UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF COLORADO

VICENTE JAVIER JIMENEZ CHAUCA,
A [redacted]

Petitioner,

v.

KRISTI NOEM, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; PAMELA BONDI, U.S. Attorney General; ROBERT HAGAN, Field Office Director, Denver Field Office, Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and JUAN BALTAZAR, Warden of Denver Contract Detention Facility,

Respondents.

Case No. 1:26-cv-864

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2241

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner Vicente Javier Jimenez Chauca ("Mr. Jimenez") is a native and citizen of Ecuador who entered the United States in December 2023. On February 4, 2026, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") detained Mr. Jimenez when he attended a scheduled check-in and placed him in immigration custody pending completion of removal proceedings in violation of his constitutional rights. The Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") and the Executive Office of Immigration Review ("EOIR") have concluded that he is subject to mandatory immigration detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), as an "applicant for admission" who is "seeking admission" to the United States.

2. DHS's interpretation of its detention authority under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) marks a complete reversal of the interpretation of the statute that the government has embraced since its inception three decades ago, its prior practice, Supreme Court precedent, and the plain language of the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA").

3. This Court should therefore intervene and grant Mr. Jimenez's petition for a writ of habeas corpus and order his release from immigration custody on account of ICE's violation of his due process rights, or, alternatively, order EOIR to conduct a bond hearing at which 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) cannot be applied and DHS bears the burden of proof that Mr. Jimenez is a flight risk or danger to society.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. Mr. Jimenez is detained at the Denver Contract Detention Facility in Aurora, Colorado, and is in physical custody of Respondents. *See* Ex. 1, ICE Detainee Locator.

5. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-02 (declaratory relief). Mr. Jimenez's detention by Respondents is a "severe restraint" on his individual liberty. *See Hensley v. Municipal Court, San Jose Milpitas Jud. Dist.*, 411 U.S. 345, 351 (1973).

6. This Court may grant relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*, and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

7. Venue is proper because Mr. Jimenez's immediate custodian at Denver Contract Detention Facility is located in this District and a "substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim" occurred in this District. 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e)(1).

PARTIES

8. Petitioner Vicente Javier Jimenez Chauca is a native and citizen of Ecuador. As of the filing of this Petition, ICE is detaining him at the Denver Contract Detention Facility in Aurora, Colorado.

9. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. She is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the INA and oversees ICE, which is

responsible for Mr. Jimenez's detention. Secretary Noem has ultimate custodial authority over Mr. Jimenez and is sued in her official capacity.

10. Respondent Pamela Bondi is the Attorney General of the United States. She is responsible for the Department of Justice, of which the Executive Office for Immigration Review and the immigration court system it operates is a component agency. She is sued in her official capacity.

11. Respondent Robert Hagan is the Field Office Director of the ICE Denver Field Office and is responsible for ICE's operations in Colorado where Mr. Jimenez is held. He is sued in his official capacity.

12. Respondent Juan Baltazar is the Warden of the Denver Contract Detention Facility and is the immediate custodian of Mr. Jimenez. He is sued in his official capacity.

REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

13. The Court must grant the petition for a 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, Respondents must file a return "within three days unless for good cause additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is allowed." *Id.*

14. 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).

15. Mr. Jimenez requests the Court issue an Order to Show Cause, and direct Respondents to file a response within three days, in light of the significant restraint on his liberty and clear Constitutional violations in this case.

TRANSFER OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT; ALL WRITS ACT

16. The All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), empowers the federal courts to "issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law."

17. Courts both in and outside this district have recently invoked the All Writs Act to prevent the transfer of individuals detained within the judicial district. *See Arostegui-Maldonado v. Baltazar*, 794 F.Supp.3d 926, 948-49 (D. Colo. Aug. 8, 2025) (listing cases).

