Adriana Mitchell, Esq.
Law Office of Adriana Mitchell
1528 Walnut Street, Suite 1402
Philadelphia, PA 19102
Phone: 877-728-1496
adriana@mitchellimmigration.com
Pennsylvania Bar ID: 323243

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

A **A#** [redacted] **Pe**	**Civil Action No. 2:26-cv-00695**
v.	**PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS**
JAMISON, J.L., **Warden,** **Federal Detention Center** **Philadelphia**	
MICHAEL T. ROSE **Acting Field Office Director** **Immigration and Customs Enforcement** **Philadelphia Field Office**	
TODD LYONS, **Acting Director,** **United States Immigration and** **Customs Enforcement (ICE),**	
KRISTI NOEM, **Secretary of the Department of** **Homeland Security, (DHS) and,**	
PAMELA JO BONDI, **Attorney General of the** **United States of America**	
Respondents	

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner Aman Aman, a twenty-three citizen of India, petitions this Court to grant habeas corpus and release him from being unlawfully detained by the Respondents.

2. Respondents had unlawfully detained Mr. Aman under 8 U.S.C.§ 1225(b)(2)(A), a statutory provision that allows Respondents to subject a large swath of noncitizens currently present in the United States to mandatory detention. The Board of Immigration Appeals decided, in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* that noncitizens who have entered the United States without inspection are mandatorily detained without a bond hearing under Section 1225(b)(2)(A). *See* 29 I. & N. Dec. 216, 228 (BIA 2025). The BIA's interpretation conflicts with the plain language and structure of the statute, as well as decades of uncontroverted agency practice, and it was also rejected by district courts all around the country, this Court included. *See, e.g. Calzado Diaz v. Noem, No. 3:25-cv-00458, 2025 WL 3628480 (W.D. Pa. Dec. 15, 2025)*; *Vasquez Majia v. Noem*, No. 3:25-cv-00333, 2025 WL 3546427 (W.D. Pa. Dec. 11, 2025);

3. In the alternative, if the statute does authorize Petitioner's detention without a bond hearing, it violates his rights to substantive and procedural due process. Petitioner's detention violates his rights to substantive and procedural due process. Detention of all noncitizens who are subject to inadmissibility grounds, like Petitioner, without any individualized hearing does not "bear a reasonable relation to the purpose for which the individual was committed." *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001). Moreover, application of the *Mathews v. Eldridge* balancing test shows that detaining Mr. Aman—a noncitizen who DHS once released on his own recognizance because he was not a danger or flight risk—is necessary to protect Petitioner from an unnecessary deprivation of liberty. 424 U.S. 319,

335 (1976).

4. Mr. Aman therefore respectfully requests that this Court issue a writ of habeas corpus and order Petitioner's release from custody. Immediate release is the appropriate remedy because Petitioner is unlawfully detained under a provision of the Immigration and Naturalization Act that it is not applicable in his case. Where DHS detains a noncitizen under an inapplicable statutory provision, the detention is not merely procedurally defective—it is unauthorized by law. In such circumstances, the role of a habeas court is not to adjust the manner of detention, but to terminate it**.**

5. In the alternative, Petitioner requests that this Court conduct or order an Immigration Judge ("IJ") to conduct a bond hearing at which (1) Respondents bear the burden of proving flight risk and/or dangerousness by clear and convincing evidence; and (2) the reviewing court considers alternatives to detention that could mitigate risk of flight and ability to pay in setting any bond. *See German Santos v. Warden Pike Cty. Corr. Facility*, 965 F.3d 203, 213-214 (3d Cir. 2020).

JURISDICTION

6. Petitioner is in the physical custody of the Respondents at the Federal Detention Center in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

7. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3) (habeas corpus), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), and Article I, section 9, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution (the Suspension Clause).

8. This Court may grant relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*, and 28 U.S.C. § 1261, the All-Writs Act.

9. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9) does not strip the Court of jurisdiction over Petitioner's challenge to his continued detention because the challenge is collateral to "the removal process," and is not "inextricably linked" to any removal action. *See Khalil v. President, United States*, No. 25-2162, 2026 WL 111933, at *9 (3d Cir. Jan. 15, 2026); *Kourouma v. Jamison*, No. 26-0182, 2026 WL 120208, at *3 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 15, 2026) ("[W]hether a bond hearing is required prior to detention . . . is collateral to the removal process." (*Cantu-Cortes v. O'Neill*, No. 25-6338, 2025 WL 3171639, at *1 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 13, 2025) (same); *see also Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 292–95 (2018)

REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

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

11. 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).

VENUE

12. Venue lies in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, the judicial district in which Petitioner is currently detained. *See Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of*

Kentucky, 410 U.S. 484, 493-500 (1973) (finding proper venue lies in the judicial district in which Petitioner is currently detained).

13. Venue is also properly in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because Respondents are employees, officers, and agencies of the United States, and because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in the Eastern District of New Jersey.

PARTIES

14. Petitioner is Aman Aman, a twenty-three-year-year-old native of India who has been detained at the Federal Detention Center in Philadelphia since January 29, 2025. He seeks issuance of a writ of *habeas corpus*.

15. Respondent J.L. Jamison, the warden of the Philadelphia Federal Detention Center, is sued in his official capacity, as he is the Petitioner's actual physical custodian and person that had direct control over Petitioner.

16. Respondent Michael T. Rose is sued in his official capacity as the Acting Field Office Director of U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement's Philadelphia Field Office. He is responsible for the administration and management of ICE Enforcement Removal Operations in Pennsylvania and exercises administrative control over Petitioner's custody.

17. Respondent Todd Lyons is sued in his official capacity as the Acting Director of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) the department within the Department of Homeland Security. In this capacity, he is responsible for administering and enforcing the immigration laws in Pennsylvania and is Petitioner's legal custodian.

18. Respondent Pamela Jo Bondi is sued in her official capacity as the Attorney General of the United States. In this capacity she is responsible for administering and enforcing the immigration laws pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1103 and is the Petitioner's legal custodian.

19. Respondent Kristi Noem is sued in her official capacity as Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security the agency in charge of administering and enforcing the immigration laws in New Jersey and is the Petitioner's legal custodian.

EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

20. There is no statutory requirement of exhaustion of administrative remedies where a noncitizen challenges the lawfulness of his detention. *Arango Marquez v. Immigr. And Naturalization Svc.*, 346 F.3d 892, 897 (9th Cir. 2003). Any requirement of administrative exhaustion is therefore purely discretionary. *See Santos v. Lowe*, No. 1:18-cv-1553, 2020 WL 4530728, at *2 (M.D. Pa. Aug. 2020) ("[T]he exhaustion requirement imposed by courts relating to habeas corpus petitions filed by immigration detainees is a prudential benchmark which is not compelled by statute.").

21. In making that decision, the Court should consider the urgency of the need for immediate review. "Where a person is detained by executive order . . . the need for collateral review is most pressing . . . In this context the need for habeas corpus is more urgent." *Boumediene v. Bush*, 553 U.S. 723, 783 (2008) (waiving administrative exhaustion for executive detainees).

