

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

MAURICIO ALEXANDER RAMIREZ
HERNANDEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

LADEON FRANCIS, Field Office
Director of Enforcement and Removal
Operations, ATLANTA Field Office,
TODD LYONS, in his official capacity
as Acting director of Immigration and
Customs Enforcement;
Immigration and Customs Enforcement;
KRISTI NOEM, Secretary, U.S.
Department of Homeland Security; U.S.
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY;
PAMELA BONDI, U.S. Attorney
General; EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR
IMMIGRATION REVIEW;
JASON STREEVAL, Warden of
STEWART DETENTION CENTER,

Respondents.

Case No. 4:26-cv-346

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner MAURICIO ALEXANDER RAMIREZ HERNANDEZ is in the physical custody of Respondents at the STEWART DETENTION CENTER. He now faces unlawful detention because the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), in direct collaboration with the adjudicative body with jurisdiction over immigrants (the Executive Office of Immigration Review) (EOIR) have concluded Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention.

2. Petitioner is charged with, inter alia, having entered the United States without admission or inspection. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i).

3. Based on this allegation in Petitioner's removal proceedings, DHS has prevented Petitioner's release from immigration custody, consistent with a new DHS policy issued on July 8, 2025, instructing all Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) employees to consider anyone inadmissible under § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i)—i.e., those who entered the United States without admission or inspection—to be subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond.

4. On September 5, 2025, the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA or Board) issued a precedent decision, binding on all immigration judges, holding that an immigration judge has no authority to consider bond requests for any person who entered the United States without admission. *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). The Board determined that such individuals are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible to be released on bond.

5. Petitioner's detention on this basis violates the plain language of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Section 1225(b)(2)(A) does not apply to individuals like

1 Petitioner who previously entered and are now residing in the United States. Instead, such
2 individuals are subject to a different statute, § 1226(a), that allows for release on
3 conditional parole or bond. That statute expressly applies to people who, like Petitioner,
4 are charged as inadmissible for having entered the United States without inspection.

5 6. Respondents' new legal interpretation is plainly contrary to the statutory
6 framework and contrary to decades of agency practice applying § 1226(a) to people like
7 Petitioner.

8 7. More importantly, the Government itself has made an abrupt about-face on
9 this issue. Respondents should be judicially estopped from asserting their current
10 interpretation of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), because they previously prevailed in litigation
11 after asserting the opposite interpretation. As explained in *New Hampshire v. Maine*, 532
12 U.S. 742 (2001), judicial estoppel applies when a party assumes a position in a legal
13 proceeding, succeeds in maintaining that position, and then adopts a contrary position in a
14 subsequent proceeding to gain an unfair advantage. Here, Respondents previously, and
15 successfully, argued that individuals who entered the United States without inspection were
16 subject to detention under § 1226(a), and not § 1225(b)(2)(A), and courts accepted that
17 position. Respondents now reverse course and assert that such individuals are subject to
18 mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A), thereby denying them bond hearings. This
19 shift in legal position undermines the integrity of the judicial process and imposes an unfair
20 detriment on Petitioners who relied on the prior interpretation. Accordingly, Respondents
21 should be estopped from asserting this inconsistent position.

22 8. Furthermore, The Government's own issuance of an I-220A placing
23 Petitioner in custody under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) reflects a discretionary, fact-based

1 determination that Petitioner was not subject to mandatory detention under §
2 1225(b)(2)(A). *See Exhibit 1*, Petitioner's Order of Release on Recognizance. This quasi-
3 judicial decision was made by DHS at the outset of proceedings, based on the facts
4 available to both parties and Petitioner's own admissions. Any reversal of such principles
5 undermines the integrity of the adjudicative process and triggers the principle of issue
6 preclusion recognized in *B&B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus., Inc.*, 575 U.S. 138 (2015),
7 which require courts to respect agency determinations when the ordinary elements of
8 preclusion are met.

9 9. Accordingly, Petitioner seeks a writ of habeas corpus requiring that he be released
10 unless Respondents provide a bond hearing under § 1226(a) within seven days.