18. Mr. Jimenez requests that this Court invoke the All Writs Act to prevent any transfer out of the District of Colorado during the pendency of his habeas action, given the likelihood that he will be ordered to appear at a bond hearing shortly after this Court rules upon the habeas petition. Mr. Jimenez lives in Colorado, and his counsel's law firm operates primarily in Colorado. He will need to participate in the preparation for and attend his bond hearing should the Court order one, and he will incur additional, unnecessary expenses and difficulty in returning to his residence in Colorado should he be granted a bond hearing after being transferred elsewhere. *See Ozturk v. Trump*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 462, 497 (D. Vt. 2025) (noting that presence in the judicial district where an action is pending "facilitate[s]" the petitioner's "ability to work with [his or] her attorneys, coordinate the appearance of witnesses," and generally present claims related to detention); *Suri v. Trump*, 785 F. Supp. 3d 128, 148 (E.D. Va. May 6, 2025).

EXHAUSTION

19. The failure to exhaust administrative remedies does not bar Mr. Jimenez's claim unless

"Congress specifically mandates" exhaustion. *Miranda v. Garland*, 34 F.4th 338, 351 (4th Cir. 2022) (1993) (quoting *McCarthy v. Madigan*, 503. U.S. 140, 144 (1992)).

20. Moreover, because detaining Mr. Jimenez without a significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future violates his right to due process, administrative exhaustion is excused. *See Guitard v. U.S. Sec'y of the Navy*, 967 F.2d 737, 741 (2d Cir. 1992) ("Exhaustion of administrative remedies may not be required when . . . a plaintiff has raised a 'substantial constitutional question.'").

21. Although the Court may impose exhaustion requirements as a prudential matter, it should not do so in this case because further administrative exhaustion would be futile. Upon information and belief, many immigration judges across the country are determining that noncitizens like Mr. Jimenez are detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) and ineligible for bond.

STATEMENT OF RELEVANT FACTS

22. Mr. Jimenez arrived in the United States on December 25, 2023. The Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") detained him for several days.

23. On December 27, 2023, DHS issued Mr. Jimenez a Notice to Appear initiating removal proceedings, charging him with removability under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) as a [noncitizen]present in the United States without being admitted or paroled, or who arrived in the United States at any time or place other than as designated by the Attorney General. Ex. 2, Notice to Appear.

24. The NTA indicates that DHS considers Mr. Jimenez to be a noncitizen "present in the United States who has not been admitted or paroled." Ex. 2. He was not placed in expedited removal proceedings. *Id.*

25. Shortly thereafter, ICE released Mr. Jimenez from detention and placed him in its Intensive

Supervision Appearance Program ("ISAP").

26. Upon information and belief, Mr. Jimenez was released on conditional parole pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).

27. Upon information and belief, Mr. Jimenez has attended every scheduled immigration hearing and has appeared at every ISAP check-in.

28. On February 4, 2026, Mr. Jimenez appeared as his scheduled in-person check-in with ICE and was detained. He has remained in detention at the Denver Contract Detention Facility since that time. Ex. 1.

29. Since his arrival, Mr. Jimenez has not been convicted of any crimes. The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services ("USCIS") issued him an employment authorization card on May 5, 2025, and he has been able to obtain a driver's license.

LEGAL BACKGROUND

Immigration Detention Authority (8 U.S.C. §§ 1225 and 1226)

30. In 1996, Congress passed the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act ("IIRIRA"), Pub. L. 104-208, which set forth separates procedures for the removal and detention of arriving or recently arrived noncitizens and those who have entered and established a presence in the United States, even those who have done so in violation of the immigration laws. *Compare* 8 U.S.C. § 1225 ("Inspection by immigration officers; expedited removal of inadmissible arriving aliens; referral for hearing"), *with* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1226 ("Apprehension and detention of aliens"), 1229a ("Removal proceedings"). For those individuals with an established presence in the United States, the INA mandates that "an immigration judge shall conduct proceedings for deciding the inadmissibility or deportability of a [noncitizen]." 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(a)(1). Removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(a)(1) "shall be the sole and exclusive procedure from the United States" unless otherwise specified in the INA. 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(a)(3).

