or an alien who seeks entry at other than an open, designated [POE] . . . is subject to the provisions of [8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)] and to removal under [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)] or [8 U.S.C. § 1229a]." 8 C.F.R. § 235.1(f)(2).

Here, the petitioners did not present themselves at a POE but instead entered the United States without having been admitted or paroled after inspection by an immigration officer. *See* Bonculescu at ¶ 1, 28, Exh. 4; *See* Rodriguez at ¶ 42, Exh. C. The petitioners are, therefore, aliens present in the United States without admission or parole and, consequently, applicants for admission. The decision issued by the Board of Immigration Appeals ("BIA") in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* is instructive here. In *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, the BIA rejected the alien's argument

that "because he has been residing in the interior of the United States for almost 3 years . . . he cannot be considered as 'seeking admission.'" 29 I&N Dec. at 221. The BIA determined that this argument "is not supported by the plain language of the INA" and creates a "legal conundrum." *Id.* If the alien "is not admitted to the United States (as he admits) but he is not 'seeking admission' (as he contends), then what is his legal status?" *Id.* (parentheticals in original). The BIA's decision is consistent not only with the plain language of § 1225(b)(2), but also with the Supreme Court's decision in *Jennings v. Rodriguez,* 583 U.S. 281 (2018), and subsequent caselaw post *Jennings*. Specifically, in *Jennings*, the Supreme Court explained that § 1225(b) applies to all applicants for admission, noting that the language of § 1225(b)(2) is "quite clear" and "unequivocally mandate[s]" detention. 583 U.S. at 300, 303.

Similarly, relying on *Jennings* and the plain language of §§ 1225 and 1226(a), the Attorney General, in *Matter of M-S-,* 27 I&N Dec. 509 (A.G. 2019), recognized that §§ 1225 and 1226(a) do not overlap but describe "different classes of aliens." 27 I&N Dec. at 516. The Attorney General also held—in an analogous context—that aliens present without admission or parole who are placed into expedited removal proceedings are detained under § 1225 even if later placed in § 1229a removal proceedings after establishing a credible fear of persecution or torture. *Id.* at 518-19; *see also* 8 § U.S.C. 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii) (providing that if an alien subject to expedited removal demonstrates a credible fear of persecution or torture, the alien "shall be detained" for further consideration of an asylum application in § 1229a removal proceedings).

Additionally, in *Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. 66 (BIA 2025), the BIA held that an alien who unlawfully entered the United States between POEs, was arrested and detained without a warrant while arriving, and was previously released from DHS custody pursuant to an 8 U.S.C. §

1182(d)(5)(A) parole is detained under § 1225(b) upon re-detention. 29 I&N Dec. at 70-71. This ongoing evolution of the law makes clear that all applicants for admission in various procedural postures are subject to detention under § 1225(b). *Cf. Niz-Chavez v. Garland*, 593 U.S. 155, 171 (2021) (stating that "no amount of policy-talk can overcome a plain statutory command"); *see generally Florida v. United States*, 660 F. Supp. 3d 1239, 1275 (N.D. Fla. 2023) (explaining that "the 1996 expansion of § 1225(b) to include illegal border crossers would make little sense if DHS retained discretion to apply § 1226(a) and release illegal border crossers whenever the agency saw fit"). *Florida's* conclusion "that § 1225(b)'s 'shall be detained' means what it says and . . . is a mandatory requirement . . . flows directly from *Jennings*." *Florida*, 660 F. Supp. 3d at 1273.

B. Petitioners are Applicants for Admission in 8 U.S.C. § 1229a Removal Proceedings and as such his Detention Pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) is Proper.

Both arriving aliens and aliens present without admission or parole, as applicants for admission, may be removed from the United States by, *inter alia*, expedited removal procedures under § 1225(b)(1) or removal proceedings before an immigration judge under § 1229a. §§ 1225(b)(1), (b)(2)(A). *See Jennings,* 583 U.S. at 287 (describing how "applicants for admission fall into one of two categories, those covered by § 1225(b)(1) and those covered by § 1225(b)(2)"). For aliens subject to expedited removal, immigration officers have discretion to apply expedited removal under § 1225(b)(1) or to initiate removal proceedings before an immigration judge under § 1229a. *See also Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. 66, 68 (BIA 2025) ("DHS may place aliens arriving in the United States in either expedited removal proceedings under [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)], or full removal proceedings under [8 U.S.C. § 1229a]" (citations omitted)).

