

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DUISHONBEK YSKAKUULU,

Petitioner,

v.

J.L. JAMISON, et al.,

Respondents.

Civil Action No. 2:26-cv-909
(Judge Perez)

RESPONDENTS' OPPOSITION TO
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

I. INTRODUCTION

As the Court is undoubtedly aware, immigration detainees in this district have filed hundreds of petitions for writs of habeas corpus challenging the authority of the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to detain them without setting a bond hearing. These cases involve individuals who have been detained pending the completion of their removal proceedings, including consideration of their asylum claims as a defense to removal, and break down into four categories:

- ***Hurtado*¹ cases:** individuals who entered the United States without inspection; after a passage of time, they were encountered by immigration authorities in the interior, placed in standard removal proceedings, and recently were detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A); *see, e.g., Cantu-Cortes v. O'Neill*, No. 25-cv-6338, 2025 WL 3171639, at *1-2 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 13, 2025);
- ***Q. Li*² cases:** individuals who entered the United States without inspection, were encountered near the border, released into the country, and, after a passage of time, recently detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A); *see, e.g., Cordero v. Rose*, No. 26-cv-534 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 29, 2026);
- **Arriving Alien cases:** individuals who presented at a port of entry without valid entry documents, were paroled into the country under 8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)(A), and, after a passage of time, recently detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A); *see, e.g., Vasquez-Rosario v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-7427, 2026 WL 196505, at *5 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 26, 2026).

¹ “*Hurtado*” refers to the Board of Immigration Appeals’ decision in *Matter of Hurtado*, 29 I & N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).

² “*Q. Li*” refers to the Board of Immigration Appeals’ decision in *Matter of Q. Li*, 29 I&N Dec. 66 (BIA 2025).

- **Expedited Removal cases:** individuals who, based on certain conditions related to their time, manner, and place of entry, were placed into expedited removal proceedings, paroled into the country under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A), and, after a passage of time, recently detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(iv); *see, e.g., Seminario Marcos v. Jamison*, No. 26-cv-421 (E.D. Pa. Feb. 6, 2026).

The first three categories of cases (*Hurtado*, *Q. Li*, and Arriving Alien) all share the same authority for mandatory detention: 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). And while there are certain legal and factual distinctions among those cases, the fundamental point of departure between the government’s position and the position advanced by petitioners and adopted in over 190 decisions in this district relates to the correct interpretation of § 1225(b)(2)(A):

In the cases of an alien who is an **applicant for admission**, if the examining immigration officer determines that an **alien seeking admission** is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, the alien shall be detained for a proceeding under section 1229a of this title.

8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) (emphasis added).

Although petitioners in these cases are indisputably “applicants for admission,” *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1), courts in this district (and many elsewhere) have concluded that § 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to applicants for admission who are present in the interior of the country because, these decisions conclude, the petitioners are no longer “seeking admission.” Courts have reasoned that “seeking admission” should be given meaning beyond “applicant for admission” to avoid surplusage and have read the term to require active and ongoing efforts to be admitted at or near the border. *See, e.g., Kashranov v. Jamison*, 2025 WL 3188399, *6–7 (E.D. Pa. 2025); *Vasquez-Rosario*, 2026 WL 196505, at *9. By contrast, the

government contends that “applicants for admission” are necessarily “seeking admission” until they have been admitted or until their removal proceedings are complete. And while the government’s position has been rejected by the vast majority of district courts to have considered it, the lone court of appeals to have squarely considered the argument, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, has agreed with the government. *See Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi*, --- F.4th ---, 2026 WL 323330, at *1, *4–*6 (5th Cir. Feb. 6, 2026) (“The everyday meaning of the statute’s terms confirms that being an ‘applicant for admission’ is not a condition independent from ‘seeking admission.’”); *but see Castañon-Nava v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, 161 F.4th 1048, 1062 (7th Cir. 2025) (concluding upon review of application for stay of a preliminary injunction that the government was not likely to succeed on the merits of its argument for mandatory detention of applicants for admission present in the United States under § 1225(b)(2)(A)).

