

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Edison Isaac QUITIO GUASCO

Petitioner,

v.

Pamela BONDI, in her official capacity as
Attorney General of the United States;

Kristi NOEM, in her official capacity as
Secretary of the U.S. Department of
Homeland Security;

Todd LYONS, in his official capacity as
Acting Director of Immigration and Customs
Enforcement;

David EASTERWOOD, in his official
capacity as Acting Director, St. Paul Field
Office, Immigration and Customs
Enforcement;

Respondents.

Case No. 26-cv-887

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS PURSUANT
TO 28 U.S.C. § 2241**

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner, Edison Isaac Quito Guasco, is a non-citizen from Ecuador who entered the United States in approximately December of 2021. At the time of his entry he was not apprehended by immigration officials. He was apprehended and detained by immigration officials within the interior of the United States in Spring Lake Park, Minnesota on January 29, 2026. The way that the immigration officers stopped his car to arrest him was dangerous as they made vehicle to vehicle contact in order to stop Petitioner's car and arrest him. To Petitioner's knowledge, no warrant was issued by immigration officials for his arrest.
2. In light of the information and belief that ICE has moved other petitioners out of the District of Minnesota, this petition also requests that the Court specifically enjoin Respondents from moving Petitioner outside of the District of Minnesota in the Order to Show Cause and if he has already been moved out of the district for Respondents to return him to Minnesota. For this injunction to be included in the Order to Show Cause would avoid the repetitive briefing and strain on the Court's resources presented by a motion for a temporary restraining order.
3. Respondents have erroneously adopted the position that an individual in Petitioner's circumstances is detained under the mandatory-detention provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1225 as an "applicant for admission." *See Jose J.O.E. v. Bondi*, 797 F. Supp. 3d 957, 963 (D. Minn. Aug. 27, 2025) (discussing ICE guidance issued on July 8, 2025 "revisit[ing] its legal position on detention and release authorities" and determining that 8 U.S.C. § 1225, rather than 8 U.S.C. § 1226, "is the applicable

immigration detention authority for all applicants for admission”); *see also Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216, 219-20 (BIA 2025) (reiterating Respondents’ broad reinterpretation of the INA’s provisions related to custody status).

4. Because Petitioner has been present in the United States since December 2021, Respondents cannot lawfully detain him under the mandatory detention provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1225, as an “applicant for admission.”
5. Petitioner’s detention on this basis violates the plain language of the INA. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to individuals like Petitioner who previously entered and are now residing within the interior of the United States. Instead, such individuals are subject to detention, if at all, only 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), which allows for release on conditional parole or bond. However, the appropriate remedy in this case is immediate release insofar as the justification for Petitioner’s detention proposed by Respondents is unlawful.
6. Respondents’ new legal interpretation of § 1226(a) is plainly contrary to the statutory framework of the INA and also contrary to decades of agency practice of instead applying § 1226(a) to individuals like Petitioner.
7. Accordingly, Petitioner seeks a writ of habeas corpus ordering his immediate release or in the alternative requiring Respondents to hold a custody redetermination hearing, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226, within seven days. Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court order Respondents to show cause why this Petition should not be granted within three days. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2243.

II. CUSTODY

8. On information and belief, Petitioner is currently being detained at the ICE/ERO office at Fort Snelling, MN. As of January 29, 2026 his family was told that he was at Fort Snelling. As of the afternoon of January 30, 2026, the ICE detainee locator does not reveal any location for Petitioner.

III. JURISDICTION & VENUE

9. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question); 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus); and Art. I, § 9, cl. 2 of the U.S. Constitution (Suspension Clause). Federal question jurisdiction arises under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. §§ 1101-1524) and the United States Constitution.
10. This Court may grant relief to Petitioner pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 *et seq.* (habeas corpus); 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.* (Declaratory Judgment Act); 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act); and the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(e)(2).
11. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241, 1391(b), and 1391(e). Venue is proper because Petitioner is in Respondents' custody in the District of Minnesota. Venue is also proper in this district because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to Petitioner's claims occurred in this district, where Petitioner is now in Respondent's custody. Venue is also proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because Respondents are employees, officers, and agencies of the United States.

