

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

Reinaldo GUEVARA MARTINEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

VERNON LIGGINS, Field Officer Director,
Immigration and Customs Enforcement,
Baltimore Field Office, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Case No. 26-cv-00520-TDC

JOINT STATUS REPORT

Petitioner and Respondents, by and through undersigned counsel, hereby submit the following Joint Status Report regarding the bond hearing ordered by the Court.

On February 10, 2026, shortly after the Court issued its order granting the habeas petition, Dkt. No. 8, the Hyattsville Immigration Court scheduled a bond hearing for February 13 at 10 am. Respondents kept Petitioner detained at the Baltimore ICE office from February 10 until the bond hearing on February 13, and Petitioner appeared at the bond hearing by videoconference from the Baltimore ICE building.

Petitioner provides the following description of the bond hearing on February 13. In advance of the hearing, Petitioner submitted evidence in support of bond, including letters of support from U.S. citizen family members and friends, multiple years of Petitioner's tax returns, proof of Petitioner's residence in Baltimore, and documentation of Petitioner having sole legal custody over his child. Counsel for the Department of Homeland Security submitted no evidence. The Immigration Judge (IJ) found that Petitioner was not a danger to the community and credited the evidence presented by Petitioner demonstrating his ties to the community. However, the IJ

found that Petitioner is a flight risk based solely on the IJ's determination that Petitioner's asylum claim, which Petitioner has not yet filed and which Petitioner's counsel briefly summarized during the bond hearing based on a single, 30-minute phone conversation with Petitioner the day before,¹ was not sufficiently strong. In his written order following the hearing, the IJ stated that "[Petitioner] is a flight risk, and no amount of bond will ensure the appearance of the [Petitioner] at future hearings or his compliance with the directives of immigration officers."

Petitioner is considering moving to enforce this Court's order, subject to what occurs at Petitioner's next immigration court hearing and pending efforts to obtain a transcript of the February 13 bond hearing. Any motion to enforce would be premised on the argument that the bond hearing was not properly conducted "pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1, 1003.19, and 1236.1" as ordered by this Court. *See Mejia Orozco v. Lyons*, 1:25-cv-1762, Dkt. No. 20 (E.D. Va. Dec. 1, 2025). Accordingly, Petitioner asks that the Court keep this case open for 30 days or otherwise expressly retain jurisdiction to enforce its order.

Respondents contend that this matter should be closed. Petitioner had a bond hearing on February 13, 2026. Petitioner's recourse for any dissatisfaction with the IJ's bond decision is to file an appeal with the Board of Immigration Appeals. In brief, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(e) bars this Court from reviewing or setting aside an IJ's bond decision. The plain language of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(e) provides: "The Attorney General's discretionary judgment regarding the application of this section shall not be subject to review. No court may set aside any action or decision by the Attorney General under this section regarding the detention of any alien or the revocation or denial of bond or parole." 8 U.S.C. § 1226(e). The Supreme Court in *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510 (2003),

¹ Due to Petitioner's detention at the Baltimore ICE office, this was the only conversation Petitioner's undersigned counsel was able to have with Petitioner between the Court's habeas order and the bond hearing.

explained § 1226(e) blocks judicial review of discretionary judgments and decisions by immigration officials (including Immigration Judges) regarding the arrest, detention, and bond of aliens subject to 8 U.S.C. § 1226. *Id.* at 516-17. Recently, this Court in *Chavez de Vasquez v. Baker*, No. SAG-25-03657, 2025 WL 3713773, at *203, agreed that § 1226(e) barred review of the petitioner's bond hearing. As such, Respondents contend that the Court should close this matter.

February 19, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Rebecca Koch

Rebecca Koch (Bar No. 802108)
Assistant United States Attorney
36 South Charles Street, 4th Floor
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
Ph 410-209-4800
Rebecca.koch@usdoj.gov

Counsel for Respondents

/s/ Ian Austin Rose

Ian Austin Rose (Bar No. 22079)
Amica Center for Immigrant Rights
1025 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 701
Washington, DC 20036
Ph 202-788-2509
Austin.rose@amicacenter.org

Counsel for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 19th day of February 2026, a copy of the foregoing Joint Status Report was served via CM/ECF on all parties and counsel receiving electronic notice in this case.

/s/ Ian Austin Rose
Counsel for Petitioner