11 JURISDICTION

12 10. Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents. Petitioner is detained at the
13 STEWART DETENTION CENTER in LUMPKIN, GEORGIA.

14 11. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(5) (habeas corpus), 28 U.S.C. § 1331
15 (federal question), and Article I, section 9, clause 2 of the United States Constitution (the
16 Suspension Clause).

17 12. This Court may grant relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, the Declaratory Judgment Act,
18 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*, and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

19 VENUE

20 13. Pursuant to *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493- 500
21 (1973), venue lies in the United States District Court for the MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
22 GEORGIA, the judicial district in which Petitioner currently is detained.

1 14. Venue is also properly in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because Respondents
2 are employees, officers, and agencies of the United States, and because a substantial part
3 of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in the MIDDLE DISTRICT
4 OF GEORGIA.

5 **REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243**

6 15. The Court must grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus or order Respondents to show
7 cause “forthwith,” unless the petitioner is not entitled to relief. 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If an
8 order to show cause is issued, Respondents must file a return “within three days unless for
9 good cause additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is allowed.” *Id.*

10 16. Habeas corpus is “perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law . . .
11 affording as it does a *swift* and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or
12 confinement.” *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963) (emphasis added). “The application
13 for the writ usurps the attention and displaces the calendar of the judge or justice who
14 entertains it and receives prompt action from him within the four corners of the
15 application.” *Yong v. I.N.S.*, 208 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted).

16 **PARTIES**

17 17. Petitioner MAURICIO ALEXANDER RAMIREZ HERNANDEZ (“Mr. Ramirez”) is a
18 citizen of El Salvador who has been in immigration detention since February 24, 2026.
19 Petitioner was attending his yearly ICE check-in when he was detained without notice. He
20 was subsequently transferred to the Stewart Detention Center, ICE did not set bond and
21 Petitioner is unable to obtain review of his custody by an IJ, pursuant to the Board’s
22 decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). Due to this

1 erroneous decision, it would be futile for Petitioner to apply to EOIR without the
2 intervention of this honorable Court.

3 18. Respondent Todd Lyons is named in his official capacity as the Acting Director of the
4 Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE"). As the senior Official Performing the
5 duties of the Director of ICE, he is responsible for the administration and enforcement of
6 the immigration laws of the United States; routinely transacts business in the Southern
7 District of Georgia; is legally responsible for any effort to detain Petitioner; and as such is
8 a custodian of the Petitioner. His address is ICE, Office of the Principal Legal Advisor, 500
9 12th St. SW, Mail Stop 5900, Washington DC 20536-5900.

10 19. Respondent Ladeon Francis is the Director of the Atlanta Field Office of ICE's
11 Enforcement and Removal Operations division; however, on information and belief, the
12 DHS is rotating their Field Office Director without publishing a schedule of rotation. As
13 such, Ladeon Francis or his unknown, unannounced provisional replacement is Petitioner's
14 immediate custodian and is responsible for Petitioner's detention and removal. He or his
15 acting counterpart is named in his or her official capacity. Respondent Francis's address is
16 180 Ted Turner Dr Se, Ste 522. Atlanta GA 30303.

17 20. Respondent Kristi Noem is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. She is
18 responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality
19 Act (INA), and oversees ICE, which is responsible for Petitioner's detention. Ms. Noem
20 has ultimate custodial authority over Petitioner and is sued in her official capacity.

21 21. Respondent Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is the federal agency responsible for
22 implementing and enforcing the INA, including the detention and removal of noncitizens.

1 22. Respondent Pamela Bondi is the Attorney General of the United States. She is responsible
2 for the Department of Justice, of which the Executive Office for Immigration Review and
3 the immigration court system it operates is a component agency. She is sued in her official
4 capacity. Respondent Noem's address is U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office of
5 the General Counsel, 2707 Martin Luther King Jr Ave Se Washington DC 20528-0525.

6 23. Respondent Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) is the federal agency
7 responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA in removal proceedings, including for
8 custody redeterminations in bond hearings.