IV. PARTIES

12. Petitioner, Edison Isaac Quicio Guasco, is 25-year-old man of Ecuadorian citizenship who has been present in the United States since December of 2021. Petitioner was detained within the interior of the United States, in Spring Lake Park, Minnesota, on January 29, 2026. On information and belief, Petitioner is currently being detained at the ICE/ERO office at Fort Snelling, MN.
13. Respondent Pamela Bondi is sued in her official capacity as the U.S. Attorney General. As Attorney General, she has authority over the Department of Justice and is charged with faithfully administering the immigration laws of the United States.
14. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. She is sued in her official capacity. As head of the DHS, Respondent Noem is responsible for overseeing the enforcement of federal immigration policies, including those that resulted in the detention of Petitioner. Secretary Noem is therefore a legal custodian of Petitioner.
15. Respondent Todd Lyons is the Acting Director of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). He is sued in his official capacity. As the head of ICE, he is responsible for decisions related to the detention and removal of certain noncitizens, including Petitioner. As such, he is a legal custodian of Petitioner.
16. Respondent David Easterwood is the Director of the St. Paul Field Office of ICE's Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) division. He is sued in his official capacity. As head of the St. Paul ERO Field Office, Respondent

Easterwood is responsible for Petitioner's detention and is a legal custodian of Petitioner.

V. REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

17. This Court must grant the petition for a writ of habeas corpus or order Respondents to show cause "forthwith," unless Petitioner is not entitled to relief. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If an order to show cause is issued, Respondents must file a return "within three days unless for good cause additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is allowed." *Id.*

18. 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) (citation omitted). "The writ of habeas corpus, challenging illegality of detention, is reduced to a sham if the trial courts do not act within a reasonable time." *Jones v. Shell*, 572 F.2d 1278, 1280 (8th Cir. 1978).

19. Due to the nature of this proceeding, Petitioner respectfully asks this Court to expedite proceedings as necessary and practicable for justice.

VI. EXHAUSTION OF REMEDIES

20. Further administrative exhaustion is unnecessary in this case as it would be futile. *See, e.g., Eliseo A.A. v. Olson*, No. 25-3381, 2025 WL 2886729, at *7 (D. Minn. Oct. 8, 2025) ("[E]xhaustion serves no purpose where the administrative body lacks jurisdiction or capacity to resolve the claim.").

21. It would be futile for Petitioner to seek a custody redetermination hearing before an Immigration Judge because of the decision issued by the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) in *Yajure Hurtado*, which holds that anyone who entered the United States without inspection is now considered an “application for admission” who is “seeking admission” and therefore subject to the INA’s mandatory-detention provision under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). 29 I&N Dec. 216; *see also Eliseo A.A. v. Olson*, 2025 WL 2886729, at *7 (D. Minn. Oct. 8, 2025) (“[F]urther administrative review would be futile in light of the BIA’s recent decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, . . . which upheld DHS’s new § 1225 policy and held that immigration judges ‘lack authority to hear bond requests or to grant bond to aliens who are present in the United States without admission.’ Where the agency has already adopted a definitive position, exhaustion serves no purpose.” (citation omitted)).

22. Further, despite the recent certification of a bond-eligible class in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, 2025 WL 3288403, at *9 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2025), which provides declaratory relief by providing that Immigration Judges have jurisdiction over bond hearings in cases similar to Petitioner’s, despite *Yajure Hurtado*, Petitioner is aware on information and belief that Immigration Judges across the country continue to follow the reasoning of *Yajure Hurtado* in continuing to deny others similarly situated to him the opportunity for a bond hearing due to their manner of entry.

23. Additionally, neither an immigration judge nor the Board of Immigration Appeals can rule on a petitioner's constitutional claims. *See Matter of Cruz de Ortiz*, 25 I&N Dec. 601, 605 (BIA 2011) (observing that neither the BIA nor Immigration Judges have authority to rule on the constitutionality of the statutes they administer); *Matter of C-*, 20 I&N Dec. 529, 532 (BIA 1992) (“[I]t is settled that the immigration judge and this Board lack jurisdiction to rule upon the constitutionality of the [Immigration and Nationality] Act and the regulations.”).