22. Moreover, the exhaustion "doctrine is not without exception." *Ashley v. Ridge*, 288 F. Supp. 2d 662, 666. (D.N.J. 2003). "Courts have found that the exhaustion of administrative remedies may not be required when available remedies provide no opportunity for adequate relief, an

administrative appeal would be futile, or if plaintiff has raised a substantial constitutional question." *Id*. at 666-67.

23. Exhaustion before the EOIR would be futile because requiring exhaustion "would almost certainly result in the BIA persisting in its earlier rulings and applying those rulings to [Petitioner], all while he remains in detention[.]" *Del Cid v. Bondi*, No. 3:25-cv-00304, 2025 WL 2985150, at *13 (W.D. Pa. Oct. 23, 2025).

24. Further, the BIA does not have jurisdiction to adjudicate constitutional issues. *Qatanani v. Att'y Gen. of the U.S.*, 144 F.4th 485, 500 (3d Cir. 2025); *see also Ashley*, 288 F. Supp. 2d at 667 (internal citations omitted). Therefore, any administrative proceedings would be futile because petitioner raises a constitutional due process claim. *Id*.

FACTS

25. Petitioner is a citizen of India who entered the United States on or about February 2, 2024. He left his country after being persecuted for his political opinion. Upon his arrival to the United States' border, he was released on his own recognizance and placed in immigration proceedings. As a condition of his release, he was required to report periodically to ICE office in Philadelphia. It was during the third check-in that he was detained, the reason given by the ICE officer being that his immigration court case has not been yet scheduled for a hearing.

26. Mr. Aman timely filed an application for asylum that is currently pending. He also requested and received an Employment Authorization Document that allows him to work legally in the United States. He works as a delivery driver for DoorDash. He has no criminal history in the United States or anywhere else in the world. He complied with all the requirements imposed by the Respondents.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

I. Section 1226(a) Governs the Detention of People Like Petitioner

27. The Immigration and Nationality Act contains several provisions authorizing detention of noncitizens. Section 1226(a) entitles most noncitizens with pending removal proceedings to a hearing before an Immigration Judge to determine whether they should be released on bond. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a); 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(d). Section 1226(c) creates an exception to section 1226(a) and provides that noncitizens who are removable by virtue of certain criminal convictions must be detained without a bond hearing. Section 1225(b) provides for mandatory detention of noncitizens subject to expedited removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and for other recent arrivals "seeking admission" under (b)(2). Finally, section 1231 governs the detention of noncitizens with a final order of removal.

28. The detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) were enacted as part of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-208, Div. C, §§ 302–03, 110 Stat. 3009-546, 3009–582 to 3009–583, 3009–585. Section 1226 was most recently amended earlier this year by the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L. No.119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025). "Upon passing IIRIRA, Congress declared that the new Section 1226(a) 'restates the current provisions in the predecessor statute,'" which allowed noncitizens who entered without inspection to be released on bond. *Rodriguez v. Bostock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239, 1258, 1260 (W.D. Wash. 2025) (citing H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 229; H.R. Rep. No. 104-828, at 210).

29. Following the enactment of the IIRIRA, EOIR drafted new regulations explaining that, in general, people who entered the country without inspection were not considered detained under § 1225 and that they were instead detained under § 1226(a). *See* Inspection and

Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal Proceedings; Asylum Procedures, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997) ("Despite being applicants for admission, aliens who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as aliens who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination.").

30. Thus, in the decades that followed, most people who entered without inspection and were thereafter arrested and placed in standard removal proceedings were eligible for and received bond hearings before an IJ, unless they have committed certain crimes. *Diaz Martinez v. Hyde*, No. 25-11613, 2025 WL 2084238, at *4 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025).

31. In recent months, Respondents have abruptly changed course. On May 15, 2025, the BIA issued a decision holding that a noncitizen who entered without inspection and was apprehended and paroled near the border was subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A) when her parole was terminated and she was re-detained. *Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. 66, 70 (BIA 2025).

32. On July 8, 2025, Respondent Todd M. Lyons issued an internal memorandum stating that, "in coordination with the Department of Justice (DOJ)," DHS had "revisited" its legal position and believed that § 1225, not § 1226, governs the detention of noncitizens who are present in the United States without having been admitted. *Diaz Martinez*, 2025 WL 2084238, at *4.

33. On September 5, 2025, the BIA issued a precedential decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). In that decision, the BIA held that noncitizens "who are present in the United States without admission are applicants for admission as defined under section 235(b)(2)(A) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), and must be detained for the duration of their removal proceedings." 29 I&N Dec. at 220.

34. The BIA adopted this position notwithstanding hundreds of recent federal court decisions rejecting DHS's position and holding that individuals who are present without having been admitted remain eligible for bond pursuant to § 1226(a).

35. As those decisions explain, the BIA's position in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* contravenes the INA. The plain text of the statute demonstrates that § 1226(a)—not § 1225(b)—governs individuals such as Petitioner.

36. Section 1226(a) applies to all persons "pending a decision on whether the [noncitizen] is to be removed from the United States." See *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 288 (2018) (describing 1226(a) as the "default rule" for detention of noncitizens pending removal).

37. Section 1226 covers all individuals charged as being inadmissible, including those who entered without inspection. See 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E). This year, Congress enacted the Laken Riley Act to add a subparagraph (E) to the section with the purpose of excluding certain noncitizens who entered without inspection and committed certain crimes from § 1226(a)'s default bond provision. As the *Rodriguez Vazquez* court explained, "[w]hen Congress creates "specific exceptions" to a statute's applicability, it "proves" that absent those exceptions, the statute generally applies." *Rodriguez Vazquez*, 2025 WL 1193850, at *12 (citing *Shady Grove Orthopedic Assocs., P.A. v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 559 U.S. 393, 400 (2010)).

38. Under the BIA's interpretation, all noncitizens subject to inadmissibility grounds are detained without the opportunity for a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. at 220; *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6) (making people who are present without having been admitted inadmissible); 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(14) (defining an admission). Therefore, this interpretation would render all the grounds of mandatory detention in §

1226(c) applying to inadmissible noncitizens, including the recently passed Laken Riley Act, superfluous. *Gomes*, 2025 WL 1869299, at *7; *Rodriguez*, 779 F. Supp. 3d at 1258; *see Marx v. Gen. Revenue Corp.*, 568 U.S. 371, 386 (2103) ("[T]he canon against surplusage is strongest when an interpretation would render superfluous another part of the same statutory scheme."). This statutory structure demonstrates that Congress did not intend to make § 1226(a) inapplicable to all inadmissible noncitizens but rather viewed it as the default bond provision for people arrested within the United States.

