

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
3 COLUMBUS DIVISION

4 ESCALANTE ROJAS, ELIAS  
5 BERNABE,

6 Petitioner,

7 v.

8 George STERLING, Field Office  
9 Director of Enforcement and Removal  
10 Operations, Atlanta Field Office,  
11 Immigration and Customs Enforcement;  
12 Kristi NOEM, Secretary, U.S.  
13 Department of Homeland Security; U.S.  
14 DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND  
15 SECURITY; Pamela BONDI, U.S.  
16 Attorney General; EXECUTIVE  
17 OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION  
18 REVIEW; Jason STREEVAL, Warden  
19 of Stewart Detention Center,

20 Respondents.  
21  
22  
23  
24

Case No.

**PETITION FOR IMMEDIATE  
RELEASE UNDER WRIT OF  
HABEAS CORPUS**

**PETITION FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE UNDER WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1  
2  
3 1. Petitioner ELIAS BERNABE ESCALANTE ROJAS brings this petition for a writ  
4 of habeas corpus to seek enforcement of their rights as members of the Bond Denial Class  
5 certified in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM (C.D. Cal.)  
6 Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents at the Stewart Detention Center and now  
7 faces unlawful detention as the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Executive  
8 Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) have refused to abide by the declaratory judgment issued  
9 on behalf of the certified class in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*.

10 2. Petitioner is ELIAS BERNABE ESCALANTE ROJAS. He is not subject to a  
11 final order of removal (or any order of removal). He has been in the United States since on or  
12 around 2005 when he entered without inspection. Respondent has a partner and a 2-year old son.

13 3. On November 20, 2025, the district court granted partial summary judgment on  
14 behalf of individual plaintiffs and on November 25, 2025, certified a nationwide class and  
15 extended declaratory judgment to the certified class. *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-  
16 CV-01873-SSS-BFM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 3289861, at \*11 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2025)  
17 (order granting partial summary judgment to Plaintiffs-Petitioners); *Maldonado Bautista v.*  
18 *Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 3288403, at \*9 (C.D.  
19 Cal. Nov. 25, 2025) (order certifying Plaintiffs-Petitioners' proposed nationwide Bond Eligible  
20 Class, incorporating and extending declaratory judgment from Order Granting Petitioners'  
21 Motion for Partial Summary Judgment).

1           4.       The declaratory judgment held that the Bond Denial Class members are detained  
2 under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), and thus may not be denied consideration for release on bond under §  
3 1225(b)(2)(A). *Maldonado Bautista*, 2025 WL 3289861, at \*11.

4           5.       Nonetheless, the Executive Office for Immigration Review and its subagency the  
5 Immigration Court and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) have blatantly refused to  
6 abide by the declaratory relief and have unlawfully ordered that Petitioner be denied the  
7 opportunity to be released on bond under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) under an erroneous interpretation  
8 that Petitioner is encompassed within the ‘mandatory detention’ provision of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b).

9           6.       The Department has blatantly refused to abide by the decision in *Maldonado*  
10 *Bautista* and appealed the district court’s decision and filed an emergency motion for a stay,  
11 pending the appeal. A temporary stay was granted on February 18, 2026. Nevertheless, despite  
12 decades of legal precedence showing class members such as Petitioner are eligible for a bond  
13 redetermination by an immigration judge, the Department under the current administration has  
14 raised bad-faith arguments misinterpreting precedential decisions. The Department has, in bad  
15 faith, appealed the district court’s declaratory judgment certifying a nationwide class member  
16 under *Maldonado Bautista* and vacating *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*.

17           7.       Petitioner is a member of the Bond Eligible Class, as he:

- 18           a.       does not have lawful status in the United States and is currently detained at the  
19 Stewart Detention Center. He was apprehended by immigration authorities on  
20 February 27, 2026;  
21           b.       entered the United States without inspection over 20 years ago and was not  
22 apprehended upon arrival, *cf. id.*; and  
23           c.       is not detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231.

24           8.       After apprehending Petitioner on February 27, 2026, DHS placed him/her in  
removal proceedings pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a on March 3, 2026. DHS has charged

1 Petitioner as being inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) as someone who entered the  
2 United States without inspection, and as inadmissible under and 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) as  
3 someone who entered the United States without proper admission documents.

4 9. The Court should expeditiously grant this petition.