9 24. Respondent, Warden Jason Streeval is, is employed by the private, for-profit detention
10 corporation contracted by the Government as an agent to confine immigrants at Stewart
11 Detention Center, where Petitioner is detained. He has immediate physical custody of
12 Petitioner. He is sued in his official capacity. Respondent Warden's address is Warden,
13 Stewart Detention Center, 1116 S Washington Ave, Lumpkin, GA 39862.

14 **LEGAL FRAMEWORK**

15 25. The INA prescribes three basic forms of detention for the vast majority of noncitizens in
16 removal proceedings.

17 26. First, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 authorizes the detention of noncitizens in standard removal
18 proceedings before an IJ. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. Individuals in § 1226(a) detention are
19 generally entitled to a bond hearing at the outset of their detention, *see* 8 C.F.R. §§
20 1003.19(a), 1236.1(d), while noncitizens who have been arrested, charged with, or
21 convicted of certain crimes are subject to mandatory detention, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c).

22 27. Second, the INA provides for mandatory detention of noncitizens subject to expedited
23 removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and for other recent arrivals seeking admission
24 referred to under § 1225(b)(2).

1 28. Last, the INA also provides for detention of noncitizens who have been ordered removed,
2 including individuals in withholding-only proceedings, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)–(b).

3 29. This case concerns the detention provisions at §§ 1226(a) and 1225(b)(2).

4 30. The detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) were enacted as part of the Illegal
5 Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-
6 –208, Div. C, §§ 302–03, 110 Stat. 3009–546, 3009–582 to 3009–583, 3009–585. Section
7 1226(a) was most recently amended earlier this year by the Laken Riley Act, Pub. L.
8 No.119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025).

9 31. Following the enactment of the IIRIRA, EOIR drafted new regulations explaining that, in
10 general, people who entered the country without inspection were not considered detained
11 under § 1225 and that they were instead detained under § 1226(a). *See* Inspection and
12 Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal
13 Proceedings; Asylum Procedures, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997).

14 32. Thus, in the decades that followed, most people who entered without inspection and were
15 placed in standard removal proceedings received bond hearings, unless their criminal
16 history rendered them ineligible pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c). That practice was
17 consistent with many more decades of prior practice, in which noncitizens who were not
18 deemed “arriving” were entitled to a custody hearing before an IJ or other hearing officer.
19 *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a) (1994); *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 229 (1996) (noting
20 that § 1226(a) simply “restates” the detention authority previously found at § 1252(a)).

21 33. In *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) explicitly
22 acknowledged that individuals who have already entered the United States and are not
23 apprehended within 100 miles of the border or within 14 days of entry are subject to

1 discretionary detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), not mandatory detention under § 1225(b).
2 During oral argument on November 30, 2016, then-Solicitor General Ian Gershengorn
3 stated: “If they are not detained within 100 miles of the border or within 14 days... then
4 they are under 1226(a) and not 1226(c)” and further clarified, in response to a question
5 concerning “an alien who has come into the United States illegally without being admitted
6 [and] who takes up residence 50 miles from the border,” the Government responded, “The
7 answer is they are held under 1226(a) and that they get a bond hearing...” Transcript of
8 Oral Argument at 7–8, *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. ____ (2018) (No. 15-1204). DHS
9 reiterated that such individuals “would be held under 1226(a)” and cited the administrative
10 record to support that position. *Id.* These statements reflect DHS’s prior litigation stance
11 that § 1226(a) governs detention for noncitizens who have entered and are residing in the
12 United States, a position directly contrary to the agency’s current interpretation applying §
13 1225(b)(2)(A) to such individuals. Having prevailed in *Jennings* after taking this position,
14 they should be estopped from taking the contrary position now simply because their
15 political or litigation interests have changed. Estoppel in this case is necessary to preserve
16 the predictability inherent in the rule of law and due process under the Fifth Amendment,
17 as well as to protect the integrity of the judicial system.

18 34. On July 8, 2025, ICE, “in coordination with” DOJ, announced a new policy that rejected
19 well-established understanding of the statutory framework and reversed decades of
20 practice.