31. During the pendency of standard removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a, § 1226 provides for the detention of noncitizens already in the United States, even those who entered illegally or without inspection. While § 1226(c) mandates the detention of certain classes of criminal noncitizens, § 1226(a) sets forth the rule for noncitizens subject to discretionary detention under § 1226. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), a noncitizen "may be arrested and detained pending a decision on whether the alien is to be removed from the United States[.]" 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). After an arrest, the noncitizen may continue to be detained, released on conditional parole, or released on a bond of at least $1,500. *Id.*

32. Once a noncitizen is detained, DHS makes an initial custody determination. 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19(a), 1236.1(d). The noncitizen may have the initial custody determination reviewed by an immigration judge, *see* 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.19(a), 1236.1(d), and ultimately by the Board, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(d)(3).

33. As part of IIRIRA, Congress created an expedited removal process to be implemented during inspection at the border for certain "applicants for admission" deemed to be "arriving aliens." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). The INA defines an applicant for admission as a noncitizen "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 and including a [noncitizen] who is brought to the United States after having been interdicted in international or United States waters)." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1). The INA further clarifies that the term "application for admission" has "reference to the application for admission *into* the United States," making clear that the term applies to those applying to enter into the United States. 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(4) (emphasis added). Notably, individuals subject to expedited removal are not eligible for bond pending completion of their removal hearings. *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287 (2018); *see id.* at 303 (distinguishing individuals subject

to § 1225(b) from those "already present in the United States").

34. Critically, expedited removal proceedings do not apply to all "applicants for admission." Instead, they may be applied only to: (1) individuals who are arriving in the United States at a port of entry without valid documents; and (2) those without valid documents who have been in the United States for less than two years and have not been admitted or paroled. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(iii)(II); *see Dep't of Homeland Sec. v. Thuraissigiam*, 591 U.S. 103, 109 (2020). Further, this second subset of individuals—noncitizens who have been in the United States for less than two years and have not been admitted or paroled—only become subject to expedited removal if so designated by DHS. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(iii)(I) (granting discretionary authority to apply expedited removal to any or all noncitizens described in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(iii)(II)); *See* Notice, Designating Aliens for Expedited Removal, 90 Fed. Reg. 8139, 8139 (Jan. 24, 2025) (designating the entire subset of noncitizens described in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(iii)(II) subject to expedited removal: noncitizens "determined to be inadmissible under [8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C) or (a)(7)] who have not been admitted or paroled into the United States and who have not affirmatively shown . . . that they have been physically present in the United States continuously for if so designated by DHS.").

35. Noncitizens placed in expedited removal proceedings are referred to standard removal proceedings under § 1229a if they establish a credible fear of persecution if removed. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). Otherwise, the noncitizen is ordered removed "without further hearing or review." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(iii). Further, any noncitizen "subject to the procedures under [8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)] shall be detained pending a final determination of credible fear of persecution and, if found not to have such a fear, until removed." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(iv).

36. Finally, § 1225(b)(2) mandates the detention of certain "applicants for admission" not

covered by § 1225(b)(1). Yet in keeping with the statute's focus on arriving aliens, the statute does not mandate detention for all applicants for admission. Instead, § 1225(b)(2)(A) only mandates the detention of "an applicant for admission" when "the examining immigration officer determines" that the noncitizen who "seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted."