5 10. Respondents are bound by the judgment in *Maldonado Bautista*, as it has the full  
6 “force and effect of a final judgment.” 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a). Nevertheless, Respondents continue  
7 to flagrantly defy the judgment in that case and continue to subject Petitioner to unlawful  
8 detention despite his clear entitlement to consideration for release on bond as a Bond Eligible  
9 Class member, and have in bad faith appealed the district court’s decision.

10 11. Immigration judges have informed class members in bond hearings that they have  
11 been instructed by “leadership” that the declaratory judgment in *Maldonado Bautista* is not  
12 controlling, even with respect to class members, and that instead IJs remain bound to follow the  
13 agency’s prior decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).

14 12. The respondents have acted in bad faith and delayed petitioners’ ability to apply  
15 for bond by previously issuing *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* and now by refusing to abide by  
16 *Maldonado Bautista* and appealing in bad faith. The state’s meritless assertions constitute  
17 dilatory tactics intended to obstruct the petitioners’ timely application for bond. Should a  
18 petitioner reach a point in their removal proceedings where they are ordered removed,  
19 petitioners’ become ineligible to apply for bond redetermination with a final order of removal  
20 under § 1252(d)(1). Because Respondents are detaining Petitioner in violation of the declaratory  
21 judgment issued in *Maldonado Bautista*, and have appealed in bad faith, the Court should  
22 accordingly order that within one day, Respondent DHS must release Petitioner.

1 13. Alternatively, the Court should order Petitioner's release unless Respondents  
2 provide a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within three days.

3 **II. JURISDICTION**

4 14. Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents. Petitioner is detained at the  
5 Stewart Detention Center in the city of Lumpkin, Georgia.

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

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

11 **III. VENUE**

12 17. Pursuant to *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493-  
13 500 (1973), venue lies in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, the  
14 judicial district in which Petitioner currently is detained.

15 18. Venue is also properly in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because  
16 Respondents are employees, officers, and agencies of the United States, and because a  
17 substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in the Middle  
18 District of Georgia.

19 19. If venue is proper at the time of filing, the district court ordinarily retains  
20 jurisdiction even if Petitioner is transferred to another district. *Ex Parte Endo*, 323 U.S. 283, 304-  
21 305 (1944).

22 **IV. REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243**



1 immediate custodian and is responsible for Petitioner's detention and removal. He is sued in his  
2 official capacity.

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

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

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

14 28. Respondent Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) is the federal  
15 agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA in removal proceedings, including  
16 for custody redeterminations in bond hearings.

17 29. Respondent Jason Streeval is employed by "CoreCivic" as Warden of Stewart  
18 Detention Center, where Petitioner is detained. He has immediate physical custody of Petitioner.  
19 He is sued in his official capacity.

## 20 VI. EXHAUSTION OF REMEDIES

21 30. This action is not barred by the exhaustion of remedies doctrine. That doctrine in  
22 inapplicable as exhaustion is not explicitly or implicitly required in this context. Even if  
23 exhaustion were required, Petitioner satisfies ample exceptions to it as exhaustion would be futile  
24

1 as the immigration court “is biased or has predetermined the issue” due to *Matter of Yajure-*  
2 *Hurtado*. Quoting *Iddir v. INS*, 301 F.3d 492, 500.

3 31. Under the doctrine of exhaustion of remedies, a petitioner must generally  
4 ‘exhaust’ all administrative remedies before seeking relief in federal court. *Thompson v. United*  
5 *States Marine Corp*, D.C. Docket No. 09-80312-CV-KLR (unpublished). Exhaustion is a  
6 prudential requirement rather than jurisdictional. *Hull v. IRS*, No. 10-1410, 2011 WL 3835402  
7 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. Aug. 31, 2011); see also William Funk, *Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies – New*  
8 *Dimensions Since Darby*, 18 Pace Environmental Law Review (2000) (Tracing the doctrine out  
9 of common law and federal equity jurisdiction).

10 32. When Congress imposes an exhaustion remedy by statute, exhaustion is generally  
11 required. *Coit Indep. Jt. Venture v. FSLIC*, 489 U.S. 561, at 579 (1989) (citing *Weinberger v.*  
12 *Salfi*, 422 U.S. 749, 766 (1975); *Myers v. Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corp.*, 303 U.S. 41, 50-51  
13 (1938). If exhaustion is not *explicit* in a statute, then “courts are guided by congressional intent in  
14 determining whether application of the doctrine would be consistent with the statutory scheme.  
15 *Coit, supra* (citing *Patsy v. Florida Board of Regents*, 457 U.S. 496, 502 (1982).