21 35. The new policy, entitled “Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applicants
22 for Admission,”¹ claims that all persons who entered the United States without inspection

¹ Available at <https://www.aila.org/library/ice-memo-interim-guidance-regarding-detention-authority-for-applications-for-admission>.

1 shall now be subject to mandatory detention provision under § 1225(b)(2)(A). The policy
2 applies regardless of when a person is apprehended, and affects those who have resided in
3 the United States for months, years, and even decades.

4 36. On September 5, 2025, the BIA adopted this same position in a published decision, *Matter*
5 *of Yajure Hurtado*. There, the Board held that all noncitizens who entered the United States
6 without admission or parole are subject to detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A) and are
7 ineligible for IJ bond hearings.

8 37. Since Respondents adopted their new policies, several federal courts have rejected their
9 new interpretation of the INA's detention authorities. Courts have likewise rejected *Matter*
10 *of Yajure Hurtado*, which adopts the same reading of the statute as ICE.

11 38. This Court has held in similar cases that petitioners present in the United States at the time
12 of their detention, who have not been lawfully admitted and are not attempting to be
13 lawfully admitted, like the Petitioner, are subject to detention under INA § 1226(a). *J.A.M.*
14 *v. Streeval*, No. 4:25-CV342-CDL, 2025 WL 3050094 (M.D. Ga. Nov. 1, 2025).

15 FACTS

16 39. Mr. Ramirez has resided in the United States since 2023 and currently resides physically
17 in Lumpkin, Georgia, where he is detained.

18 40. Upon his entry into the United States, the DHS released Petitioner into the country on an
19 I-220A form *Order of Release on Recognizance*, or "OREC" and placed into removal
20 proceedings. See **Exhibit 1**.

21 41. The DHS also provided the Petitioner with a Notice to Appear upon his entry however,
22 the Notice to Appear was not filed with EOIR until March 3, 2026.

1 42. Petitioner complied with all aspects of his release and attended yearly check-ins with
2 ICE.

3 43. Starting August 14, 2023, ICE appointments were done via email and the Petitioner was
4 told to report via email. He did so on January 17, 2024, and January 21, 2025.

5 44. On January 21, 2025, he was given a new report date of January 20, 2026. Petitioner
6 attempted to report via email however he received no response.

7 45. Petitioner diligently contacted ICE to ensure compliance with his conditions of release
8 and was told he now had to report in person.

9 46. On February 24, 2026, Petitioner and his U.S citizen spouse attempted to report at 180
10 Ted Turner Drive in Atlanta GA 30308. As Petitioner placed his information in the kiosk,
11 a blank screen generated. When they asked for assistance, Petitioner was told this meant
12 he had to be detained and taken into custody without notice or further explanation.

13 47. Mr. Ramirez was then transferred to the Stewart Detention Center in Lumpkin Georgia
14 where he remains detained.

15 48. Pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, the immigration judge is unable to consider Mr.
16 Ramirez's bond request, and his unlawful detention cannot be litigated before that body,
17 who collaborated with the DHS – who is a party to these contested proceedings – to adopt
18 the DHS position wholesale, because such efforts would be futile.

19 49. As a result, Mr. Ramirez remains in detention. Without relief from this court, he faces the
20 prospect of months, or even years, in immigration custody, separated from his family and
21 community while his relief remains pending.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I
Violation of the INA

50. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

51. The mandatory detention provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to all noncitizens residing in the United States who are subject to the grounds of inadmissibility. As relevant here, it does not apply to those who received an I-220A and were released in accordance with INA § 236. Such noncitizens continue to be detained under § 1226(a), unless they are subject to § 1225(b)(1), § 1226(c), or § 1231.

52. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates her continued detention and violates the INA.

COUNT II
Violation of the Bond Regulations

53. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in preceding paragraphs.