VII. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

24. Petitioner, Edison Isaac Quicio Guasco, is 25-year-old man of Ecuadorian citizenship.
25. Petitioner has resided in the United States since December of 2021.
26. When Petitioner arrived to the United States in December 2021, he was not detained by immigration officials.
27. He was detained by immigration officials on January 30, 2026 in Spring Lake Park, Minnesota. To Petitioner's knowledge, there was no warrant for his arrest.
28. Petitioner is being detained by ICE at Fort Snelling, MN or at a different unknown location – his last known location is Fort Snelling, MN as of late in the day on January 29, 2026.
29. Respondents now contend, capriciously and in further violation of the Petitioner's constitutional and statutory rights, that she is subject to mandatory

detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and thus ineligible for bond, or even a bond hearing.

VIII. LEGAL BACKGROUND

30. A writ of habeas corpus permits federal courts to order a petitioner released from custody where the petitioner's detention is in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States. 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3); *Mayamu K. v. Bondi*, No. 25-3035, 2025 WL 3641819, at *2 (D. Minn. Oct. 20, 2025).
31. As relevant here, the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1101-1524, describes two means of handling the custody and potential removal of a noncitizen under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).
32. First, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) authorizes—but does not mandate—the detention of noncitizens who have been placed in standard removal proceedings. *See* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1226(a) (describing discretionary detention pending a removal decision); 1229a (describing removal proceedings). Individuals in § 1226(a) detention are generally entitled to a custody-redetermination hearing (commonly known as a “bond hearing”) at the outset of their detention. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19(a), 1236.1(d). The text of § 1226 explicitly applies to noncitizens charged as inadmissible, which includes those who entered without inspection and were subsequently charged with certain criminal offenses. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c). While an exception to the general rule, subparagraph (c)'s reference to such individuals makes clear that, in the context of the entire statutory scheme, such people are afforded a bond hearing under subsection (a) so long as they do not fall within the class of “criminal aliens”

set forth in subsection (c). “[W]hen Congress creates ‘specific exceptions’ to a statute’s applicability, it ‘proves’ that absent those exceptions, the statute generally applies.” *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239, 1256-57 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 24, 2025) (citing *Shady Grove Orthopedic Assocs. v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 559 U.S. 393, 400 (2010) (adopting this logic in analyzing the existence of exceptions to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 23 as evidence of the rule’s general applicability)).

33. In addition, the Refugee Act, which is codified in various sections of the INA, broadly affords a noncitizen “who is physically present in the United States or who arrives in the United States,” like Petitioner, a right to apply for asylum. 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1); Refugee Act of 1980, § 101(a), Pub. L. No. 96-212, 94 Stat. 102 (1980). The INA guarantees to noncitizens in standard removal proceedings who apply for asylum and other relief procedural rights that reduce the risk of an erroneous decision. *E.g.*, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1229a(b)(4)(A), 1362 (right to legal counsel); 8 U.S.C. § 1148(b)(1)(B) (right to present supporting evidence and to challenge through cross-examination adverse evidence during a full adversarial hearing before an immigration judge); 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(6)-(7) (right to seek reconsideration or reopening of an adverse decision); 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(5) (right to appeal an adverse decision of an immigration judge to the Board of Immigration Appeals); 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b) (right to appeal an adverse decision of the Board to a federal circuit court of appeals). These rights are guaranteed to noncitizens

seeking asylum under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution. *See Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 306 (1993).

34. The second relevant means of detention is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1225, which provides for mandatory detention of noncitizens subject to expedited removal under § 1225(b)(1) and for other recent arrivals seeking admission under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). Respondents treat noncitizens subject to mandatory detention under § 1225 as ineligible for bond.