37. Courts and the U.S. Government have consistently taken the position that noncitizens who have entered without inspection and are encountered in the United States years after their initial entry are entitled to removal proceedings under § 1229a and subject to detention under § 1226. *See, e.g.*, *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 303 ("While the language of §§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2) is quite clear, §1226(c) is even clearer. As noted, § 1226 applies to aliens *already present in the United States*.") (emphasis added); IIRIRA Implementing Regulation, 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."). This is because these individuals are not "seeking admission." *See Lopez Benitez v. Francis*, 795 F. Supp. 3d 475 (S.D.N.Y. 2025) (holding that a noncitizens who has been residing in the United States for more than two years cannot be classified as an "alien seeking admission"); *Martinez v. Hyde*, 792 F. Supp. 3d 211 (D. Mass. 2025); (rejecting the Government's "novel interpretation" that 1225(b) applies to noncitizens detained while present in the United States).

38. Despite amending the INA numerous times since passing IIRIRA, *see, e.g.*, REAL ID Act of 2005, Pub. L. No. 109-13, 119 Stat. 302, Congress has never seen fit to clarify or alter this universally accepted interpretation of the statute.

39. Yet in July 2025, the Government abruptly rejected the reading of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) it

had embraced when IIRIRA was first enacted and over three decades since. In a complete reversal, "DHS, in coordination with the Department of Justice (DOJ) . . . revisited its legal position on detention and release authorities," and issued guidance instructing all ICE employees that 8 U.S.C. § 1225 rather than § 1226 "is the applicable immigration detention authority for all applicants for admission."[1] This policy has since been vacated. *Bautista*, 2025 WL 3713987.

40. In September 2025, the Board of Immigration Appeals adopted DHS's novel statutory reading of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). The Board found no distinction between the statutory terms "applicant for admission" and "seeking admission," and concluded that § 1225(b)(2) must be read to include all noncitizens who have not been inspected and admitted at any point. *Id.* at 221-22. Further, the Board asserted that legislative history supported its construction, although it did not cite any legislative history addressing the detention statutes. *Id.* at 223-25. This decision was recently vacated. *Maldonado Bautista, et al. v. Santacruz, et al.*, 2026 WL 468284, at *10 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 18, 2026).

41. Courts that have reviewed this issue have almost universally rejected Respondents' new reading of the statute. *See, e.g., Nava Hernandez v. Baltazar*, 2025 WL 2996643 (D. Colo. Oct. 24, 2025); *Hernandez Vazquez v. Baltasar*, 1:25-cv-3049 (D. Colo. Oct. 23, 2025); *Loa Caballero v. Baltazar*, 2025 WL 2977650 (D. Colo. Oct. 22, 2025); *Moya Pineda v. Baltasar*, No. 1:25-cv-2966 (D. Colo. Oct. 20, 2025); *Mendoza Gutierrez*, 2025 WL 2962908 (D. Colo. Oct. 17, 2025); *Garcia Cortes v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2652880 (D. Colo. Sept. 16, 2025); *Ortiz Ventura v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-01429-MSN-WBP (E.D. Va. Oct. 2, 2025); *Quispe-Ardiles v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-01382-MSN-WEF (E.D. Va. Sept. 30, 2025); *Salazar v. Dedos*, 2025 WL 2676729 (D.N.M. Sept. 17, 2025); *Galdamez Martinez v. Noem, et al.*, 2025 WL 3471575 (W.D. Tex. Nov. 26, 2025); *Lopez-*

[1] https://www.aila.org/library/ice-memo-interim-guidance-regarding-detention-authority-for-applications-for-admission.

Arevelo v. Ripa, No. EP-25-CV-337-KC, 2025 WL 2691828 (W.D. Tex. Sept. 22, 2025).

42. Notwithstanding the resounding rejection of DHS and DOJ's policy, Respondents continue to defend the policy. Yet this policy deprives Mr. Jimenez of any process by subjecting him—with limited criminal history and with many years residence in the United States—to the same mandatory detention provisions as applicants at the border seeking to initially enter the United States.

Parole Release Provisions

43. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), on a warrant issued by the government, "an alien may be arrested and detained pending a decision on whether the alien is to be removed from the United States. . . . [The government] may release the alien on. . . (B) conditional parole." 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2)(B).