This case is an “Arriving Alien” case where the government has detained petitioner under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). The Petitioner here presented at a port of entry without valid entry documents on April 22, 2023. He was paroled into the country under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A). His parole expired on April 20, 2024. *See Ex. 1*-Petitioner’s I-94. And on February 11, 2026, the government detained him under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). At the time the habeas petition was filed, Petitioner was detained within the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Thus, the case turns principally on the threshold question of statutory interpretation discussed above—whether petitioner is an “applicant for admission” that is “seeking admission” within the meaning of § 1225(b)(2)(A).³ The government

³ In many of its prior responses filed in this district, the government has advanced various jurisdictional arguments that it is not advancing here. Of course, the Court may appropriately satisfy itself of its jurisdiction upon consideration of 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(9), 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii), 1252(g), and the Third Circuit’s decision in *Khalil v. President, United States of America*, --- F.4th ---, 2026 WL 111933 (3d Cir. 2026).

expands on that argument below, addresses the particular context of petitioner's status as an "arriving alien" whose parole has terminated, and addresses petitioner's separate argument alleging a violation of due process.

II. ARGUMENT

The Court should deny the petition because: (1) Petitioner is lawfully detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(a); (2) neither a grant of discretionary parole nor its later revocation changes Petitioner's legal status as an inadmissible arriving alien subject to mandatory detention; and (3) Petitioner's detention does not violate constitutional due process.⁴

A. Petitioner is lawfully detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).

1. Petitioner is an "applicant for admission" "seeking admission."

An individual who "arrives in the United States," or is "present" in this country but "has not been admitted," is an "applicant for admission" under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1). *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287 (2018); *Buenrostro-Mendez*, 2026 WL 323330, at *2. Applicants for admission are covered by either § 1225(b)(1) or § 1225(b)(2). *See Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287 (section 1225(b)(2) "serves as a catchall provision that applies to *all* applicants for admission not covered by § 1225(b)(1)") (emphasis added).

An alien remains an applicant for admission, and subject to § 1225(b)(2), so long as he is "not clearly and beyond doubt entitled to be admitted" to the United States. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). *See also* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a) (defining applicant for admission as *either* "[a]n alien present in the United States who has not been admitted *or* who arrives in the United States") (emphasis added). Congress

⁴ In the event the Court were to grant relief and order a bond hearing, the Court should allow for Petitioner's transfer within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (not just the Eastern District of Pennsylvania), which will facilitate Respondents' ability to provide a prompt bond hearing.

defined *all* aliens who are present in the United States without being admitted as “applicant[s] for admission,” regardless of when they entered. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1).

When an immigration officer encounters and examines an applicant for admission who seeks to remain in the United States, and that alien (like Petitioner) desires to remain in the United States, the applicant is necessarily “seeking admission” within the meaning of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). *See Buenrostro-Mendez*, 2026 WL 323330, at *5 (“[A]n ‘applicant for admission’ is necessarily someone who is ‘seeking admission.’”); *id.* at *4 (“When a person applies for something, they are necessarily seeking it.”). Otherwise, the alien must “withdraw the application for admission and depart immediately from the United States.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(4). An alien continues to be “seeking admission” while in immigration removal proceedings to determine whether he can “be admitted to the United States.” *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(3).

The government acknowledges that all courts in this district (and many more elsewhere) have reasoned that § 1225(b)(2)(A) requires that an “applicant for admission” be actively “seeking admission” at or near the border to fall within its scope. *See, e.g., Kashranov*, 2025 WL 3188399, *6–7; *Demirel v. Fed. Detention Ctr.*, No. 25-cv-5488 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 18., 2025).⁵ But, as noted, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals has agreed with the government. *See Buenrostro-Mendez*, 2026 WL 323330, at *1, *4–*6 (“The everyday meaning of the statute’s terms confirms that being an ‘applicant for admission’ is not a condition independent from ‘seeking admission.’”). The *Buenrostro-Mendez* court concluded, correctly, that an “applicant for admission” is “necessarily someone who is ‘seeking admission.’” *Id.* at *5; *but see Castañon-Nava*, 161 F.4th at 1062.