The petitioners are currently in § 1229a removal proceedings and subject to detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A). *See* Bonculescu at Exh. 4; Exh. C. Hence, under § 1225(b)(2)(A), "an alien who

is an applicant for admission" "*shall be detained* for a proceeding under [8 U.S.C. § 1229a]" "if the examining immigration officer determines that [the] alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) (emphasis added); 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(3) (providing that an alien placed into § 1229a removal proceedings in lieu of expedited removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1225 "shall be detained" pursuant to § 1225(b)(2)). As the Supreme Court observed in *Jennings*, nothing in § 1225(b)(2)(A) "says anything whatsoever about bond hearings." 583 U.S. at 297. Further, there is no textual basis for arguing that § 1225(b)(2)(A) applies only to arriving aliens as no provision therein refers to "arriving aliens," or limits that paragraph to arriving aliens. Where Congress means for a rule to apply only to "arriving aliens," it uses that specific term of art or similar phrasing. *See, e.g.*, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182(a)(9)(A)(i), 1225(c)(1).

C. Section 1226 does Not Impact the Detention Authority that Governs with respect to Applicants for Admission in removal proceedings.

Section 1226(a) is the applicable detention authority for aliens who have been admitted and are subject to removal proceedings under § 1229 and this does not impact the directive in § 1225(b)(2)(A) that "if the examining immigration officer determines that an alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, the alien shall be detained for a proceedings under [8 U.S.C. § 1229a]," § 1225(b)(2)(A). As the Supreme Court explained, § 1226(a) "applies to aliens already present in the United States" and "creates a default rule for those aliens by permitting—but not requiring—the [Secretary] to issue warrants for their arrest and detention pending removal proceedings." *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 289, 303; *Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. at 70; *see also M-S-*, 27 I&N Dec. at 516 (describing 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) as a "permissive" detention authority separate from the "mandatory" detention authority under 8 U.S.C. § 1225).

Generally, such aliens may be released on bond or their own recognizance, also known as "conditional parole." 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a); *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 303, 306. Section 1226(a) does not, however, confer the *right* to be released on bond; rather, both DHS and immigration judges have broad discretion in determining whether to release an alien on bond as long as the alien establishes that he or she is not a flight risk or a danger to the community. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1(c)(8), 1236.1(c)(8); *Matter of Guerra*, 24 I&N Dec. 37, 39 (BIA 2006); *Matter of Adeniji*, 22 I&N Dec. 1102 (BIA 1999). To interpret § 1225(b)(2)(A) as not applying to all applicants for admission would render it meaningless. As explained above, Congress expanded § 1225(b) in 1996 to apply to a broader category of aliens, including those aliens who crossed the border illegally. There would have been no need for Congress to make such a change if § 1226(a) was meant to apply to aliens present without admission.

D. Applicants for Admission may Only be Released from Detention on an 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5) Parole.

DHS has the exclusive authority to temporarily release on parole "any alien applying for admission to the United States" on a "case-by-case basis for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit." 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5); *see* 8 C.F.R. § 212.5(b). In *Jennings*, the Supreme Court placed significance on the fact that § 1182(d)(5) is the specific provision that authorizes temporary release from detention under § 1225(b). 583 U.S. at 300.