16 33. The INA does have an exhaustion provision, which only applies in the context of  
17 “final orders of removal.” 8 U.S.C. § 1252(d)(1) (“A court may review a final order of removal  
18 only if the alien has exhausted all administrative remedies ...”). This exhaustion provision is not  
19 jurisdictional. *Santos-Zacaria v. Garland*, 498 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2023).

20 34. Petitioner is not subject to a final order of removal (or any order of removal); so,  
21 § 1252(d)(1) is inapplicable. So, the INA does not impose an explicit exhaustion requirement  
22 that can apply here. Nor can § 1252(d)(1) be read to *implicitly* impose an exhaustion  
23 requirement. The Court need not engage in statutory interpretation as “[w]here statutory  
24

1 language is plain and unambiguous, courts give effect to the statute as written without engaging  
2 in statutory construction.” *In re Adoption of Doe*, 156 Idaho 345, 349.

3 35. Even if this Court found § 1252(d)(1) to be ambiguous, which it is not, plain text  
4 interpretation reveals § 1252(d)(1) does not impose an applicable exhaustion requirement. *See*  
5 Antonin Scalia & Bryan A. Gardner, *Reading Law: The Interpretation of Legal Texts* (1<sup>st</sup> Ed.  
6 2012) (The “Supremacy of the Text Principle” (The words of a governing text are of paramount  
7 concern, and what they convey, in their context, is what the text means), “Omitted Case Canon”  
8 (*casus omissus pro omisso habendus est* – nothing is to be added to what the text state or  
9 reasonably implies), “Negative Implication Canon” (*expression unius est exclusion alterius* – the  
10 expression of one thing implies the exclusion of alternatives), and the “Whole Text Canon” (The  
11 text must be construed as a whole) each demonstrate Congress did not impose an exhaustion  
12 requirement – either expressly or by implication. *See also A Dozen Canons of Statutory and*  
13 *Constitutional Text Construction*, [Judicature.duke.edu Articles](https://judicature.duke.edu/articles/a-dozen-canons-of-statutory-and-constitutional-text-construction/), available at  
14 [https://judicature.duke.edu/articles/a-dozen-canons-of-statutory-and-constitutional-text-](https://judicature.duke.edu/articles/a-dozen-canons-of-statutory-and-constitutional-text-construction/)  
15 [construction/](https://judicature.duke.edu/articles/a-dozen-canons-of-statutory-and-constitutional-text-construction/)).

16 36. Even if the doctrine of exhaustion did apply, Petitioner satisfies several  
17 exceptions to it. Exhaustion is excused if:

- 18 (1) Requiring exhaustion of administrative remedies causes prejudice, due to  
19 unreasonable delay or an ‘indefinite timeframe for administrative action’;  
20 (2) The agency lacks the ability or competence to resolve the issue or grant the  
21 relief requested;  
22 (3) Appealing through the administrative process would be futile because the  
23 agency is biased or has predetermined the issue; or  
24

1 (4) where substantial constitutional questions are raised.

2 *Iddir v. INS*, 301 F.3d 492, 500 (7<sup>th</sup> circuit case citing *McCarthy v. Madigan*, 503 U.S.  
3 140, 146-48 (1992); *Bowen v. City of New York*, 476 U.S. 467, 483 (1986); *Mathews v.*  
4 *Diaz*, 426 U.S. 67, 76 (1976); *Gibson v. Berryhill*, 411 U.S. 564, 575 (1973); *Houghton v.*  
5 *Shafer*, 392 U.S. 639, 640 (1968); *McNeese v. Board of Educ.*, 373 U.S. 668, 675  
6 (1963)).

7 37. Here, exhaustion would be futile. Immigration judges continue to rely on a  
8 September 5, 2025 BIA decision, *Yajure-Hurtado*, which holds “Based on the plain  
9 language of [...] 8 U.S.C. § 1225(B)(2)(A) (2018), Immigration Judges lack authority to  
10 hear bond requests or grant bond to aliens who are present in the United States without  
11 admission. *Matter of Yajure-Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). BIA therefore  
12 asserts that all “applicants for admission”, a class that encompasses more than fourteen  
13 million people<sup>1</sup>, are detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) and therefore subject to  
14 “mandatory detention” and ineligible for release on bond. This interpretation is wrong. It  
15 defies due process, plain text interpretation of the INA, common sense, and at least one  
16 federal court order discussed more thoroughly below. *See Lazaro Maldonado Bautista v.*  
17 *Ernesto Santacruz Jr*, 5:25-cv-01873, (C.D. Cal.) (A declaratory judgment binds the  
18 immigration courts and expressly forbids the interpretation of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)  
19 advanced by BIA in *Yajure-Hurtado*). Immigration judges continue to make this  
20 interpretation in apparent reliance on the orders of executive branch supervisors as to the  
21