35. The mandatory detention scheme under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) applies only to noncitizens at U.S. ports of entry who have only recently entered the United States. The statute's entire framework is premised on inspections at the border of people who are "seeking admission" to the United States. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Indeed, the Supreme Court has explained that this mandatory detention scheme applies "at the Nation's borders and ports of entry, where the Government must determine whether a[] [noncitizen] seeking to enter the country is admissible." *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287 (2018). These individuals "shall be detained" pending removal proceedings, unless "paroled" for "'urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit' under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A)." *Id.*; *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 300. This group does *not* include those "who are 'already in the country' on a discretionary basis." *Rueda Torres v. Francis*, No. 25-8408 (DEH), 2025 WL 3168759, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. 11/13/2025) (citing and quoting *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 288-89).

36. As to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1), this subsection provides for mandatory detention of noncitizens subject to expedited removal. Because expedited removal provides very few procedural protections, it applies narrowly to only those noncitizens who are inadmissible to the United States because they engaged in fraud or misrepresentation to procure admission or other immigration benefits, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C), or those who are applicants for admission without required documentation, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(7). The government may not subject any other person to expedited removal. 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(1), (b)(3).
37. For noncitizens in expedited removal, the INA does not grant the full rights that are enshrined for standard removal proceedings. To begin, an immigration officer may order them removed “without further hearing or review,” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i), unless the noncitizen has expressed an intent to apply for asylum or a fear of persecution. Even then, noncitizens’ rights are truncated. Although the immigration officer “shall refer the [noncitizen] for an interview by an asylum officer,” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i)-(ii), a “credible fear” interview differs from an asylum application. First, the INA does not, as it does during standard removal proceedings, guarantee the noncitizen the right to counsel, to present documents or witness testimony, or to cross-examine adverse evidence. See *id.* § 1225(b)(1)(B)(iv). Second, if the asylum officer determines that the noncitizen does not have a credible fear of persecution, the noncitizen may seek review before an immigration judge, but such review is limited to the record of the interview. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(iii)(III). Finally, if the immigration judge agrees with the

asylum officer, the noncitizen is removed without access to further review by the Board of Immigration Appeals or a federal court. Only if a noncitizen passes a credible fear interview may they then apply for asylum or other relief in full removal proceedings. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B); 8 C.F.R. § 208.30(f).

38. An expedited removal order comes with significant consequences beyond removal itself. Noncitizens who are issued expedited removal orders are subject to a five-year bar to admission to the United States unless they qualify for a discretionary waiver. 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(i); 8 C.F.R. § 212.2. Similarly, noncitizens issued expedited removal orders after having been found inadmissible based on misrepresentation are subject to a lifetime bar on admission to the United States unless they are granted a discretionary exception or waiver. 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C).

39. These statutory authorities for determining custodial status and bond eligibility of a noncitizen within the United States have governed removal proceedings for nearly three decades. The release provisions for noncitizens placed in standard removal proceedings under § 1226 and the mandatory detention provisions for noncitizens arriving to the United States under § 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2) were enacted in 1996 in the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA), Pub. L. No. 104-208, Div. C, §§ 302-03, 110 Stat. 3009-546, 3009-582 to 3009-583, 3009-585.

40. In the decades following IIRIRA's enactment, noncitizens who entered the country, were arrested and released by the DHS with parole, and who were placed

in standard removal proceedings, have received bond hearings unless their criminal history rendered them ineligible. That practice was consistent with many more decades of prior agency practice, in which noncitizens who were not deemed “arriving” were entitled to a custody hearing before an IJ or other hearing officer. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a) (1994); *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 229 (1996) (noting that § 1226(a) simply “restates” the detention authority previously found at § 1252(a)); *Martinez v. Hyde*, 792 F. Supp. 3d 211, 222 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025) (“[T]he idea that a different detention scheme would apply to non-citizens ‘already in the country,’ as compared to those ‘seeking admission into the country,’ . . . is consonant with the core logic of our immigration system.”) (citing *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 289).