⁵ The government has filed protective notices of appeal in numerous cases and is awaiting final authorization decisions from the Solicitor General.

Thus, Petitioner, who is indisputably an “applicant for admission,” is also “seeking admission” and covered by § 1225(b)(2)(A).

2. Applicants for admission must be detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), absent discretionary parole.

Pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), “in the case of an alien who is an applicant for admission, if the examining immigration officer determines that an alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, the alien **shall be detained** for a proceeding under section 1229a [removal proceedings].” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) (emphasis added). The Supreme Court has held that § 1225(b)(2)(A) is a mandatory detention statute and that individuals detained pursuant to that provision are not entitled to bond. *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 287 (“Both § 1225(b)(1) and § 1225(b)(2) authorize the detention of certain aliens.”).

Petitioner remains an applicant for admission seeking admission, as he has not clearly and beyond doubt established that he is entitled to be admitted to the United States. Consequently, he is subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2), and ineligible for a bond hearing before an immigration judge.

B. Neither a grant of discretionary parole nor a later expiration or revocation of parole changes Petitioner’s legal status as an inadmissible arriving alien.

Under the INA and its implementing regulations, Petitioner was—and remains—an inadmissible arriving alien. Specifically:

Arriving alien means an applicant for admission coming or attempting to come into the United States at a port-of-entry[] An arriving alien remains an arriving alien even if paroled pursuant to section 212(d)(5) of the [INA], and even after any such parole is terminated or revoked....

8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(q); *see also* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1) (“An alien present in the United States who has not been admitted or who arrives in the United States (whether or

not at a designated port of arrival ...) shall be deemed for purposes of this chapter an applicant for admission.”).

As an “arriving alien”—which constitutes a distinct category of “applicants for admission” within the category considered by the Board of Immigration Appeals in *Matter of Hurtado*, 29 I.&N. Dec. 216 (B.I.A. 2025)—Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), as discussed above. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(c)(1). Custody regulations expressly exclude arriving aliens from receiving a bond hearing, even if they have been paroled into the country. Specifically, 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(h)(2)(i) provides that an immigration judge “may not redetermine conditions of custody” (i.e., set bond) “with respect to . . . (B) Arriving aliens in removal proceedings, including aliens paroled after arrival pursuant to section 212(d)(5) of the Act.”

Here, Petitioner presented at a port-of-entry without valid entry documents. *See* Ex. 2-Record of Deportable/Inadmissible Alien (Feb. 11, 2026). “Thus, by definition, he is an arriving alien.” *Contreras v. Oddo*, 2025 WL 2104428, *4 (W.D. Pa. July 28, 2025); *see also* Pet. Ex. A (Notice to Appear charging Petitioner as an “arriving alien”).⁶ Moreover, “an inadmissible arriving alien, such as Petitioner, is entitled to an asylum interview based on a claim that the alien indicates an intention to apply for asylum or a fear of persecution; *the alien’s detention is mandatory absent DHS’s discretionary decision to parole the alien, and the alien is*

⁶ Judge Kenney of this Court rejected a similar government argument relying on the “arriving alien” distinction, but did so by placing great weight on the government’s reclassification of the petitioner in a superseding Notice to Appear as an “alien present in the United States” who had “arrived in the United States” one year before. *See Vasquez-Rosario v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-7427, 2026 WL 196505, at *5 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 26, 2026). By contrast, here, Petitioner’s Notice to Appear classified Petitioner as an “arriving alien” and the petition does not allege the government has issued a subsequent, superseding Notice to Appear. *See* Pet. Ex. A (Notice to Appear).

not entitled to a bond hearing.” Id. (emphasis added). *But see A-J-R v. Rokosky*, 2026 WL 25056, *5 (D.N.J. Jan. 5, 2026).

“[A]pplicants for admission may be temporarily released on parole ‘in a case-by-case basis for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit.’”

