

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

Maria Patino Martinez,

\*

Petitioner,

\*

Case No. 1:26-cv-00682-MJM

v.

\*

Vernon Liggins, *et al.*,

\*

Respondents.

\*

\* \* \* \* \*

**PETITIONER'S STATUS REPORT**

Petitioner, by and through undersigned counsel, provides this Status Report regarding this Court's February 24, 2026 Order granting in part her petition for writ of habeas corpus, ECF No. 9, and states:

1. On February 24, 2026, this Court ordered, in relevant part, that (1) Petitioner is detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and Respondents are enjoined from detaining Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b); and (2) Petitioner is entitled to an immigration court bond hearing consistent with 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1(d), 1003.19, and 1236.1(d). *See* ECF No. 9.
2. On March 3, 2026, Petitioner filed her bond request before the Adelanto Immigration Court. *See* Exhibit A (bond service confirmation email). Included with her filing was this Court's Order enjoining Respondents from detaining Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). *See* Exhibit B (Order with ECAS filing stamp); ECF No. 9.
3. The Adelanto court scheduled Petitioner's bond hearing for March 12, 2026, at 1:00pm PST. *See* Exhibit C (Bond Hearing Notice).
4. Before Petitioner's scheduled hearing, on March 11, 2026, Judge Susan Phan of the Adelanto Immigration Court issued an order denying Petitioner's bond request for lack of jurisdiction. *See* Exhibit D (Order of the Immigration Judge). Judge Phan's reasoning was as follows:

No jurisdiction. The record contains no evidence that Respondent has been lawfully admitted into the United States. Pursuant to INA § 235(a)(1), an alien present in the United States without admission is deemed an "applicant for admission" and is subject to mandatory

detention under INA § 235(b)(2)(A). The Board has expressly held that Immigration Judges lack jurisdiction to consider or grant bond to such individuals. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). The Ninth Circuit in *Maldonado Bautista v. DHS*, No. 26-1044, Dkt. 5.1 (9th Cir. Mar. 6, 2026), stayed the district court’s decision vacating *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*.

*Id.* In finding she lacked jurisdiction to redetermine Petitioner’s custody status, Judge Phan expressly defied this Court’s Order enjoining Respondents from detaining Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), cited in Judge Phan’s Order by its citation under the INA, INA § 235(b). *See id.*; ECF No. 9 (“Respondents are enjoined from detaining Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) . . .”).

5. Judge Phan’s Order refusing to provide Petitioner a bond hearing—issued the day *before* Petitioner even had a chance to present her case at her previously-scheduled bond hearing—is in direct violation of this Court’s Order. *See* ECF No. 9 (“Petitioner is entitled to a bond hearing consistent with 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1(d), 1003.19 and 1236.1(d) . . .”); *see also* Exhibits C (Hearing Notice scheduling Petitioner’s bond hearing for March 12, 2026) & D (Order of the Immigration Judge, issued March 11, 2026).
6. In light of Respondents’ blatant noncompliance with this Court’s Order, Petitioner respectfully requests this Court find that Respondents violated its Order and, accordingly, order Petitioner’s immediate release from Respondents’ custody.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner requests that this Court ACCEPT this Status Report and ORDER Petitioner be IMMEDIATELY RELEASED from Respondents’ custody.

Dated: March 12, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Rachael E. Savage  
Rachael E. Savage (Bar No.: 31908)  
Eldridge Crandell, LLC  
1 South Street, Suite 2150  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
(443) 559-4384  
[rsavage@myMDlegal.com](mailto:rsavage@myMDlegal.com)  
*Counsel for Petitioner*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 12th day of March of 2026, a copy of the foregoing Amended Joint Status Report was served via CM/ECF on all parties and counsel receiving electronic notice in this case.

*/s/ Rachael E. Savage*  
Rachael E. Savage, Esq.  
*Counsel for Petitioner*