Parole, like an admission, is a factual occurrence. *See Hing Sum*, 602 F.3d at 1098; *Matter of Roque-Izada*, 29 I&N Dec. 106 (BIA 2025) (treating whether an alien was paroled as a question of fact). The parole authority under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5) is "delegated solely to the Secretary of Homeland Security." *Matter of Castillo-Padilla*, 25 I&N Dec. 257, 261 (BIA 2010); *see* 8 C.F.R. § 212.5(a). Thus, neither the BIA nor immigration judges have authority to parole an alien into the

United States under § 1182(d)(5). *Castillo-Padilla*, 25 I&N Dec. at 261; *see also Matter of Arrabally and Yerrabelly*, 25 I&N Dec. 771, 777 n.5 (BIA 2002) (indicating that "parole authority [under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)] is now exercised exclusively by the DHS" and "reference to the Attorney General in [8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)] is thus deemed to refer to the Secretary of Homeland Security"). Lastly, because DHS has exclusive jurisdiction to parole an alien into the United States, the manner in which DHS exercises its parole authority may not be reviewed by an immigration judge or the BIA. *Castillo-Padilla*, 25 I&N Dec. at 261; *see Matter of Castellon*, 17 I&N Dec. 616, 620 (BIA 1981) (noting that the BIA does not have authority to review the way DHS exercises its parole authority).

E. Petitioner failed to Exhaust his Administrative Remedies

Lastly, the Court should dismiss the petitions for writ of habeas corpus for failure to exhaust administrative remedies. A habeas petitioner must normally exhaust administrative remedies before seeking federal court intervention. The exhaustion requirement "aims to provide the agency with a chance to correct its own errors, 'protect [] the authority of administrative agencies,' and otherwise conserve judicial resources by 'limiting interference in agency affairs, developing the factual record to make judicial review more efficient, and resolving issues to render judicial review unnecessary." *Beharry v. Ashcroft*, 329 F.3d 51, 62 (2d Cir. 2003) (Sotomayor, J.).

Here, the petitioners argue "exhaustion would be futile" because they have already requested bond from an immigration court and anticipate an unfavorable outcome in the event of an appeal. *See* Bonculescu at ¶ 20-24; *see generally* Rodriguez at ¶ 4. Additionally, the petitioners argue that there is "no meaningful opportunity to challenge the constitutionality of [their] detention through any available administrative process." *Id.*

By regulation, the BIA has authority to review immigration judges' custody determinations. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.1(b)(7), 1003.19(f), 1003.38, 1236.1(d)(3). An Immigration Judge's denial is a decision appealable to the BIA who "plainly has jurisdiction to determine whether an Immigration Judge properly denied an alien detainee's motion for bond redetermination." *J.G. v. Warden, Irwin Cnty. Det. Ctr.*, 501 F. Supp. 3d 1331, 1349 (M.D. Ga. 2020) (holding that habeas petitioner failed exhaust his administrative remedies in appealing an Immigration Judge's denial of bond redetermination to the BIA). As set forth in the EOIR Policy Memo 25-45 the BIA and immigration judges can consider constitutional challenges to the INA – such could include a Fifth Amendment challenge to the BIA's interpretation of 235(b)(2) in *Yajure Hurtado*. *See* https://www.justice.gov/eoir/eoir-policy-manual/memoranda-pm-list. Here, the petitioners' removal proceedings are pending, thus they have not availed themselves of the administrative process and remedies available to them before proceeding to this Court in hopes of shopping for a more favorable forum. Accordingly, their petitions should be dismissed for failure to exhaust administrative remedies.

F. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) Bars Review of Petitioners' Claims.

Section 1252(g) categorically bars jurisdiction over "*any* cause or claim by or on behalf of any alien *arising from* the decision or action by the [Secretary of Homeland Security] to *commence proceedings*, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders against any alien." 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) (emphasis added). The Secretary of Homeland Security's decision to *commence removal proceedings*, including the decision to detain an alien pending such removal proceedings, squarely falls within this jurisdictional bar. In other words, detention clearly "aris[es] from" the decision to commence removal proceedings against an alien. *See Alvarez v. ICE*, 818 F.3d 1194, 1203 (11th