Contreas, 2025 WL 2104428 at *5 (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A)) (citing *Pierre*, 350 F.Supp.3d at 330 (“Decisions under § 1182 are purely discretionary.”)); 8 C.F.R. § 212.5(b) (setting forth general considerations for parole from custody)). However,

[P]arole of such alien shall not be regarded as an admission of the alien and when the purposes of such parole shall, in the opinion of the Secretary of [DHS], have been served the alien shall forthwith return or be returned to the custody from which he was paroled and thereafter his case shall continue to be dealt with in the same manner as that of any other applicant for admission to the United States.

Contreas, 2025 WL 2104428 at *5 (emphasis added) (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A) and citing *Chi Thon Ngo v. INS*, 192 F.3d 390, 392 n.1 (3d Cir. 1999) (“When parole is revoked, the alien reverts to the status of an applicant for admission.”)). “In short, the decision to grant and revoke parole to an inadmissible arriving alien is discretionary.” *Id.* And, at the conclusion of parole, § 1182(d)(5)(A) provides that the alien must be “returned to the custody from which he was paroled.” 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A).

Here, therefore, although Petitioner may previously have been paroled into the United States, a later decision to terminate or revoke that parole “is left to the discretion of the Executive Branch.” *Id.* And, upon the expiration, termination, or revocation of his parole, Petitioner is returned to the custody from which he was paroled, the mandatory detention required for inadmissible arriving aliens under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). “Thus, under the applicable law, Petitioner’s detention is lawful.” *Id.*

C. Petitioner’s detention does not violate constitutional due process.

Congress broadly crafted “applicants for admission” to include undocumented persons, like Petitioner, who are present within the United States. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1). In so doing, Congress made a legislative judgment to detain undocumented persons during removal proceedings. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A); *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 297 (“Read most naturally, §§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2) thus mandate detention of applicants for admission until certain proceedings have concluded.”).

The Supreme Court has repeatedly recognized this profound interest. Petitioner’s mandatory detention pursuant to §1225(b) will only last the duration of his removal proceedings. *Demore*, 538 U.S. at 512 (“[B]ecause the statutory provision at issue in this case governs detention of deportable criminal aliens *pending their removal proceedings*, the detention necessarily serves the purpose of preventing the aliens from fleeing prior to or during such proceedings”); *see also Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 304. In light of Congress’s interest in regulating immigration, including by keeping specified persons in detention pending the removal period, the Supreme Court dispensed of any due process concerns without engaging in the test set forth in *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976). *See generally Demore*, 538 U.S. at 531.

Petitioner’s recent detention pending his removal proceedings does not violate the Due Process Clause. *See, e.g., Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 701 (2001) (detention less than six months presumed constitutional). Congress made the decision to detain him pending removal, which is a “constitutionally permissible part of that process.” *Demore*, 538 U.S. at 531.

The Third Circuit has recognized that there may come a time when mandatory civil detention without a bond hearing becomes unreasonable. *See German Santos v. Warden Pike Cnty. Corr. Facility*, 965 F.3d 203, 211 (3d Cir. 2020)

(analyzing detention under § 1226(c)). However, at this time, Petitioner does not challenge the reasonableness of his detention under *German Santos*.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, respondents respectfully request that the petition for writ of habeas corpus be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID METCALF
United States Attorney

/s/ Susan R. Becker for GBD
GREGORY B. DAVID
Assistant United States Attorney
Chief, Civil Division

/s/ Stacey L. B. Smith
STACEY L. B. SMITH
Assistant United States Attorney
United States Attorney's Office
Eastern District of Pennsylvania
615 Chestnut Street, Suite 1250
Philadelphia, PA 19106
Phone: 215-861-8348
Stacey.Smith@usdoj.gov

Dated: February 13, 2026

Counsel for Respondents

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this date, I filed the foregoing Response in Opposition to Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus via the Court's CM/ECF System, thereby making it available for viewing and download for all parties to the case.