44. Under 8 C.F.R. § 236.1(c)(8), "any officer authorized to issue a warrant of arrest may, in the officer's discretion, release an alien not described in section 236(c)(1) of the Act [8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)], under the conditions at section 236(a)(2) and (3) of the Act [8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2) and (3)]; provided that the alien must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the officer that such release would not pose a danger to property or persons, and that the alien is likely to appear for any future proceeding."

45. Mr. Jimenez's release from his initial detention at the border was conducted pursuant 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). This release was premised upon either an explicit or implicit finding that he was not dangerous or a flight risk.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT ONE
Violation of the Immigration and Nationality Act
Arbitrary Detention; 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225 and 1226

46. Mr. Jimenez realleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

47. This Court should rule that Mr. Jimenez is subject to detention under § 1226(a), and not detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b).

48. Mr. Jimenez was never processed for removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225 and therefore is not subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1).

49. Nor is Mr. Jimenez an applicant for admission "seeking admission" who, at the time of inspection for admission, an examining officer determined was not clearly and beyond a doubt inadmissible. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

50. To apply § 1225(b) to Mr. Jimenez is contrary to the INA. As the Supreme Court recognized in *Jennings*, § 1225(b) focuses on individuals arriving at the border and ports of entry and thus are in the process of "seeking admission." *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 297, 303; *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 1.2 (addressing noncitizens who are geographically "coming or attempting to come into the United States."). Mr. Jimenez was detained after living in the United States for more than two years, and has been proceeding before an immigration judge to seek relief from removal

51. Rather, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) is the only potentially applicable statute of detention. DHS released Mr. Jimenez's on conditional parole. Such release is only permitted through 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and the attendant regulations.

52. Section 1226(a) focuses on individuals who are in the United States and the government is seeking to remove through removal proceedings. *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 303. The titles of 8 U.S.C. § 1225 and § 1226 statutory sections make this distinction clear. *Compare* 8 U.S.C. § 1225 (titled "Inspection by immigration officers; expedited removal of inadmissible arriving aliens; referral for hearing"), *with* 8 U.S.C. § 1226 ("Apprehension and detention of aliens").

53. Indeed, Mr. Jimenez cannot be deemed "seeking admission." Such statutory reasoning would render the phrase "seeking admission" superfluous because it violates principle that

"Congress is presumed to have acted intentionally in choosing different words in a statute, such that different words and phrases should be accorded different meanings." *Lopez Benitez*, 795 F. Supp. 3d at 489; *TRW Inc. v. Andrews*, 534 U.S. 19, 31 (2001) ("[N]o clause, sentence, or word shall be superfluous, void, or insignificant."); *accord Mendoza Gutierrez*, 2025 WL 2962908, at *7. Section 1225's mandatory detention regime applies to noncitizens who meet three criteria; first, the noncitizen must be "an 'applicant for admission' (a 'term of art' in the INA that includes noncitizens who 'arrive[] in the United States,' as well as those already 'present in the United States who ha[ve] not been admitted," second, the noncitizen must be "actively 'seeking admission' to the country," and third, the noncitizen must be "one whom an examining immigration officer determines 'is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted.'"); *Lopez Benitez*, 795 F. Supp. 3d at 488 (quoting *Martinez*, 792 F. Supp. 3d at 214).

54. Applying § 1225(b)(2) to all noncitizens except those who have been admitted could not have been Congress's intent because it would render other mandatory detention provisions, such as § 1226(c)(1)(E), unnecessary. *Sampiao v. Hyde*, 799 F. Supp. 3d 14, 28 (D. Mass. 2025); *Rodriguez Vasquez v. Bostock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239, 1259 (W.D. Wa. 2025); *Gomes v. Hyde*, 2025 WL 1869299, *7 (D. Mass July 7, 2025). Section 1225(c) requires mandatory detention for individuals who are present in the United States without being admitted or paroled and who are subject to specific criminal conduct criteria. *Sampiao*, 799 F. Supp. 3d at 28. If Congress intended § 1225(b) detention to extend to all noncitizens who have not been admitted, the recent amendments would be surplusage. *Id.* (citing *Marx v. Gen. Revenue Corp.*, 568 U.S. 371, 386 (2013) ("The canon against surplusage is strongest when an interpretation would render superfluous another part of the same statutory scheme."). For these reasons, the plain language of § 1225(b)(2)(A) demonstrate that Mr. Jimenez is not an "applicant for admission" who is "seeking

admission" to the United States.