39. By contrast, § 1225(b) applies to people arriving at U.S. ports of entry or who very 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. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A); *see also Diaz Martinez*, 2025 WL 2084238, at *8 ("'[O]ur immigration laws have long made a distinction between those [noncitizens] who have come to our shores seeking admission . . . and those who are within the United States after an entry, irrespective of its legality.'" (quoting *Leng May Ma v. Barber*, 357 U.S. 185, 187 (1958))). 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*, 583 U.S. at 287.

40. The BIA's interpretation "would render the phrase 'seeking admission' in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) mere surplusage." *Lopez Benitez*, 2025 WL 2371588, at *6. That section applies to people who are (1) applicants for admission; (2) seeking admission; and (3) not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A); *Lopez Benitez*, 2025 WL 2371588, at *6; *Diaz Martinez*, 2025 WL 2084238, at *2. The BIA's interpretation makes all applicants for admission subject to mandatory detention, leaving the "seeking

admission" criterion unnecessary and violating the rule against surplusage. *Lopez Benitez*, 2025 WL 2371588, at *6; *Diaz Martinez*, 2025 WL 2084238, at *6.

41. Instead, the phrase "seeking admission" indicates that § 1225(b)(2)(A) applies to people who are taking "some sort of present-tense action," in other words, coming or attempting to come into the United States. *Diaz Martinez*, 2025 WL 2084238, at *6; *see also Matter of M-C-D-V-*, 28 I&N Dec. 18, 23 (BIA 2020) (stating that "the use of the present progressive tense . . . denotes an ongoing process"). Therefore, § 1226(a), not § 1225(b)(2)(A), governs the detention of people detained within the United States who are not actively seeking admission, as required by the statute.

42. Applying § 1226(a), rather than § 1225(b), to people detained in the interior who had previously entered without inspection is consistent with the government's longstanding practice, which "can inform a court's determination of what the law is." *Loper Bright Enter. v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369, 386 (2024). This longstanding practice further counsels against the BIA's abrupt change in policy. *Maldonado*, 2025 WL 2374411, at *11.

43. Finally, as discussed below, the BIA's interpretation of § 1225(b)(2)(A) to mandate detention without a bond hearing for all noncitizens present in the United States without having been admitted presents serious constitutional concerns. Therefore, to the degree that the statute remains ambiguous, the Court should presume that Congress "did not intend the alternative which raises serious constitutional doubts" and reject that construction. *Clark v. Martinez*, 543 U.S. 371, 381-82 (2005). Therefore, § 1226(a), which permits bond hearings, not § 1225(b)(2)(A), which does not, governs the detention of people like Petitioner.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act

Contrary to Law and Arbitrary and Capricious Agency Policy

44. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference the above paragraphs.

45. The APA provides that a "reviewing court shall . . . hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be . . . arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law." 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).59.

46. The mandatory detention provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to all noncitizens residing in the United States who are subject to grounds of inadmissibility. It does not apply to Petitioner, who entered the United States two years ago.

47. In taking a contrary position, the BIA has reversed decades of prior practice, and "would expand § 1225(b) face beyond how it has been enforced historically, potentially subjecting millions more undocumented immigrants to mandatory detention, while simultaneously narrowing § 1226(a) such that it would have extremely limited (if any) application." *Lopez Benitez*, 2025 2371588, at *8. Respondents have failed to articulate reasoned explanations for their decisions, which represent changes in the agencies' policies and positions; have considered factors that Congress did not intend to be considered; have entirely failed to consider important aspects of the problem; and have offered explanations for their decisions that run counter to the evidence before the agencies.

48. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner is arbitrary, capricious, and not in accordance with law, and as such, it violates the APA. See 5 U.S.C. § 706(2).

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violation of the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause

Substantive Due Process

49. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference the above paragraphs.

50. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment forbids the government from depriving any "person" of liberty "without due process of law." U.S. Const. amend. V. Substantive due process requires that immigration detention without a bond hearing be reasonably related to the goals of ensuring the appearance of noncitizens at future proceedings and preventing danger to the community. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690.

51. The BIA's application of mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2) is not reasonably related to those goals and thus violates substantive due process. Petitioner is not a danger to the community. He is a law-abiding citizen, who has never committed any crimes and is lawfully employed. After being released on his own recognizance and placed into removal proceedings, Petitioner promptly submitted his asylum. He also attended his ICE-mandated appointments, including the one during which he was arrested.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violation of the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause

Procedural Due Process

52. Petitioner re-alleges and incorporates by reference the above paragraphs.

53. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment forbids the government from depriving any "person" of liberty "without due process of law." U.S. Const. amend. V. Courts apply the *Mathews v. Eldridge* balancing test to determine what procedures the due process clause requires. *Gayle*, 12 F.4th at 331.

54. The first factor is the private interest that will be affected by the official action. *Id.* Here, the deprivation of Petitioner's liberty is a particularly weighty interest. Petitioner has been unlawfully detained without the right to request bond.

55. The second factor is the risk of erroneous deprivation of such interest through the procedures used, and the probable value, if any, of additional safeguards. *Id.* Here, there is a great risk of unnecessary detention because the BIA's interpretation of the statute does not permit any individualized determination of whether detention during removal proceedings is necessary. *See Ashley*, 288 F. Supp. 2d at 670.

56. The final factor is the Government's interest. *Gayle*, 12 F.4th at 331. The government has no legitimate interest in detaining Petitioner when detention is not necessary to ensure appearance at future hearings or protect the community. *Hernandez-Lara*, 10 F.4th at 32-33; *see Ousman D. v. Decker*, No. 20-9646, 2020 WL 5587441, at *4 (holding that due process requires consideration of less restrictive alternatives to detention that would address the government's legitimate purpose); *Hechavarria v. Whitaker*, 358 F. Supp. 3d 227, 241-42 (W.D.N.Y. 2019) (same). Petitioner is not a danger to the community, and his presence at the ICE check-ins demonstrates he is not a risk of flight. Therefore, the government does not have an interest in detaining Petitioner without a bond hearing that outweighs his substantial liberty interest in such an individualized determination.

57. Respondents' detention of Petitioner without any hearing to determine whether that detention is necessary violates procedural due process.

REMEDY

A. Because Petitioner is Detained Under the Wrong INA Provision, his Custody is Ultra Vires and Must End

58. Where DHS detains a noncitizen under an inapplicable statutory provision, the detention is not merely procedurally defective—it is unauthorized by law. In such instances, the role of a habeas court is not to adjust the manner of detention, but to terminate it**.** A habeas court has "the power to order the conditional release of an individual unlawfully detained—though release need not be the exclusive remedy and is not the appropriate one in every case in which the writ is granted." *Boumediene v. Bush*, 553 U.S. 723, 779 (2008). A federal district court is authorized to grant a writ of habeas corpus …where the petitioner is "in custody under or by color of the authority of the United States ... in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States. *Patel v. McShane*, No. CV 25-5975, 2025 WL 3241212 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 20, 2025) (citing 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241(c)(1), (3)); *see also*, *Kashranov v. Jamison*, No. 2:25-CV-05555-JDW, 2025 WL 3188399 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 14, 2025).