---

22 <sup>1</sup>See Jeffrey S. Passel and Jens Manuel Krogstad, *U.S. Unauthorized Immigrant Population Reached a Record 14*  
23 *Million in 2023*, Pew Research, Sept. 12, 2025, accessible at <https://www.pewresearch.org/race-and-ethnicity/2025/08/21/u-s-unauthorized-immigrant-population-reached-a-record-14-million-in-2023/#:~:text=The%20number%20of%20unauthorized%20immigrants%20in%20the%20United%20States%20reached,a%20comprehensive%20and%20detailed%20estimate> (Describing that “Unauthorized immigrants were 27% of  
24 the U.S. foreign-born population in 2023”, consisting of “14.0 million [people]...”)

1 supposed inapplicability of the Maldonado-Baustista class action, or misguided  
2 interpretation of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), § 1226(a), and the general tenor of the due process  
3 clause and its historical foundations. Furthermore, *Maldonado-Bautista* has been  
4 temporarily stayed pending the government's appeal.

5 38. See also *McCarthy v. Madigan*, 503 U.S. 140, 148 (1992) ("an  
6 administrative remedy may be inadequate where the administrative body is shown to be  
7 biased or has otherwise predetermined the issue before it." Citing  
8 *Gibson v. Berryhill*, 411 U. S., at 575, n. 14; *Montana National Bank of*  
9 *Billings v. Yellowstone County*, 276 U. S. 499, 505 (1928) (taxpayer seeking refund not  
10 required to exhaust where "any such application [would have been] utterly futile since the  
11 county board of equalization was powerless to grant any appropriate relief" in face of  
12 prior controlling court decision – here, similarly, BIA has expressly demonstrated its  
13 belief that IJs lack jurisdiction to grant a bond to the Petitioner); *Houghton v. Shafer*,  
14 392 U. S. 639, 640 (1968); *Association of National Advertisers, Inc. v. FTC*, 201 U. S.  
15 App. D. C. 165, 170-171, 627 F.2d 1151, 1156-1157 (1979) (bias of Federal Trade  
16 Commission chairman), cert. denied, 447 U. S. 921 (1980); *Patsy v. Florida*  
17 *International University*, 634 F.2d 900, 912-913 (CA5 1981) (*en banc*) (administrative  
18 procedures must "not be used to harass or otherwise discourage those with legitimate  
19 claims"), rev'd on other grounds sub nom. *Patsy v. Board of Regents of Florida*, 457 U. S.  
20 496 (1982)).

21 39. Immigration judges make this erroneous interpretation of the INA in apparent  
22 reliance on the orders of supervisors as to the supposed inapplicability of *Maldonado-Bautista*,  
23 or on various misguided interpretations of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) and § 1226(a), and a failure to  
24

1 account for the general tenor of the due process clause and its historical roots. Immigration  
 2 judges continue to treat *Yajure-Hurtado* as binding, while treating the federal class action  
 3 *Maldonado-Bautista* as if it is not. This flips *Loper-Bright* on its head. *Loper-Bright Enterprises*  
 4 *v. Raimondo*, 603 US \_\_\_ (2024) (Overturning the Chevron doctrine, *Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v.*  
 5 *NRDC*, 467 U.S. 837 (1984), and providing that agency interpretations of ambiguous statutory  
 6 provisions are not entitled to deference).

7  
 8 40. Dozens of federal district courts, in addition to Maldonado-Bautista, have  
 9 concluded 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) does generally govern the detention of an applicant for admission,  
 10 and that 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) does not. For twenty-eight such decisions outside the eleventh  
 11 circuit, see footnote 3.<sup>2</sup> Within the eleventh circuit, see also *J.A.M. v. Streeval*, No. 4:25-CV-342

---

11 <sup>2</sup> For twenty-eight district court decisions favorable to the Petitioner’s position that 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) governs the  
 12 Petitioner’s detention (each from outside the 11th circuit), see the following set of cases.

