

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

Maria Del Rocio Ramirez Perez,

*

Petitioner,

*

Case No. 1:26-cv-00866-DLB

*

Nikita Baker, *et al.*,

*

Respondents.

*

*

* * * * *

JOINT NOTICE

Petitioner and Respondents (the “Parties”), by and through undersigned counsel, hereby submit the following Notice to the Court regarding the Petition for Habeas Corpus (ECF No. 1), and state in lieu of further briefing:

1. This matter arises out of Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, which challenges Petitioner’s detention under 8 U.S.C. §1225 (requiring mandatory detention) instead of under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 (providing for discretionary detention after a bond hearing). *See generally*, ECF No. 1.

2. The Parties agree that the factual and legal arguments presented in the instant habeas petition do not materially differ from those presented in many similar cases before this Court, including, for example, *Velasquez v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-3215-GLR, 2025 WL 3003684 (D. Md. Oct. 27, 2025); *Villanueva Funes v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-3860-TDC, 2026 WL 92860 (D. Md. Jan. 13, 2026); and, *Leal-Hernandez v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-02428-JRR, 2025 WL 2430025 (D. Md. Aug. 24, 2025). As in those cases, this Petition concerns whether Petitioner, a noncitizen who entered the United States without inspection and was detained, is subject to mandatory detention

under 8 U.S.C. § 1225 or discretionary detention under § 1226(a) during the pendency of administrative removal proceedings

3. Given that the Respondents have previously briefed the question of mandatory or discretionary detention and any related jurisdictional issues in numerous cases, including those referenced above, Respondents hereby incorporate the arguments raised those cases in lieu of further briefing.

4. Additionally, on February 6, 2026, the Fifth Circuit, in *Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi*, No. 25-20496 (5th Cir. Feb. 6, 2026), held, 2-1, that the Department of Homeland Security can charge individuals they initially encounter, no matter how long they have been in the United States, under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), stating:

After reviewing carefully the relevant provisions and structure of the Immigration and Naturalization Act, the statutory history, and Congressional intent, we conclude that the government's position is correct. We REVERSE the district courts' orders to provide petitioners with bond hearings or release them and REMAND for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

Id. at p. 3. The Parties acknowledge that this Fifth Circuit case is not binding in this District.

5. Several Judges in this District have recently asked the parties in similar cases to address the application of the *Maldonado Bautista v. Noem* decision, 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, 2025 WL 3678485 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025). Respondents contend that *Maldonado* is not binding on this Court for reasons set forth in prior briefs, which are incorporated as if fully set forth herein, including in *Bautista Villanueva v. Bondi, et al.*, United States District Court for the District of Maryland, Case No.: 1:25-cv-4152-ABA, ECF No. 8, pp. 18-23, but recognize that several judges in this District have found that even if *Maldonado* is not binding or controlling, they would adopt and incorporate *Maldonado's* reasoning in deciding the merits of claims like Petitioner's.

6. As such, the Parties jointly agree and assert is that no further briefing is necessary and that the Petition can be decided without a hearing.

7. If the Court orders a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226, then the Parties jointly request that the Court include the following in any such Order:

- a. Petitioner is detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and Respondents are enjoined from detaining Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b);
- b. Petitioner shall not be detained in Baltimore, Maryland.
- c. Petitioner is entitled to a bond hearing consistent with 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1(d), 1003.19 and 1236.1(d), which shall be held **within 14 days** of the **Petitioner's filing of a motion with the Immigration Court** with meaningful consideration by the Immigration Judge of applicable, relevant factors;
- d. The bond hearing may be conducted by any Immigration Judge having jurisdiction or administrative control over Petitioner's detention or having administrative control over Petitioner's immigration case or removal proceedings and need not take place in Maryland; but, Petitioner must be present (in person or by video) and able to participate in the hearing;
- e. If bond is granted and Petitioner is released, nothing in this Order precludes Respondents from imposing reasonable conditions of release;
- f. **Petitioner shall file a status report with this Court** if a bond hearing is not held by an Immigration Judge within 14 days of the filing of a motion for a bond hearing;
- g. **Petitioner shall file a status report** within 14 days of this Order.
- h. Any request for attorney's fees and costs is denied.

WHEREFORE, the Parties request that the Court consider the Petition fully briefed; that no hearing is necessary; and, that if the Court orders relief form of a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226, it include the aforementioned terms in any such order.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly O. Hayes
United States Attorney

/s/ Michelle J Moodispaw

Michelle J Moodispaw, Bar number: 31696
Casiano Law Office
7678 Quarterfield Road
Suite 204
Glen Burnie, MD 21601
240-268-0444
mmoodispaw@abogadamd.com
Counsel for Petitioner

/s/ Melissa E. Goldmeier

Melissa E. Goldmeier, Bar number: 18769
Assistant U.S. Attorney
Ivory Macklin, Special Assistant United
States Attorney
U.S. Attorney's Office, District of Maryland
36 S. Charles Street, 4th Fl.
Baltimore, MD 21201
Ivory.Macklin@usdoj.gov
melissa.goldmeier@usdoj.gov
(410) 209-4855
Counsel for Respondents