59. The Third Circuit has made clear that immigration detention authority is implicitly limited, and once those limits are exceeded—or where detention lacks statutory footing altogether—continued custody is unlawful. *Diop v. ICE/Homeland Sec.*, 656 F.3d 221, 232–33 (3d Cir. 2011). Detention that is not authorized by statute cannot be cured by further administrative process because "the statute no longer permits it." *Id.*

60. Mr. Aman is detained under the wrong provision of the INA, which makes his detention unlawful. As a matter of law, DHS therefore lacks authority to continue holding him. The only remedy that restores Petitioner to the position he would have occupied absent the statutory violation is release from custody. See *Leslie v. Att'y Gen.*, 678 F.3d 265, 271–72 (3d Cir. 2012) (habeas relief must be effective and restore the petitioner's liberty interest). *See also Patel v. McShane, supra; Kashranov v. Jamison, supra, Morocho v. Jamison*, No.

5:25-CV-05930-JMG, 2025 WL 3296300 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 26, 2025); *Lopez Yepes v. Bondi*, No. CV 26-0002, 2026 WL 130774 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 16, 2026), *Kumar v. Jameson,* No. CV 26-470, 2026 WL 244309 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 29, 2026).

B. An Immigration Judge Bond Hearing is not a Legally Adequate Habeas Remedy

61. The Government may argue that any defect can be remedied by ordering an Immigration Judge to conduct a bond hearing. That argument fails for three independent reasons**.**

62. First, Immigration Judges lack authority to cure statutory misclassification. Bond proceedings presuppose lawful detention under a bond-eligible statute. Immigration Judges have no authority to reclassify DHS's custody determination or to declare detention *ultra vires*. They accept DHS's asserted detention authority as a given and merely assess discretionary release within that framework. Accordingly, where detention itself is unauthorized, a bond hearing cannot cure the violation. Habeas relief cannot consist of referring a petitioner back to an adjudicator who lacks jurisdiction to address the legal defect. See *Guerrero-Sanchez v. Warden York Cnty. Prison*, 905 F.3d 208, 224–25 (3d Cir. 2018) (habeas courts retain authority to define the remedy necessary to cure unlawful detention).

63. Second, Article III courts may not delegate their habeas function to EOIR. The writ of habeas corpus requires a court to order relief that ends unlawful custody, not one that merely initiates another administrative proceeding. The Third Circuit has repeatedly emphasized that habeas relief must be meaningful and effective, not theoretical. *Chavez-Alvarez v. Warden York Cnty. Prison*, 783 F.3d 469, 475–78 (3d Cir. 2015).

64. Ordering an Immigration Judge bond to hold a bond hearing improperly delegates the Court's core Article III function to an Executive Branch tribunal that is institutionally

subordinate to the Attorney General; lacks authority to correct DHS's statutory error; and cannot guarantee release even where detention is unlawful. Such delegation is incompatible with the habeas court's duty to independently remedy unlawful executive detention. *Guerrero-Sanchez*, 905 F.3d at 224.

65. Last, bond hearings in Immigration Court are futile and illusory. Immigration Judge bond hearings—particularly in post-habeas cases—have become systematically predetermined exercises designed to maintain detention regardless of individual circumstances. This is part of a larger scheme of conduct meant to transform Immigration Judges from independent thinkers and adjudicators to employees that follow orders. In recent months, experienced Immigration Judges have been terminated or have resigned. [1] They have been replaced by temporary inexperienced adjudicators, mostly recruited from the ranks of Judge Advocate General ("JAG") attorneys.[2]

66. The Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") has publicly promoted the replacement of Immigration Judges with so-called "deportation judges.[3] With limited exceptions, noncitizens present in the United States are increasingly treated as subject to mandatory, indefinite

---

[1] See Eric Katz,,'Climate of fear': Immigration judges say functioning of their court system is in jeopardy due to Trump's firings. November 14, 2025. Retrievable at https://www.govexec.com/management/2025/11/climate-fear-immigration-judges-say-functioning-theircourt-system-jeopardy-due-trumps-firings/409544/

[2] See Chris Williams, Trump Replaces Fired Immigration Judges with Military Lawyers. Fox News Live, October 4, 2025. Retrievable at https://www.livenowfox.com/news/trump-military-lawyers-immigrationjudges

[3] See Respondent's Noem post on her official X account dated November 20, 2025, advertising the hiring of "deportation judges". Retrievable at https://x.com/Sec_Noem/status/1991655946247106920.

detention based on an unlawful interpretation of the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA") that has been rejected by an overwhelming majority of district courts nationwide.

67. Immigration practitioners have witnessed a corresponding and unprecedented surge in fundamentally unfair bond denials that seems to follow the same pattern. *See* **Exhibit 1**, Affidavit of Jorge E. Artieda, Esq.; **Exhibit 2**, Affidavit of Attorney Matthew Archeambault; **Exhibit 3**, Affidavit of Attorney Noemi C. Simbron; **Exhibit 4**, Affidavit of Attorney Eric Mark.

68. The Immigration Judges who have been who meaningfully questioned DHS detention positions were abruptly reassigned from detained dockets. Exhibit 1, *supra*. Bond has been categorically denied in cases that previously warranted release. Id. Judges rely on pretextual rationales that would make bond impossible for virtually any detained noncitizen. Id. The pattern is uniform, coordinated, and temporally linked to federal habeas grants. Id. This evidence establishes that remand to EOIR would be futile **a**nd would render this Court's habeas jurisdiction meaningless. Habeas relief cannot consist of an "illusory remedy" that predictably fails to secure liberty. See *Chavez-Alvarez*, 783 F.3d at 475.

69. Where detention is unauthorized and administrative remedies are ineffective, the habeas court must order immediate release, subject only to reasonable conditions of supervision if necessary. See *Leslie*, 678 F.3d at 271–72.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court:

1. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;

2. Declare that Petitioner's continued detention violates the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A); and/or the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution;
3. Issue a Writ of *Habeas Corpus* and order Petitioner's immediate release from custody;
4. In the alternative, hold a bond hearing at which the government must establish by clear and convincing evidence that Petitioner presents a risk of flight or danger, even after consideration of alternatives to detention that could mitigate any risk that Petitioner's release would present;
5. Award Petitioner his costs and reasonable attorney fees in this action as provided for by the Equal Access to Justice Act, as amended, 5 U.S.C. § 504 and 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and on any other basis justified under law; and
6. Grant such further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: February 4, 2026

Adriana Mitchell, Esq.
PA Bar # 323243
Law Office of Adriana Mitchell
1528 Walnut Street, Suite 1402
Philadelphia, PA 19102
Attorney for Petitioner

VERIFICATION BY SOMEONE ACTING ON PETITIONER'S BEHALF PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2242

I am submitting this verification on behalf of the Petitioner because I am Petitioner's attorneys, and I have discussed the claims with the Petitioner. Based on those discussions, I hereby verify that the statements made in the attached Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

DATED: February 3, 2026

Adriana Mitchell
Attorney for Petitioner

EXHIBIT 1

DECLARATION OF JORGE E. ARTIEDA

I, Jorge E. Artieda, declare as follows under penalty of perjury pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746:

I. PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the Commonwealth of Virginia and am admitted to practice before the United States District Courts for the Eastern and Western Districts of Virginia.