13 **First Circuit:**

- 14 • *Sampiao v. Hyde*, 2025 WL 2607924 (D. Mass. Sept. 9, 2025) (Noting disagreement with BIA analysis in *Yajure-Hurtado*);
- 15 • *Jimenez v. FCI Berlin, Warden*, No. 25-cv-326-LM-AJ (D.N.H. Sept. 8, 2025) (Ruling the Petitioner was entitled to a bail hearing);
- 16 • *Doe v. Moniz*, 2025 WL 2576819 (D. Mass. Sept. 5, 2025) (Ordering a bond hearing and ruling that detaining an individual solely on the basis of his prior arrest violates due process);
- 17 • *Romero v. Hyde*, 2025 WL 2403827 (D. Mass. Aug. 19, 2025) (Ordering that Petitioner receive a bond hearing governed by section 1226 rather than 1225(b));
- 18 • *Martinez v. Hyde*, 2025 WL 2084238 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025) (Court found detention unlawful and ordered his release, denying the Government’s motion for reconsideration);
- 19 • *dos Santos v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2370988 (D. Mass. Aug. 14, 2025) (Ordering ICE to release the Petitioner within 48 hours); *Gomes v. Hyde*, 2025 WL 1869299 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025) (“The government’s interpretation contravenes the plain text of Section 1226(a) and would render superfluous Section 1226(c)...”);

20 **Second Circuit:**

- 21 • *Lopez Benitez v. Francis*, 2025 WL 2371588 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2025) (Granting the Petition, where ICE agents “violently detained” Petitioner as he left a scheduled immigration court appearance in Manhattan “in violation of the Due Process Clause and the Fourth Amendment.”);
- 22 • *Samb v. Joyce*, 2025 WL 2398831 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 19, 2025) (Granting petition for the writ of habeas corpus);

23 **Fourth Circuit:**

- 24 • *Leal-Hernandez v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2430025 (D. Md. Aug. 24, 2025) (Respondents arrested Petitioner while he was on his way to work, took him into custody, Petitioner was then granted a bond by an immigration judge who concluded § 1226(a) governed, Respondents refused to accept payment of the bond, the government invoked a regulatory stay pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 1003.19(i)(2) to continue detaining the Petitioner as his favorable bond decision was on appeal before the BIA, the Court grants the petition for the writ);

**Fifth Circuit:**

(CDL), 2025 WL 3050094 (M.D. Ga. Nov. 1, 2025) (Granting habeas relief in a consolidated case with similar facts, ordering bond hearings under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)).

## VII. LEGAL FRAMEWORK

41. Noncitizens in immigration proceedings are entitled to protections under the Fifth Amendment Due Process clause. *Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 306 (1993). Immigration detention should not be used as a punishment and should only be used when, under an individualized determination, a noncitizen is a flight risk because they are unlikely to appear for court or is a danger to the community. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).

- 
- *Kostak v. Trump*, 2025 WL 2472136 (W.D. La. Aug. 27, 2025) (Court finds (1) habeas jurisdiction encompasses a challenge to the statutory authority by which Respondent contends her detention without bond unlawful, (2) Court did not find persuasive Respondents argument that Petitioner failed to exhaust administrative remedies “because this Court is the proper form in which Petitioner can bring her ... constitutional claims.” (3) Court grants Temporary Restraining Order concluding Petitioner is likely to succeed on the merits in showing mandatory detention under § 1225 “was erroneous” and that “she is entitled to a bond hearing under section 1226(a).”);

### Sixth Circuit:

- *Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft*, 2025 WL 2609425 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9, 2025) (disagreeing with BIA’s analysis in *Yajure Hurtado*);
- *Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft*, 2025 WL 2496379 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025) (Granting writ, finding detention without a bond hearing is unlawful, a violation of Petitioner’s due process rights, and ordering his immediate release – or alternatively – a bond hearing within seven (7) days);