54. In 1997, after Congress amended the INA through IIRIRA, EOIR and the then-Immigration and Naturalization Service issued an interim rule to interpret and apply IIRIRA. Specifically, under the heading of “Apprehension, Custody, and Detention of [Noncitizens],” the agencies explained that “[d]espite being applicants for admission, [noncitizens] who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as [noncitizens] who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination.” 62 Fed. Reg. at 10323 (emphasis added). The agencies thus made clear that individuals who had entered without inspection were eligible for consideration for

1 bond and bond hearings before IJs under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and its implementing
2 regulations.

3 55. Nonetheless, pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, EOIR has a policy and practice of
4 applying § 1225(b)(2) to individual like Petitioner.

5 56. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates her continued
6 detention and violates 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1, 1236.1, and 1003.19.

7 **COUNT III**
8 **Violation of Due Process**
9

10 57. Petitioner repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in
11 the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

12 58. The government may not deprive a person of life, liberty, or property without due process
13 of law. U.S. Const. amend. V. “Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody,
14 detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that the
15 Clause protects.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).

16 59. Petitioner has a fundamental interest in liberty and being free from official restraint.

17 60. The government’s detention of Petitioner without a bond redetermination hearing to
18 determine whether he is a flight risk or danger to others violates [his/her/their] right to
19 due process.

20 **Judicial Estoppel**

21 61. Petitioner repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in
22 the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

23 62. The Government is judicially estopped from asserting that Petitioner is subject to
24 mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). In prior litigation,
25 including *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, the Government successfully argued that individuals who

1 entered without inspection and were not apprehended near the border or within 14 days
2 were subject to discretionary detention under § 1226(a), not mandatory detention under §
3 1225(b)(2)(A). See *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, No. 15-1204, Tr. of Oral Arg. at 7–8 (Nov. 30,
4 2016). Courts accepted that position. Now, the Government reverses course and asserts the
5 opposite interpretation to deny bond hearings. Under *New Hampshire v. Maine*, 532 U.S.
6 742 (2001), judicial estoppel applies where a party assumes a position, prevails, and then
7 adopts a contrary position to gain an unfair advantage. The Government’s reversal
8 undermines the integrity of the judicial process and prejudices Petitioners who relied on
9 the prior interpretation.

10 PRAYER FOR RELIEF

11 WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that this Court grant the following relief:

- 12 a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- 13 b. Order that Petitioner shall not be transferred outside the Middle District of
14 Georgia while this habeas petition is pending;
- 15 c. Issue an Order to Show Cause ordering Respondents to show cause why this
16 Petition should not be granted within three days;
- 17 d. Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus requiring that Respondents release Petitioner or, in
18 the alternative, provide Petitioner with a bond hearing pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §
19 1226(a) within seven days;
- 20 e. Declare that Petitioner’s detention is unlawful;
- 21 f. Award Petitioner attorney’s fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act
22 (“EAJA”), as amended, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and on any other basis justified under
23 law; and

1 g. Grant any other and further relief that this Court deems just and proper.

2 h.

3 DATED this 4th day of March, 2026.

4 /s/ Peter Tadeo, Esq.

5 Peter Tadeo, Esq.

6 Georgia Bar No. 505253

7 Tadeo and Silva Law

8 P.O. Box 921249

9 Peachtree Corners, Georgia 30010

10 Telephone: (404)993-8941

11 Email: Peter@tadeosilvalaw.com

28 U.S.C. § 2242 VERIFICATION STATEMENT

I am submitting this verification on behalf of the Petitioner because I am the
Petitioner's attorney. I have discussed with Petitioner's family members and have reviewed various
documents for Petitioner. On the basis of those discussions, I hereby verify that I have reviewed
the foregoing Petition and that the facts and statements made in this Petition and Complaint are
true and correct to the best of my knowledge or belief pursuant to 28 USC § 2242.

DATED this 4th day of March, 2026.

/s/ Peter Tadeo, Esq.
Peter Tadeo, Esq.
Georgia Bar No. 505253
Tadeo and Silva Law
P.O. Box 921249
Peachtree Corners, Georgia 30010
Telephone: (404)993-8941
Email: Peter@tadeosilvalaw.com

Attorney for Petitioner