2. I have over two decades of experience in immigration law and federal law enforcement, including:

a. Service as a prosecutor in New York City;

b. Service as legal counsel to Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Headquarters in Washington, D.C.;

c. Service as Assistant Chief Counsel for ICE in Virginia;

d. Service as a Special Assistant United States Attorney in Virginia; and

e. For the past decade, private practice as an immigration attorney specializing in detention and removal defense, including routine representation of detained individuals in bond proceedings before Immigration Judges in the Eastern District of Virginia.

3. I am proud of my years of service as a government attorney. My time working within the City of New York, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and as a federal prosecutor was among the most meaningful work of my career. I remain grateful for the opportunity to have served the public in those capacities and continue to hold deep respect for the dedicated public servants who work within these institutions to faithfully administer our immigration laws.

4. Based on this extensive experience on both sides of immigration enforcement and litigation, I am intimately familiar with the standards, practices, and norms governing bond determinations in immigration proceedings in this district.

II. PURPOSE OF THIS DECLARATION

5. I submit this declaration to provide the Court with direct, firsthand observations of a dramatic and systematic change in bond hearing outcomes that have occurred over the past three weeks in immigration proceedings in Virginia and Maryland, particularly before Immigration Judges assigned to the detained docket.

6. This declaration is based on: (a) my personal observations of bond hearings I have attended; (b) my review of written bond decisions issued to clients; (c) communications with numerous immigration attorneys practicing in this district; and (d) my professional knowledge of historical bond practices in this jurisdiction spanning more than a decade.

7. I authorize any attorney representing detained individuals in habeas corpus proceedings or emergency motions for immediate release to use and file this declaration in support of their clients' cases.

III. THE SEISMIC SHIFT: SYSTEMATIC DENIAL OF BOND IN POST-HABEAS CASES

8. Beginning in or around the first week of January 2026, I began observing what can only be described as a seismic shift in bond hearing outcomes for individuals who had been granted federal habeas relief and ordered § 1226(a) bond hearings by this Court and other judges in the Eastern District of Virginia.

9. Prior to this shift, while bond amounts had increased in recent months, bond was *routinely granted* in post-habeas cases where individuals demonstrated: (a) lack of significant criminal history; (b) strong family ties in the United States; (c) lengthy residence in the country; (d) viable claims for relief from removal; and (e) community support including stable housing and employment prospects.

10. Beginning approximately three weeks ago, this pattern *abruptly and uniformly ceased*. In numerous cases I have personally observed or learned about from colleagues, Immigration Judges have denied bond in circumstances that, weeks earlier, would have resulted in bond being set.

11. In my professional observation, the consistency, timing, and uniformity of these denials cannot be readily explained by coincidence, changes in individual case facts, or independent judicial decision-making. The pattern appears systematic and suggests coordinated institutional direction.

IV. THE REASSIGNMENT OF IMMIGRATION JUDGES CHOI AND DONOSO-STEVENS

12. What I believe to be compelling evidence of possible institutional coordination occurred in early January 2026, when two Immigration Judges who had been assigned to the Annandale detained docket for years—Immigration Judge Raphael Choi and Immigration Judge Karen Donoso-Stevens—were abruptly reassigned to the non-detained docket.

13. Prior to their reassignment from the detained docket, these judges were conducting what appeared to be meaningful individualized bond assessments in

post-habeas cases. They were granting bond in appropriate cases and, critically, had begun questioning—*on the record*—the government's blanket detention positions and the Department of Justice's insistence on maintaining detention under circumstances that appeared not to justify continued custody.

14. The timing and circumstances of their reassignment are, in my view, extraordinary. Judges who appeared to be fulfilling their duty to conduct individualized bond assessments and who were openly questioning government positions were removed from the very docket where such assessments are most critical.

15. Since their reassignment, the Immigration Judges who replaced them on the detained docket have, based on my observations, *systematically denied bond* in post-habeas cases. This pattern suggests that the reassignment may not have been administrative happenstance but rather a deliberate effort to ensure predetermined outcomes—continued detention—regardless of individual circumstances.

V. PRETEXTUAL AND LEGALLY INSUFFICIENT RATIONALES FOR DENYING BOND

16. Over the past three weeks, Immigration Judges have, in my observation, relied on a remarkably narrow and predictable set of rationales to deny bond—rationales that appear to bear little relationship to genuine individualized risk assessment and that would not have been deemed sufficient to justify denial just weeks earlier.

17. These rationales, which I believe to be pretextual, include but are not limited to:

a. Treating the absence of a financial sponsor as dispositive of flight risk, even when other equities (family ties, length of residence, employment history, community support) overwhelmingly favor release;

b. Finding that a sponsor who is not a *financial* sponsor is insufficient, despite no legal requirement that sponsors provide financial guarantees;

c. Treating the fact that an individual did not seek relief from removal until after being detained as evidence of lack of intent to comply with immigration proceedings;

d. Finding that applications for relief under INA § 240A(b) (cancellation of removal) are "speculative" and therefore do not mitigate flight risk, despite the fact that all immigration relief applications involve some degree of uncertainty and merit assessment;

e. Characterizing unlawful entry into the United States—*by itself*—as establishing flight risk, a rationale that would render bond impossible for the vast majority of detained individuals;

f. Treating the accumulation of unlawful presence (which is a civil violation, not a crime) as evidence of danger or disregard for the law;

g. Finding that unauthorized employment—a status violation shared by millions of undocumented immigrants—constitutes a significant negative factor warranting denial of bond;

h. Treating minor discrepancies in addresses listed on various documents as evidence of "deceitfulness," even when such discrepancies are readily explained and do not reflect any intent to mislead;

i. Questioning the accuracy of tax returns and suggesting "underreporting" based on subjective assessments of lifestyle (such as photographs showing children at Disneyland or a respondent in a vehicle), without any actual evidence of fraud or misrepresentation;

j. Imposing on respondents the burden of proving that they *will* appear for future court proceedings—an impossible burden that requires proving a negative—even though many respondents have never failed to appear for any prior proceeding because *they have never been required to appear* until being placed in removal proceedings; and

k. Dismissing applications for cancellation of removal as "pro forma" when they have not been fully completed or developed, even though detained individuals often lack access to the resources and legal support necessary to perfect such applications while in custody.

18. In my professional assessment, these rationales do not appear to be grounded in legitimate risk assessment. They appear to be pretexts designed to ensure denial of bond regardless of the individual facts of each case.

19. The rationales being employed to deny bond appear to depart significantly from the standards articulated in BIA precedent governing bond determinations.