Cir. 2016) ("By its plain terms, [§ 1252(g)] bars us from questioning ICE's discretionary decisions to commence removal" and also to review "ICE's decision to take [plaintiff] into custody and to detain him during removal proceedings"); *Tazu v. Att'y Gen. U.S.*, 975 F.3d 292, 298 (3d Cir. 2020) ("The text of § 1252(g)... strips us of jurisdiction to review... [T]o perform or complete a removal, the [Secretary of Homeland Security] must exercise [her] discretionary power to detain an alien for a few days. That detention does not fall within some other part of the deportation process.") (cleaned up) (internal quotations and citations omitted); *Valencia-Mejia v. United States*, No. CV 08–2943 CAS (PJWx), 2008 WL 4286979, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2008) ("The decision to detain plaintiff until his hearing before the Immigration Judge *arose from* this decision to commence proceedings[.]") (emphasis added); *Wang v. United States*, No. CV 10-0389 SVW (RCx), 2010 WL 11463156, at *6 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 18, 2010) (citing *Khorrami v. Rolince*, 493 F. Supp. 2d 1061 (N.D. Ill. 2007) ("[Plaintiff's] detention necessarily *arises from* the decision to initiate removal proceedings against him.") (emphasis added); *Herrera-Correra v. United States*, No. CV 08-2941 DSF (JCx), 2008 WL 11336833, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2008) (citing *Sissoko v. Rocha*, 509 F.3d 947, 949 (9th Cir. 2007) ("The [Secretary] may arrest the alien against whom proceedings are commenced and detain that individual until the conclusion of those proceedings. ... Thus, an alien's detention throughout this process *arises from* the [Secretary]'s decision to commence proceedings []" and review of claims arising from such detention is barred under § 1252(g)) (emphasis added). Put in the Supreme Court's words, detention pending removal is a "specification" of the decision to commence proceedings. *See Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.* ("*AADC*"), 525 U.S. 471, 485 n.9 (1999) ("§ 1252(g) covers" a "specification of the decision to 'commence proceedings'").

As such, judicial review of the petitioners' claims is barred by § 1252(g).

G. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9) Bars Review of Petitioners' claims.

Under § 1252(b)(9), "judicial review of all questions of law . . . including interpretation and application of statutory provisions . . . arising from any action taken . . . to remove an alien from the United States" is only proper before the appropriate court of appeals in the form of a petition for review of a final removal order. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9); *Reno v. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 483 (1999) ("*AADC*"). Section 1252(b)(9) is an "unmistakable 'zipper' clause" that "channels judicial review of all [claims arising from deportation proceedings]" to a court of appeals in the first instance. *Id.*; *see Lopez v. Barr*, No. CV 20-1330 (JRT/BRT), 2021 WL 195523, at *2 (D. Minn. Jan. 20, 2021) (citing *Nasrallah v. Barr*, 590 U.S. 573, 579–80 (2020)). Moreover, § 1252(a)(5) provides that a petition for review is the exclusive means for judicial review of immigration proceedings. Notwithstanding any other provision of law (statutory or non-statutory), . . . a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals in accordance with this section shall be the sole and exclusive means for judicial review of an order of removal entered or issued under any provision of this chapter, except as provided in subsection (e) [concerning aliens not admitted to the United States]. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(5). "Taken together, § 1252(a)(5) and § 1252(b)(9) mean that *any* issue—whether legal or factual—arising from *any* removal-related activity can be reviewed *only* through the [petition-for-review] process." *J.E.F.M. v. Lynch*, 837 F.3d 1026, 1031 (9th Cir. 2016) (emphasis in original); *see id.* at 1035 ("§§ 1252(a)(5) and [(b)(9)] channel review of all claims, including policies-and-practices challenges . . . whenever they 'arise from' removal proceedings"); *accord Ruiz v.*

Mukasey, 552 F.3d 269, 274 n.3 (2d Cir. 2009) (only when the action is "unrelated to any removal action or proceeding" is it within the district court's jurisdiction); *cf. Xiao Ji Chen v. U.S. Dep't of Justice*, 434 F.3d 144, 151 n.3 (2d Cir. 2006) (a "primary effect" of the REAL ID Act is to "limit all aliens to one bite of the apple" (internal quotation marks omitted)).