Dated: February 13, 2026

/s/ Stacey L. B. Smith
STACEY L. B. SMITH
Assistant United States Attorney

 For: **DUISHONBEK YSKAKUULU**



U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Securing America's Borders

Most Recent I-94

Admission (I-94) Record Number : 

Most Recent Date of Entry: 2023 April 22

Class of Admission : DT

Admit Until Date : 04/20/2024

Details provided on the I-94 Information form:

Last/Surname : YSKAKUULU

First (Given) Name : DUISHONBEK

Birth Date : 

Document Number : 

Country of Citizenship : Russia

[Get Travel History](#)

► Effective April 26, 2013, DHS began automating the admission process. An alien lawfully admitted or paroled into the U.S. is no longer required to be in possession of a preprinted Form I-94. A record of admission printed from the CBP website constitutes a lawful record of admission. See 8 CFR § 1.4(d).

► If an employer, local, state or federal agency requests admission information, present your admission (I-94) number along with any additional required documents requested by that employer or agency.

► Note: For security reasons, we recommend that you close your browser after you have finished retrieving your I-94 number.

OMB No. 1651-0111
Expiration Date: 04/30/2023

[For inquiries or questions regarding your I-94, please click here](#)

[Accessibility](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)



защита от спама reCAPTCHA

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Subject ID :

Record of Deportable/Inadmissible Alien

Family Name (CAPS) YSKAKUULU, DUISHONBEK		First	Middle	Sex M	Hair BLK	Eyes BLK	Cmpbkn LGT
Country of Citizenship RUSSIA	Passport Number and Country of Issue			Height 68	Weight 187	Occupation UNR	
U.S. Address 				Scars and Marks			
Date, Place, Time, and Manner of Last Entry 04/22/2023 07:57, SYS,			Passenger Boarded at UNKNOWN	F.B.I. Number 			
Number, Street, City, Province (State) and Country of Permanent Residence				☐ Single ☐ Divorced ☐ Married ☐ Widower ☐ Separated			
Date of Birth 		Age: 50	Date of Action 02/11/2026	Location Code PHI/PHI			
City, Province (State) and Country of Birth RUSSIA		AR ☒	Form : (Type and No.) Lifted ☐ Not Lifted ☐				
NIV Issuing Post and NIV Number		Social Security Account Name					
Date Visa Issued		Social Security Number					
Immigration Record NEGATIVE				Criminal Record			
Name, Address, and Nationality of Spouse (Maiden Name, if Appropriate)						Number and Nationality of Minor Children None	
Father's Name, Nationality, and Address, if Known MOLDOKULOV, YSKAK NATIONALITY: RUSSIA			Mother's Present and Maiden Names, Nationality, and Address, if Known MOLDOKULVA, NAZPUL NATIONALITY: RUSSIA				
Monies Due/Property in U.S. Not in Immediate Possession None Claimed		Fingerprinted? ☐ Yes ☒ No		Systems Checks See Narrative		Charge Code Words(s) See Narrative	
Name and Address of (Last)(Current) U.S. Employer		Type of Employment Unemployed or Retired		Salary Hr		Employed from/to	
Narrative (Outline particulars under which alien was located/apprehended. Include details not shown above regarding time, place and manner of last entry, attempted entry, or any other entry, and elements which establish administrative and/or criminal violation. Indicate means and route of travel to interior.) Left Index fingerprint  Right Index fingerprint							
FAMILY INFORMATION ----- Father: MOLDOKULOV, YSKAK is a citizen of RUSSIA. Mother: MOLDOKULVA, NAZPUL is a citizen of RUSSIA. Spouse: Subject is not married. Child: Subject does not have children or dependents.							
SUBJECT HEALTH STATUS ----- The subject claims good health. ...(CONTINUED ON I-831)							
Alien has been advised of communication privileges _____ (Date/Initials)				ALTON FEASTER Deportation Officer			
Distribution:				Received: (Subject and Documents) (Report of Interview) Officer: ALTON FEASTER on: February 11, 2026 (time) Disposition: Other Examining Officer: DEMURGUIONDO, ASD8132			

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Continuation Page for Form I-213