20. The rationales I have observed over the past three weeks—treating unlawful entry alone as establishing flight risk, dismissing relief applications as inherently "speculative," requiring financial sponsorship as a prerequisite, and treating any immigration violation as dispositive—appear to represent a departure from these precedential standards. BIA case law requires that Immigration Judges consider the *specific circumstances* of each case and weigh multiple factors in reaching bond

determinations. The systematic application of categorical exclusions based on status violations common to the detained population does not appear consistent with the individualized, fact-specific analysis that BIA precedent mandates.

VI. OBSERVATIONS FROM JANUARY 14 and JANUARY 28, 2026, DETENTION DOCKET

21. On January 14 and January 28, 2026, I personally observed bond hearings before Immigration Judge Gardey at the Annandale Immigration Court. What I witnessed confirmed the systematic pattern of denial that has emerged over the past three weeks.

22. Multiple cases that would have resulted in bond being set just weeks earlier were denied. The denials were based on the same rationales I have described above: lack of financial sponsors, unauthorized work, the "speculative" nature of relief applications, and immigration violations that are endemic to the detained population.

23. In each instance I observed, the Immigration Judge appeared to apply factors that, if consistently applied, would make bond impossible for virtually any detained individual in removal proceedings. There did not appear to be meaningful individualized assessment. The hearings appeared to be perfunctory exercises designed to create a veneer of due process while ensuring predetermined outcomes.

24. The cases I observed on the above dates, involved individuals with no criminal history, or only minor criminal history unrelated to violence or flight. These individuals had family members present in court, stable housing, employment prospects, and pending applications for relief. Under the standards that prevailed in this district for years—and indeed, as recently as three weeks ago—these individuals would have been granted bond.

VII. CORROBORATION FROM THE IMMIGRATION LEGAL COMMUNITY

25. My observations are not isolated. In recent weeks, I have communicated with numerous immigration attorneys practicing all over the United States who handle detention cases. These conversations have confirmed that the pattern I have observed is widespread and consistent.

26. Colleagues have reported the same experience: clients who were granted federal habeas relief and ordered § 1226(a) bond hearings are now being systematically denied bond based on rationales that would not have been deemed sufficient weeks earlier.

27. These attorneys have described bond hearings as appearing to be "pro forma" exercises where the outcome seems predetermined. Meaningful individualized

review appears to have been replaced by boilerplate language and cookie-cutter denials.

28. The consistency of these reports across multiple practitioners, representing different clients before different Immigration Judges, suggests that this is not a matter of individual judicial discretion or case-specific circumstances. It appears to be a coordinated institutional effort.

VIII. PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENT AND CONCLUSION

29. Based on my two decades of experience in immigration law, including my service within the ICE, the pattern of events over the past three weeks—the abrupt reassignment of judges who were granting bond and questioning government positions, the immediate and uniform shift to systematic denial of bond, and the reliance on a narrow set of rationales across multiple judges and cases—suggests what appears to be a coordinated effort by the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) and the Department of Justice to undermine federal habeas relief.

30. In my professional judgment, this apparent coordination is the most plausible explanation for what I and my colleagues have observed. Independent adjudication does not typically produce this level of uniformity in outcome and reasoning across multiple judges and cases in such a compressed timeframe.

31. The bond hearings being provided to individuals who have been granted federal habeas relief do not appear to be genuine adjudications. They appear to be illusory remedies—proceedings designed to create the appearance of due process while ensuring that individuals remain detained indefinitely.

32. What I have witnessed over the past three weeks appears to be a systematic effort to nullify the constitutional protections that federal courts have recognized and enforced through habeas corpus. It appears to be a deliberate campaign to render meaningless the bond hearings that this Court and others have ordered.

33. I am profoundly concerned by what I have witnessed. As an attorney who has dedicated my career to the fair administration of immigration law—having served both as a government attorney enforcing those laws and as a private practitioner defending individuals subject to them—I find what appears to be a coordinated effort to undermine judicial authority and deny due process to be deeply troubling and inconsistent with the values I learned and embraced during my years of public service.

34. The individuals affected by this systematic denial of bond are not abstractions. They are human beings with families, with children, with jobs, with lives in this country. They have been found by federal courts to be entitled to bond hearings.

They are now being denied those hearings in any meaningful sense, held in detention not because they pose a danger or a flight risk, but because, in my observation, the Executive Branch appears to have decided to circumvent federal court orders through institutional means.

35. I submit this declaration in the hope that it will assist courts in understanding the reality of what appears to be occurring in immigration proceedings in this district and in ensuring that the constitutional right to habeas corpus is not rendered meaningless.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 28th day of January 2026, in Arlington, Virginia.



Jorge E. Artieda, Esq.
Va. Bar # 82963
P.O. Box 343
Falls Church, VA 22040
(703) 388-6055 (telephone)
(703) 649-6491 (facsimile)
jorge@artiedalaw.com

EXHIBIT 2

Law Office of
Matthew J. Archambeault
IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY LAW

Matthew J. Archambeault, Esq.
Direct: 215-599-2189
Fax: 215-790-6242
mja@archambeaultlaw.com

December 12, 2025

AFFIDAVIT OF MATTHEW J. ARCHAMBEAULT

I swear, under the penalty of perjury, the following is true and correct. I have been a practicing immigration attorney for over 23 years. I practice primarily in removal defense, including the representation of detained individuals. I have appeared in immigration courts in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Maryland, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Texas, Louisiana, Colorado, California, Washington, Puerto Rico, St. Thomas, and St. Lucia over my career. I have also represented immigrants in federal court at both the District and Circuit levels.

I write this affidavit for general use for my colleagues for submission in any court proceedings they feel appropriate.

I have represented hundreds of clients over the years and done scores of bond redetermination hearings. Under the current administration, bond redeterminations have undergone a noticeable shift, most notably in the issuance of the BIA precedent decision *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025) . This decision illegally concluded that a vast swath of immigrants, who entered without inspection, were subjected to mandatory detention pursuant to INA 235(b)(2), and not eligible for bond. Decades of practice and legal precedent found the same individuals eligible for bond and detained under INA 236(a). Hundreds of federal district courts have ruled against the administration following a flood of habeas corpus petitions nationwide. The result of this litigation has been that immigrants are either released or afforded an opportunity to have a bond hearing before an immigration judge.

I represent Jorge Perez Florez in both immigration court and the New Jersey District Court (case no. 2-25-cv-17865-SDW). Mr. Perez Florez was detained by ICE on November 24, 2025, and transported to the Elizabeth Detention Center in Elizabeth, New Jersey. I filed a habeas corpus petition on his behalf on the same day, and the Honorable Susan D. Wigenton of the New Jersey District Court issued a text order directing that a bond hearing be held by December 1, 2025. Immigration Judge Ramin Rastegar conducted a bond hearing on December 1, 2025, at the Elizabeth Immigration Court in Elizabeth, New Jersey.