Critically, "[§] 1252(b)(9) is a judicial channeling provision, not a claim-barring one." *Aguilar v. ICE*, 510 F.3d 1, 11 (1st Cir. 2007). Indeed, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(D) provides that "[n]othing . . . in any other provision of this chapter . . . shall be construed as precluding review of constitutional claims or questions of law raised upon a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals in accordance with this section." *See also Ajlani v. Chertoff*, 545 F.3d 229, 235 (2d Cir. 2008) ("[J]urisdiction to review such claims is vested exclusively in the courts of appeals[.]"). The petition-for-review process before the court of appeals ensures that aliens have a proper forum for claims arising from their immigration proceedings and "receive their day in court." *J.E.F.M.*, 837 F.3d at 1031–32 (internal quotations omitted); *see also Rosario v. Holder*, 627 F.3d 58, 61 (2d Cir. 2010) ("The REAL ID Act of 2005 amended the [INA] to obviate . . . Suspension Clause concerns" by permitting judicial review of "nondiscretionary" BIA determinations and "all constitutional claims or questions of law.").

In evaluating the reach of subsections (a)(5) and (b)(9), the Second Circuit explained that jurisdiction turns on the substance of the relief sought. *Delgado v. Quarantillo*, 643 F.3d 52, 55 (2d Cir. 2011). Those provisions divest district courts of jurisdiction to review both direct and indirect challenges to removal orders, including decisions to detain for purposes of removal or for proceedings. *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 294–95 (section 1252(b)(9) includes challenges to the "decision to detain [an alien] in the first place or to seek removal[.]"). Here, the petitioners

challenge the decision and action to detain them, which arises from DHS's decision to commence removal proceedings, and is thus an "action taken . . . to remove [them] from the United States." *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9); *see also, e.g.*, *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 294–95; *Velasco Lopez v. Decker*, 978 F.3d 842, 850 (2d Cir. 2020) (finding that 8 U.S.C. § 1226(e) did not bar review in that case because the petitioner did not challenge "his initial detention"); *Saadulloev v. Garland*, No. 3:23-CV-00106, 2024 WL 1076106, at *3 (W.D. Pa. Mar. 12, 2024) (recognizing that there is no judicial review of the threshold detention decision, which flows from the government's decision to "commence proceedings"). As such, the Court lacks jurisdiction over this action. The reasoning in *Jennings* outlines why the petitioners' claims cannot be reviewed by the Court.

While holding that it was unnecessary to comprehensively address the scope of § 1252(b)(9), the Supreme Court in *Jennings* provided guidance on the types of challenges that may fall within the scope of § 1252(b)(9). *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 293–94. The Court found that "§1252(b)(9) [did] not present a jurisdictional bar" in situations where "respondents . . . [were] not challenging the decision to detain them in the first place." *Id.* at 294–95. In this case, the petitioners *do* challenge the government's decision to detain them in the first place. Though the Petitioner frames his challenge as relating to detention authority, rather than a challenge to DHS's decision to detain him in the first instance, such creative framing does not evade the preclusive effect of § 1252(b)(9).

The fact that the petitioners are challenging the basis upon which they are detained is enough to trigger § 1252(b)(9) because "detention *is* an 'action taken . . . to remove' an alien." *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 319 (Thomas, J., concurring); 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9). The Court should dismiss the petitioners' claims for lack of jurisdiction under § 1252(b)(9). The petitioners must

present their claims before the appropriate court of appeals because they challenge the government's decision or action to detain them, which must be raised before a court of appeals, not this Court. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9).

H. CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, the petitions should be dismissed because detention is lawful under § 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) and the petitioners have failed to exhaust their administrative remedies before seeking relief from the Court. Additionally, given that the respondents are not the petitioners' immediate custodians, they must be dismissed as parties.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON A. READING QUIÑONES
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Defendant's Counsel:

/s/ Michele S. Vigilance

Michele S. Vigilance
Assistant U.S. Attorney
Federal Bar ID No. 5502091
99 NE 4th Street
Miami, Fl. 33132
(305) 961 9387
Email: michele.vigilance@usdoj.gov