### Eighth Circuit:

- *Carmona-Lorenzo v. Trump*, 2025 WL 2531521 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025) (Ordering release on bond);
- *Cortes Fernandez v. Lyons*, 2025 WL 2531539 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025) (Court finds “the government is unlawfully detaining Petition in violation of his Due Process rights by invoking a unilateral automatic stay of the bond duly appointed by” an immigration judge, and “orders Respondents to immediately release Petitioner.”);
- *Palma Perez v. Berg*, 2025 WL 2531566 (D. Neb. Sept 3, 2025) (Same as *Cortes Fernandez, supra*);
- *O.E. v. Bondi*, 2025 WL 2466670 (D. Minn. Aug. 27, 2025) (Court concludes § 1226’s discretionary detention scheme applies);
- *Jacinto v. Trump*, 2025 WL 2402271 (D. Neb. Aug. 19, 2025) (Judge ruled the Petitioner was being held unlawfully and ordered her released on bond);
- *Maldonado v. Olson*, 2025 WL 2374411 (D. Minn. Aug. 15, 2025) (Granting Preliminary Injunction favoring Petitioner);
- *Garcia Jimenez v. Kramer*, 2025 WL 2374223 (D. Neb. Aug. 14, 2025) (Judgment favoring Petitioner);

### Ninth Circuit:

- *Cuevas Guzman v. Andrews*, 2025 WL 2617256, at \*3 n.4 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025) (distinguishing *Yajure Hurtado*);
- *Caicedo Hinestroza v. Kaiser*, 2025 WL 2606983 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025) (Granting TRO ordering Respondents to immediately release Petitioners from custody, enjoining re-detention without a pre-detention hearing before a neutral decisionmaker, and, inter alia, enjoining Respondents from transferring Petitioners out of custody without the Court’s prior approval);

1           42.     At issue is the lawfulness of Petitioner’s detention without bond. Petitioner  
2 anticipates the primary legal dispute in this case involves a question of statutory interpretation  
3 regarding what provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) governs his detention.  
4 Petitioner argues 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) governs the detention and therefore that Petitioner may  
5 apply for and receive bond under a discretionary framework. More than twenty-eight federal  
6 district courts agree with Petitioner’s position that 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) governs and § 1225(B)  
7 does not. See *Footnote 3, above*. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) cannot be properly read to apply to  
8 Petitioner’s detention. Petitioner is being deprived of his right to request or receive bond based  
9 on improper, ultra vires application of § 1225(b).

10           43.     Agency interpretations of ambiguous statutory provisions are not entitled to  
11 deference. *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*, 602 U.S. 574 (2024) (Overruling *Chevron*  
12 *U.S.A. Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837 (1984), noting agency  
13 interpretations are entitled to “respect” only to the extent those interpretations have the power to  
14 persuade (citing *Skidmore v. Swift & Co.*, 323 U.S. 134 (1944)). Therefore, this Court is not  
15 bound by *Yajure-Hurtado, supra*.

## VIII. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

### COUNT ONE: Request for Relief Pursuant to *Maldonado Bautista*

16           44.     Petitioner repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each allegation in the  
17 preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

18           45.     As a member of the Bond Eligible Class, Petitioner is entitled to consideration for  
19 release on bond under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).

20           46.     The order granting partial summary judgment in *Maldonado Bautista* holds that  
21 Respondents violate the INA in applying the mandatory detention statute at § 1225(b)(2) to class  
22 members.

23           47.     The order granting class certification in *Maldonado Bautista* further orders that  
24 “[w]hen considering this determination with the MSJ Order, the Court extends the same  
declaratory relief granted to Petitioners to the Bond Eligible Class as a whole.”

1 48. Respondents are parties to *Maldonado Bautista* and bound by the Court's  
2 declaratory judgment, which has the full "force and effect of a final judgment." 28 U.S.C.  
3 § 2201(a).

4 49. By denying Petitioner a bond hearing under § 1226(a) and asserting that he is  
5 subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2), Respondents violate Petitioner's statutory  
6 rights under the INA and the Court's judgment in *Maldonado Bautista*.

7 **COUNT TWO: Violation of Fifth Amendment Due Process**

8 50. Respondents are unlawfully detaining the Petitioner by depriving him of a bond  
9 hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and erroneously considering him to be bound by 8 U.S.C. §  
10 1225(b). "Freedom from imprisonment-from government custody, detention, or other forms of  
11 physical restraint- lies at the heart of the liberty that Clause protects." *Zadvydas*.

12 51. Notwithstanding applicability of *Maldonado-Bautista*, Petitioner remains eligible  
13 for habeas relief because his detention violates the due process clause. U.S. Const. Amend. V.  
14 The Due Process Clause entitles aliens to due process in deportation proceedings. *Reno v. Flores*,  
15 507 U.S. 292, 306 (1993); *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510 (2003); *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S.  
16 678 (2001); *see also Jackson v. Indiana*, 406 U.S. 715, 738 (1972) (Criminal law case in which  
17 the Supreme Court noted in dicta that "At the least, due process requires that the nature and  
18 duration of commitment bear some reasonable relation to the purpose for which the individual is  
19 committed.")