Alien's Name YSKAKUULU, DUISHONBEK	File Number 	Date 02/11/2026
CURRENT ADMINISTRATIVE CHARGES ----- 02/11/2026 - 212a6Ai - ALIEN PRESENT WITHOUT ADMISSION OR PAROLE - (PWAs) 02/11/2026 - 212a7AiI - IMMIGRANT WITHOUT AN IMMIGRANT VISA ----- RECORDS CHECKED ----- NCIC checked on 02/11/2026 with Negative result. O checked on 02/11/2026 with Negative result. EARM checked on 02/11/2026 with Negative result. O checked on 02/11/2026 with Negative result. ARRESTED AT/NEAR -----  RECORD OF DEPORTABLE/EXCLUDABLE ALIEN: ----- 213 Duishonbek YSKAKUULU is subject to President Donald Trump's Executive Order, titled "Protecting the American People Against Invasion," signed on January 20, 2025. ENCOUNTER On February 11, 2026, Duishonbek YSKAKUULU,  a native and citizen of Russia reported to the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) Philadelphia Field Office for his scheduled check-in appointment. The Philadelphia Non-Detained Unit confirmed YSKAKUULU's identity, alienage, and removability and served him a with a Warrant, Form I-200, charging him under Section 212a6Ai and 212a7AiI of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). Alienage & Removability: YSKAKUULU is a citizen of Russia and a national of Russia by virtue of birth, who entered the United States illegally without being admitted or paroled by an immigration officer. Numerous checks using databases with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Department of Justice (DOJ) indicated an October 7, 2026 upcoming court date, but shows no other pending appeals, waivers, or petitions. Family/ Derivative Citizenship: YSKAKUULU has not asserted any claim to United States citizenship, nor do any records indicate that he has obtained or derived such citizenship. Immigration History: The U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) encountered YSKAKUULU on April 22, 2023, at the San Ysidro, CA, Port of Entry through the pedestrian west entrance gate while attempting to illegally enter the United States without inspection by an immigration officer at a time and place other than as designated by the Secretary of Homeland Security. The USBP served YSKAKUULU with a Notice to Appear, Form I-862 charging him under Section 212a6Ai of the INA. The USBP released him from custody and instructed him to report to the closest ICE office near his intended residence. The USBP uploaded YSKAKUULU's NTA into ECAS to initiate his immigration proceedings. On December 15, 2023, YSKAKUULU filed an Application for Asylum and Withholding of Removal, Form I-589, with U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). On February 14, 2024, YSKAKUULU filed an Application for Asylum and Withholding of Removal, Form I-589, with U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS).		
Signature ALTON FEASTER	Title Deportation Officer	

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Continuation Page for Form I-213

Alien's Name YSKAKUULU, DUISHONBEK	File Number 	Date 02/11/2026
Criminal History: YSKAKUULU has no previous criminal record and does not have any outstanding wants or warrants. Health & Humanitarian: YSKAKUULU denied any significant humanitarian concerns. YSKAKUULU made a 5-minute phone call to his daughter,  at . YSKAKUULU declined his right to speak with the Russian Consulate. Consular notifications are not mandatory. YSKAKUULU did claim a fear of removal to Russia. YSKAKUULU initially claimed no health issues or medications. After being taken into custody, YSKAKUULU claimed to have a rash on his torso, for which he applies medication (no specifics). He also later claimed that he takes medication for high blood pressure, and he does not have it with him. YSKAKUULU claims he is married. He lives with his wife. YSKAKUULU claims to have minor children in the U.S. YSKAKUULU stated that he did not serve in the United States Military. Foreign Identity and Travel Documents: At the time of arrest, ERO was able to obtain YSKAKUULU's foreign identity/travel document: Russian passport, . Disposition: ICE served YSKAKUULU with a Warrant of Arrest, Form I-200. Subject's I-830 and I-200 were uploaded into EARM. I-77:  DHS-589: N/A OTHER IDENTIFYING NUMBERS ----- ALIEN- 		
Signature ALTON FEASTER		Title Deportation Officer

3 of 3 Pages