55. In 2023, DHS elected to release Mr. Jimenez into the United States after either an explicit or implicit determination that he was neither a danger to society or a flight risk. It should not now be permitted to suggest that he is subject to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). Thus, this Court must find that to subject Mr. Jimenez to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) would be a clear violation of the INA and order his immediate release. *Hotak v. Baltazar*, 1:25-cv-610-CNS, Doc. 14 (D. Colo. Feb. 25, 2026) (granting immediate release); *Yanez Chavez v. Baltazar*, 1:26-cv-556-SKC, Doc. 17 (D. Colo. Feb. 25, 2026) (same); *see also Vargas v. Bondi*, 2025 WL 3300446, at *5 (W.D. Tex. Nov. 12, 2025), *report and recommendation adopted Vargas v. Bondi*, 2025 WL 3300141 (W.D. Tex. Nov. 26, 2025).

COUNT TWO
Violation of Substantive Due Process
Arbitrary Detention; 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225 and 1226

56. Mr. Jimenez realleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

57. The government may not deprive a person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. U.S. Const. amend. V. "Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that the Clause protects." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690. Indeed, the liberty interest in freedom from detention "is the most elemental of liberty interests." *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507, 529 (2004).

58. Mr. Jimenez has a fundamental interest in liberty and being free from official restraint, and the government's new, erroneous classification of him as an "arriving alien" who is "seeking admission" to the United States and thus subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) without any avenue to challenge that detention violates his substantive right to due process.

59. Respondents have granted that liberty right to Mr. Jimenez in the past, releasing him on conditional parole upon first encountering him when he came into the United States in 2023. Mr. Jimenez does not have a criminal record and has appeared for his immigration proceedings and ICE check-ins. "In such circumstances, where Respondents have already determined that it is proper to release Petitioner under § 1226," there is "no reason to prolong his detention now." *Singh v. Baltazar*, -- F. Supp. 3d --, 2026 WL 352870, at *3 (D. Colo. Feb. 9, 2026) (citing *Valera v. Baltazar*, No. 1:25-cv-03744-CNS, 2025 WL 3496174, at *3 (D. Colo. Dec. 5, 2025) (ordering noncitizen's immediate release where Respondents have already determined that the noncitizen is neither a flight risk nor a danger to the community)).

COUNT THREE
Violation of Procedural Due Process
Arbitrary Detention; 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225 and 1226

60. Mr. Jimenez realleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

61. The Supreme Court has been clear that for noncitizens "on the threshold of initial entry . . . [w]hatever the procedure authorized by Congress is, it is due process." *Shaughnessy v. United States ex rel. Mezei*, 345 U.S. 206, 212 (1953) (emphasis added). However, Mr. Jimenez—after having been paroled into the United States pursuant to § 1226(a)—is no longer on the threshold of initial entry. Indeed, it is well established that noncitizens like Mr. Jimenez who "once passed through our gates, even illegally" are entitled to greater constitutional protections. *Id.*; *see also Zadvydas*, 553 U.S. at 693 ("It is well established that certain constitutional protections available to persons inside the United States are unavailable to [noncitizens] outside of our geographic borders."). "The fundamental requirement of due process is the opportunity to be heard at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner." *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 333 (1976). Because Mr. Jimenez is not properly detained under § 1225(b)(2), his detention does not comply

with due process.