Mr. Jorge Perez Florez is a Mexican immigrant who has been in the United States for more than 18 years, lives with his long-term partner and their 15-year-old U.S. citizen daughter in Maple Shade, New Jersey. Mr. Perez Florez has resided at the Maple Shade, New Jersey, address for more than 8 years and in the immediate area for the entirety of his time in the United States. Mr. Perez Florez has never been arrested in the United States or anywhere else in the world. Mr. Perez Florez is eligible to apply for Cancellation of Removal for Certain Non-

Permanent Residents, as he has been in the United States for more than ten years, has a US citizen child who would suffer extreme and unusual hardship if he were removed, and has been a person of good moral character and worthy of discretion. Mr. Perez Florez's US citizen daughter had been recently hospitalized for anxiety disorder and was beginning treatment. Mr. Perez Florez had numerous persons write on his behalf, and a US citizen sponsor was prepared to post any bond issued by the immigration judge.

The Department of Homeland Security raised the following negative factor: Mr. Perez Florez had previously attempted to enter the United States more than 18 years ago, was voluntarily returned, and then re-entered undetected. DHS also concluded that Mr. Perez had received a traffic ticket in 2009, when it appears he did not have a license, as an indicator of dangerousness. DHS further questioned a "learner's permit" from Maryland obtained by Mr. Perez Florez, despite his never appearing to live in Maryland.

These sets of facts would traditionally have earned Mr. Perez Florez a bond, as his lack of criminal history indicates he is not a danger to the community, and his long-term, stable residency in the United States with a family, relief from removal available, and support from the community would indicate he is not a flight risk. In my professional experience, one would expect a bond ranging from $2,500 to $10,000. This was not the case this time.

Immigration Judge Rastegar ruled that he posed a danger to the community and a flight risk so significant that no amount of bond would ensure his appearance for deportation if he lost his case. Immigration Judge Rastegar refused to explain why Mr. Perez Florez was a flight risk, indicating we could read it in his bond memorandum if we appealed. He did explain that Mr. Perez Florez's long-term residency here was a negative factor, as he never attempted to "fix" his immigration status, despite the fact that no options for doing so existed. After extensive questioning, Judge Rastegar concluded that Mr. Perez Florez was not credible based on his receiving a "driver's license" from Maryland, even though it was apparent he never lived there, and questions regarding an educational program Mr. Perez Florez completed in Camden, NJ. Judge Rastegar also held the fact that no applciation for relief had not been submitted to the immigraiton court, despite the fact that he had yet to appear for his first initial master calendar hearing (bond proceedings are separate and distinct from removal proceedings), which was scheduled for December 8, 2025 and pleadings on the allegations alleged by the Department of Homeland Security had not been completed. Judge Rastegar refused to recognize Mr. Perez Florez's long-term, committed relationship with the mother of their child because they were not married. Lastly, Judge Rastegar concluded that, because there was scant documentation of the medical condition affecting his 15-year-old USC daughter, he could not meet his burden to approve any Cancellation of Removal Application submitted, and that no amount of bond would be sufficient to ensure Mr. Perez Florez would appear for his ordered removal. Judge Rastegar did not even consider other restrictions on Mr. Perez Florez's liberty that could have ensured his compliance, such as electronic monitoring and/or reporting to ICE.

In my 23-year professional career, I have never had a bond flatly denied under similar facts. It is clear that I am not alone. The New Jersey AILA listserve is replete with similar, and even more egregious examples of bond denials from the judges at the Elizabeth Immigration Court and other courts across the country. I observed a bond hearing for an immigrant who has been in the United States for over 20 years, several US citizen children, one with a serious heart

condition, and no criminal record, denied a bond by Immigration Judge Wilson, finding he was a flight risk because he resided so long in the United States without being detected and that no amount of bond would be sufficient to ensure he complied with a deportation order. Now immigration judges are using immigrants' long-term residency and deep ties to the community as evidence of their flight risk. This is not normal.

Despite the losses of over 200 federal district court cases on the issue of detention pursuant to INA 235(b)(2), DHS persists in illegally denying immigrants their statutory right to a bond hearing, causing the current flood of litigation that is taking the time of US Attorneys who could be working on essential cases affecting our security as a nation, and time away from District Court judges and their staff. DHS has no incentive to change its practice if the result is immigrants spending thousands of dollars for legal representation and a rigged bond hearing, designed only to deny deserving immigrants the ability to receive a bond and return to their families and community as Congress intended.

We implore District Court judges to address this issue by either ordering the straight release from detention when it is shown that the detention is illegal, or conducting their own bond analysis and making their own determination regarding the issuance of bond, the amount, and any other restrictions the Court deems necessary.

We sincerely appreciate the Court's attention to this matter.

Respectfully,
/s/Matthew J. Archambeault
Matthew J. Archambeault
Law Office of Matthew J. Archambeault
216 Haddon Avenue, Suite 402
Haddon Township, NJ 08108
215-599-2189
mja@archambeaultlaw.com

EXHIBIT 3

Law Offices of Noemi C. Simbron
56 Hamilton Street, Ste. 2
Paterson, New Jersey 07505

Tel: (973) 684-4214
Fax: (201) 625-6365
noemi.simbron@gmail.com

AFFIDAVIT OF NOEMI C. SIMBRON IN HER CAPACITY AS AN IMMIGRATION ATTORNEY

I have been a member of the New Jersey Bar of Attorneys and of the New Jersey Federal District Court since 2016. I have been a solo practitioner concentrating mainly in representing immigrants before the USCIS and in Removal Proceedings in immigration Court. Before I was admitted to the Bar, I worked as a legal assistant for respected counsels also from our district for 8 years. Accordingly, I have personally handled and participated in documenting hundreds of cases before immigration courts all over the country.

I am writing this statement in good faith to provide the Federal Court with my testimony of the obvious change in impossible standards that immigration judges are currently applying to individuals who are seeking release under bond. Over the course of my career, I have witnessed individuals being provided with a fair opportunity to be released under bond when they are able to show that there is neither a danger to the community nor a flight risk. Whenever an adjudicator immigration judge found that an individual had less than ideal ties to the community, he or she would even grant a larger amount so as to secure their continued appearances at future hearings. This practice seems to have been eradicated since July of 2025.

There seems to be internal instructions to judges to find ways to deny release under bond which were never there before. For instance, I recently represented a 42-year-old Mexican lady, Ms. Eva Alvarez Coeto, before the immigration court (A221-491-571) and this honorable tribunal (2:25-cv-17789-B). Ms. Alvarez entered the United States without inspection in the year 2002. Over the course of her 22-year life span in the U.S., she bore four U.S.C. children (ages 21, 18, 13 and 12)– all of whom resided with her up until the time she was detained. The two youngest children have learning and speech disabilities. Also, she heavily cooperated with the Passaic Police Department in prosecuting the father of her younger children when he showed pornographic videos to her oldest daughter. This participation led to the criminal conviction of this individual, thereby making Ms. Alvarez Coeto also eligible to apply for U visa status. In August of 2025, Ms. Alvarez moved into the father of her older children's father's home following a reduction of her hours at work. The father of her children attempted to kiss Ms. Alvarez against her will and she slapped him once due to unwanted advances before leaving his house. This incident was reported to the police by the father of Ms. Alvarez's children and she was charged with simple assault in the city of Clifton, NJ on or about August 27, 2025. Ms. Alvarez was arrested pursuant to that incident for the first and only time after being present in

the United States for 22 years. She was then referred to immigration detention and is currently being held at the Delaney Hall Detention Center.