41. On July 8, 2025, without congressional authorization, ICE announced a new policy entitled “Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission.” The policy asserts that all undocumented noncitizens deemed “applicants for admission” are subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). The policy purports to apply even to those like Petitioner whom, at the time of the policy shift, the government had already arrested and released from custody, placed in standard removal proceedings, and allowed to apply for asylum. This change in policy violates the government’s own regulations, including regulations that prohibit the government from seeking dismissal of full removal proceedings unless it can be shown that the “[c]ircumstances of the case have changed.” *See* 8 C.F.R. § 239.2(a)(7). But the government’s new policy

purports to allow it to seek dismissal based on changed circumstances independent of the facts of a particular noncitizen's case.

42. Adopting the policy set forth by ICE on July 8, on September 5, 2025, the BIA issued a precedential decision holding that all noncitizens who entered the United States without admission or parole are considered applicants for admission and are therefore ineligible for a bond hearing before an immigration judge. *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). This decision departs from the plain language of the INA, federal precedent, and long-standing regulations. *See id.*

43. Respondents' new legal interpretation of the custody provisions of the INA is plainly contrary to the statutory framework of the INA and its implementing regulations. For decades, Respondents applied § 1226(a) to individuals similarly situated to Petitioner. Respondents' new policies regarding custody determinations are therefore not only contrary to law, but also arbitrary and capricious in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"). This new interpretation of the statutes was also adopted without following the procedural requirements of the APA. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 553. Under *Loper Bright v. Raimondo*, "the role of the reviewing court under the APA is . . . to independently interpret the statute and effectuate the will of Congress subject to constitutional limits." 603 U.S. 369, 395 (2024). Applying *Loper Bright*, this Court should independently interpret the pertinent statutes and give no weight to the BIA's expansive and unprecedented reinterpretation of § 1225(b)(2), as that interpretation conflicts with the plain text

of the statute, is contrary to the regulations, and contravenes precedent on the issue of jurisdiction for bond proceedings.

44. ICE and EOIR have continued to adopt this policy despite numerous federal courts rejecting the reasoning of the July 8 memo and *Yajure Hurtado*. For example, after immigration judges in the Tacoma, Washington Immigration Court stopped providing bond hearings for persons who entered the United States without inspection and who have since resided in the United States, the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington found that such a reading of the INA is likely unlawful and that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b), applies to such noncitizens. *Rodriguez Vazquez*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239; *see also Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11571-JEK, 2025 WL 1869299, at *8 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025) (granting habeas petition based on same conclusion). Federal courts, including this district, have resoundingly rejected Respondents' erroneous interpretation of the INA's framework around discretionary and mandatory detention since ICE implemented its July 8, 2025 memo. *See, e.g., Khalid B.Q. v. Noem*, No. 25-4584 (D. Minn. Dec. 18, 2025); *Aguilar Maldonado v. Olson*, 795 F. Supp. 3d 1134 (D. Minn. 2025); *Mayamu K.*, No. 25-3035, 2025 WL 3641819; *Jose J.O.E.*, 797 F. Supp. 3d 957; *Eliseo A.A.*, 2025 WL 2886729; *Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft*, No. 25-cv-12546, 2025 WL 2609425 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9, 2025); *Sampiao v. Hyde*, 799 F. Supp. 3d 14 (D. Mass. Sept. 9, 2025); *Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft*, 797 F. Supp. 3d 771 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025); *Martinez*, 792 F. Supp. 3d 211; *Lopez Benitez v. Francis*, 795 F. Supp. 3d 475 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2025); *Garcia Jimenez v. Kramer*, No.

4:25CV03162, 2025 WL 2374223 (D. Neb. Aug. 14, 2025); *Arrazola-Gonzalez v. Noem*, No. 5:25-cv-01789, 2025 WL 2379285 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2025); *Leal-Hernandez v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-02428, 2025 WL 2430025 (D. Md. Aug. 24, 2025).

45. As in those cases, Petitioner's detention under § 1225(b)(2) is likewise unlawful. As numerous federal courts have now found, § 1225(b)(2) applies to noncitizens *seeking admission* into the United States. It does not apply to noncitizens, like Petitioner, who entered the United States, were apprehended and then paroled into the country, placed in standard removal proceedings, and allowed to apply for asylum.