62. Mr. Jimenez has a strong private interest in remaining free from detention. Indeed, the Supreme Court has affirmed that even for noncitizens, "[f]reedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that [the Due Process] Clause protects." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690. And the Supreme Court, recognizing the strong private interest in remaining free from detention, has held "that detention violates that Clause unless the detention is ordered in a criminal proceeding with adequate procedural protections, or, in certain special and narrow non-punitive circumstances where a special justification, such as harm-threatening mental illness, outweighs the individual's constitutionally protected interest in avoiding physical restraint." *Id.* (cleaned up).

63. While the government has an interest in ensuring Mr. Jimenez's appearance at his removal proceedings and protecting the community, the government cannot plausibly justify denying a bond hearing based on "administrative burdens" when it has previously Mr. Jimenez from immigration custody and he has never been convicted of a crime or missed an ICE check-in.

64. Finally, this case demonstrates the high risk of erroneous deprivation that would result from allowing DHS to detain noncitizens like Mr. Jimenez without any opportunity to challenge his detention. Without an order from this Court, there is a high probability that Mr. Jimenez would be detained even though his continued detention serves no non-punitive purpose as it is unnecessary to protect the community or to ensure his appearance at his removal proceedings.

65. In Respondents' contrasting version of the INA, Mr. Jimenez may be stripped of any mechanism to require the government to justify his detention. Such a lack of any process, necessarily leading to an erroneous deprivation of liberty, cannot be supported by the Constitution.

66. Release is the appropriate remedy. Alternatively, a bond hearing before a neutral arbiter at which the government bears the burden of proof and at which the immigration judge must consider the ability to pay is the only constitutionally sufficient process outside release without conditions. *See L.G. v. Choate*, 744 F. Supp. 3d 1172, 1181 (D. Colo. 2024).

67. Notably, civil detention is non-punitive and there is an important liberty interest at play such that the government must show a compelling justification for continued detention absence criminal activity. *L.G.*, 744 F. Supp. 3d at 1187; *Diaz-Ceja v. McAleenan*, 2019 WL 2774211, at *8 (D. Colo. July 2, 2019); *Martinez Escobar v. Baltazar*, 2026 WL 503313, at *5 (D. Colo. Feb. 24, 2026).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Based on the foregoing, Mr. Jimenez requests that this Court:

(1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;

(2) Order under the All Writs Act that Mr. Jimenez not be removed from this District while this petition is pending:

(3) Issue an order requiring Respondents to show cause why this Petition should not be granted within three days;

(4) Declare that 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) governs Mr. Jimenez detention by U.S. immigration authorities;

(5) Order that Mr. Jimenez be released from immigration custody with all of his personal belongings, including any identification documents or employment authorization cards, with no additional condition of release imposed by ICE;

(6) Alternatively, order a bond hearing as authorized under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) at which 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) cannot be applied, DHS bears the burden of proof, and the immigration judge

considers Mr. Jimenez's ability to pay bond as part of the factors in setting bond; and

(7) Grant leave to file an application for attorneys' fees and costs of this suit under the Equal Access to Justice Act, 5 U.S.C. § 504 and 28 U.S.C. § 2412(2), *et seq.*;

(8) Grant any further relief this Court deems just and proper.

Dated: March 3, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Sarah L. Vuong
SARAH L. VUONG
CA Bar No. 258528
Ariela Lake Law & Consulting PLLC
3355 Hudson St., #7098
Denver, CO 80207
Ph: (202) 996-5757
Email: sarah@allc.law

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 attorney. I have reviewed documents provided by Petitioner and his spouse and spoken with Petitioner and his spouse relating to the events described in this Petition. Based on those discussions and documents, I hereby verify that the statements made in this Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: March 3, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Sarah L. Vuong
SARAH L. VUONG
CA Bar No. 258528
Ariela Lake Law & Consulting PLLC
3355 Hudson St., #7098
Denver, CO 80207
Ph: (202) 996-5757
Email: sarah@allc.law