On November 20, 2025, this counsel was retained to represent Ms. Alvarez Coeto for a Petition for Habeas Corpus. In preparation for the petition for Habeas Corpus, this counsel requested a bond hearing before the Immigration Court. The immigration Court scheduled a bond redetermination hearing on December 9, 2025. This counsel provided the Court with the children's birth certificates, their medical records showing that the youngest 2 suffer from learning disabilities, evidence of Ms. Alvarez Coeto's work history in the 22 years she has lived here, and a statement from Ms. Alvarez Coeto describing the underlying circumstances leading to the arrest as well as the consequences of her detention, including the fact that custody of the youngest children is being handled by the State's Children's Services because their father is prohibited from approaching them due to the existence of his record as a sexual predator. After hearing legal arguments, Immigration Judge Shana Chen found that she lacked jurisdiction pursuant to Yajure-Hurtado, 29 I&N 216 (BIA 2025) and Maldonado Bautista "not controlling on [that] Court." In the alternative, Judge Chen found that the Respondent "only acknowledged what she could not hide [from the arrest]," and that she was a danger to the community based upon this sole isolated incident in 22 years of history of hard work and raising American children. She also found that Ms. Alvarez Coeto was a flight risk despite her undeniable ties to the community due to the existence of minor children, and her eligibility to obtain status through the U visa statute for indirect victims of crimes as well as through Cancellation of Removal for Nonimmigrants.

In the past, such mild criminal offense would have never been the basis to find an individual such as Ms. Alvarez to be a danger to the community– especially in light of the obvious isolated nature of this offense. Most importantly, the extent of ties that Ms. Alvarez has to this community in her children and the heightened responsibilities of addressing their disabilities *on her own* because the father is under a permanent restraining order and is required to be registered as a sexual predator pursuant to Meghan's Laws is undeniable. In the past, a reasonable finder of fact would have considered that this woman would have a great incentive to pursue relief because her circumstances squarely fit eligibility for U visa status and Cancellations of Removal. Even the most conservative of judges in the country would have at least considered release under higher bond to assure the Respondent's future appearances and to discourage any further potential criminal actions. But this is not the case now. As I waited for my case to be called, I have heard other hearings handled by colleagues who are also being denied release due to absurd reasons which would have never led to denials in the past. This sort of stories about denials are also being shared by numerous of my colleagues within our listserve in the American Immigration Attorneys Association (AILA).

This internal change in the standards for release under bond has to be merely a plot to have immigrants be denied their due process rights because they know individuals who are hard-working and that do not engage in criminal conduct will not be able to withstand being in detention for extended periods of time. They also know that cutting those individuals' access to earn a living will cripple their ability to be represented by counsel causing a flood of them to give up their rights and just ask to voluntarily depart or be deported. And what happens with our

judicial system? Our constitutional rights? Our communities? As this Court is aware, access to bond has been cut by recently published case law to several categories of immigrants who would've been able to be released and to have a real opportunity to exercise their due process rights. For instance, under Qu Li, 29 I&N Dec. 66 (BIA 2025), there are no more bonds for individuals who are deemed "applicants for admissions," that if they had a stop and/or were processed near the border or a port of entry. Under Matter of M-S-, 27 I&N Dec. 509 (A.G. 2019), there is no more access to bond for individuals who were placed in expedited removal, or subjected to administrative deportation, even after they obtain a favorable result of a filter mechanism to be able to see a judge called a credible fear interview. Now, under Yajure-Hurtado, the government sought to subject every immigrant who may have entered without status at any time to mandatory detention. It is solely because of the intervention of the Federal Courts that this smaller group of individuals– those who are present unlawfully but are not deemed applicants for admission because they were arrested within the territory and are here for a lengthy period of time after their initial entry– have now access to bond when a Petition for Habeas is granted. But, what good does it do if the cases fall back into the same pattern through (presumably) unpublished instructions being received by the immigration judges who are still being mandated to find alternate ways to deny our clients of their due process rights?

Through this letter, I unite my plea to my colleagues to please order our clients released after conducting a fair analysis through this tribunal as we had in the immigration court before the current impossible standards for release were internally mandated. Thank you in advance for your attention.

Respectfully,

/s/ Noemi C. Simbron
Noemi C. Simbron, Esq

EXHIBIT 4

AFFIDAVIT OF ERIC M. MARK, ESQ.

I have been practicing criminal defense and immigration for more than 15 years and have represented dozens, or hundreds, of clients during bond proceedings before the Immigration Court.

Presently, I am the attorney representing Pablo Martinez Ron before the Immigration Court and before the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey before the Hon. Michael E. Farbiarz on a Petition for Habeas Corpus.

Judge Farbiarz ordered a bond hearing for Mr. Martinez Ron that was conducted by Immigration Judge Counihan of the Batavia Immigration Court. Mr. Martinez Ron has been present in the United States for approximately two years. He has no criminal history. He was initially on the docket in Maryland and appeared there once for a hearing. Subsequently, he changed his address with the court and venue was transferred to New Jersey. He was awaiting a hearing in New Jersey. Substantial documentary evidence was submitted demonstrating that he was engaged to be married and lived with his fiancé and his fiance's mother in a house owned by his fiance's mother. The couple had begun IVF treatments, including blood draws and payments and this was also documented to the court. His fiancé was present at the bond hearing.

Despite this evidence, the immigration judge found Mr. Martinez Ron did not have a meaningful family tie in the United States, and that he might have such a tie if he got married. The immigration judge found he did not have a fixed address in the U.S. because he had previously lived at other addresses, was not on the deed and there was no lease. The judge also held against him, without articulating why, that he made $500 - $700 per week.

In the past, such facts would have resulted in a low bond based on decades of caselaw. Her the immigration judge created an impossible standard. Evidence of stable employment was somehow held against the non-citizen. Living with a fiancé and going through IVF was somehow not sufficient to establish a meaningful tie to the U.S. Merely having prior addresses, something that virtually every person on the face of the Earth has, was held against him even though he updated the court when he moved and appeared in court when scheduled.

It is evident that immigration judges have been instructed not to issue bonds and what rationales to rely on to do so. Judges who have been issuing bonds for years, if they have not been terminated, have suddenly stopped issuing bonds. Facts and evidence that were sufficient evidence in 2024 are completely discarded or held against the non-citizens in

2025. The burden of proof has been elevated to such a level that it is impossible to meet and is far beyond what is constitutionally permissible or statutorily authorized.

I affirm that the foregoing statements are true and correct and that any willfully false statement is punishable under the penalty of perjury.

Dated: Decemeber 11, 2025

/s/ Eric M. Mark

Eric M. Mark, Esq.