46. In short, Respondents' detention of Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) is patently unlawful, as it violates due process, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the Immigration and Nationality Act.

IX. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I

Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act: Unlawful Agency Action Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)

47. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

48. Under the APA, a court shall "hold unlawful and set aside agency action" that is arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, or not in accordance with law. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

49. Agency action is arbitrary and capricious if the agency “entirely failed to consider an important aspect of the problem, offered an explanation for its decision that runs counter to the evidence before the agency, or is so implausible that it could not be ascribed to a difference in view or the product of agency expertise.” *Nat’l Ass’n of Home Builders v. Defs. of Wildlife*, 551 U.S. 644, 658 (2007) (quoting *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass’n of U.S. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983)).
50. To show that an agency action was not arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise unlawful under 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A), the agency must articulate “a satisfactory explanation” for its action, “including a rational connection between the facts found and the choice made.” *Dep’t of Comm. v. New York*, 588 U.S. 752, 773 (2019) (quotation omitted). A pretextual rationale does not satisfy this standard. *Id.* at 773-74.
51. Respondents’ detention of Petitioner without allowing him the process of a bond hearing pursuant to the statutory framework of the INA is arbitrary and capricious.

COUNT II

Violation of the Immigration and Nationality Act: Unlawful Detention Under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)

52. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in the preceding paragraphs.
53. To the extent that Respondents purport to detain Petitioner pursuant to 8

U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), his detention is unlawful. The mandatory detention provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to noncitizens residing within the interior of the United States who are subject to grounds of inadmissibility. As relevant here, it does not apply to those who previously entered the country and were arrested inside the interior of the United States. Such noncitizens are instead discretionarily detained under § 1226(a), unless they are subject to § 1225(b)(1), § 1226(c), or § 1231, none of which apply in this case.

54. Respondents' erroneous application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner has resulted in her unlawful ongoing detention, in violation of the INA.

COUNT III

Violation of Fifth Amendment Right to Due Process: Arbitrary Detention

55. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in the preceding paragraphs.
56. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution applies to all persons within the United States. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001). Thus, whether a noncitizen's presence in the country is "lawful, unlawful, temporary, or permanent," the Due Process Clause applies. *Id.*
57. Petitioner has a fundamental liberty interest in her freedom from the restraints placed on her while she remains in Respondents' custody. *See Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507, 529 (2004) ("[T]he most elemental of liberty interests . . . [is] the interest in being free from physical detention by [the] government.")

(citations omitted).

58. The government's detention of Petitioner, including categorizing his detention in a manner that denies her the opportunity for a bond redetermination hearing to determine whether she is a flight risk or danger to others, violates her right to due process under the U.S. Constitution.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court:

1. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
2. Set this matter for expedited consideration pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1657;
3. Order Respondents to Show Cause why a Writ of Habeas Corpus should not be granted within three days, allowing Petitioner three days to file a traverse, and, if necessary, setting a hearing on this Petition within five days of submission of the return pursuant to 28 U. S. C. § 2243
4. Issue Petitioner a Writ of Habeas Corpus ordering Respondents to immediately release Petitioner from custody, or, in the alternative, issue a writ of habeas corpus ordering that the Immigration Court to hold a bond hearing pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226 within seven days;
5. Prohibit Respondents from transferring Petitioner from the district without the court's approval;
6. Award Petitioner attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act, and on any other basis justified under law;

7. Order that all of Petitioner's property be returned to him when he is released; and
8. Grant any further relief that this court deems to be just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 30, 2026

/s/ Graham Ojala-Barbour
Graham Ojala-Barbour
Minnesota Bar No. 0392397
Ojala-Barbour Law Firm, PLLC
1100 7th Street West
Saint Paul, MN 55102
(651) 214-6284
graham@ojalabarbour.com
Attorney for Petitioner

VERIFICATION

I represent the Petitioner, Edison Isaac Quitio Guasco, and submit this verification on his behalf. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2242 and 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the facts set forth in the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

/s/ Graham Ojala-Barbour
Graham Ojala-Barbour
Attorney for Petitioner

Dated: January 30, 2026