20 52. "[I]mpermissible punishment before trial" violates substantive due process  
21 protections. *United States v. Salerno*, 481 U.S. 739, 746 (1987). ). In *Salerno*, the Court  
22 analyzed whether the Bail Reform Act of 1984 complied with the requirements of Fifth  
23 Amendment due process. Justice Rehnquist writing for the majority held the Bail Reform Act of  
24 1984 did *not* violate the substantive due process clause, reasoning: "[p]reventing danger to the

1 community is a legitimate regulatory goal and the incidents of detention are not excessive in  
2 relation to that goal, *since the Act carefully limits the circumstances under which detention*  
3 *may be sought to the most serious of crimes, the arrestee is entitled to a prompt hearing, the*  
4 *maximum length of detention is limited by the Speedy Trial Act, and detainees must be*  
5 *housed apart from convicts.* Thus, the Act constitutes a permissible regulation, rather than  
6 impermissible punishment.” (emphasis added).

7 53. Unlike Salerno, the interpretation of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) Respondent’s and BIA in  
8 *Yajure-Hurtado* put forward does not “carefully limit” the circumstances of detention – it does  
9 the polar opposite and transmutes a narrow exception into a general rule to the utter disregard of  
10 the manner in which this transmogrification renders 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) superfluous along with  
11 other broad swathes of the INA. Nor does it afford Petitioner or those like him a “prompt  
12 hearing” - it does the polar opposite, and claims authority to strip away Petitioner’s right to  
13 request a bond hearing or receive bond. Nor does it describe any limits whatsoever as to how  
14 long people like Petitioner may continue to be detained. Salerno therefore shows application of  
15 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) is “impermissible punishment before trial” demonstrating the  
16 unconstitutionality of such interpretation.

17 **COUNT THREE: Violation of the Eighth Amendment**

18 54. The Eighth Amendment provides “Excessive bail shall not be required, nor  
19 excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.” U.S. Const. Amend. VIII.

20 55. By denying Petitioner the right to any amount of bail and erroneously applying 8  
21 U.S.C. § 1225(b) to him, Respondents violate the Eighth Amendment.

22 56. Respondents also violate the Eighth Amendment because the detention is an  
23 “impermissible punishment before trial.” *Salerno*, discussed above.

1           57. Courts have found deportation to not be a “punishment” for a crime. Wong Wing  
2 v. United States, 163 U.S. 228, 236 (1896) (Citing Fong Yue Ting v. United States, 149 U.S. 698,  
3 730 (1893) Elia v. Gonzales, 431 F.3d 268, 276 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005); Briseno v. Immigr. &  
4 Naturalization Serv., 192 F.3d 1320, 1323 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999); Oliver v. U.S. Dep’t of Just., Immigr.  
5 & Naturalization Serv., 517 F.2d 426, 428 (2d Cir. 1975) (despite its “severe ... consequences,”  
6 deportation is not a criminal punishment) (Quoting Harisiades v. Shaughnessy, 342 U.S. 580,  
7 594 (1952)). From this premise, Courts have sometimes noted in dicta that Immigration Law is  
8 an area of “civil law” and subsequently concluded that 6th amendment protections – the right to  
9 counsel, etc. – have been found to not apply.

10           58. Here, Petitioner does not assert otherwise. Petitioner agrees the current legal  
11 framework does not recognize deportation or “removal” to be a punishment for a crime. From  
12 this premise though, it does not then follow that no detention – however gruesome its conditions,  
13 arbitrary its imposition, or whatever set of other Constitutional rights get trampled over to  
14 accomplish such detention – could ever amount to “punishment” such that Eighth Amendment  
15 protections extend. Rather, the Eighth Amendment can apply to immigration detention in certain  
16 circumstances which, admittedly, the Supreme Court has not yet gotten around to delineating.  
17 However, that Court has never held the Eighth Amendment cannot apply to immigration. See  
18 Harisiades v. Shaughnessy, Justice Douglas’s dissent 342 U.S. 580, 598-600 (1952) (“The  
19 power of deportation is ... an implied one. The right to life and liberty is an express one. Why  
20 this implied power should be given priority over the express guarantee of the Fifth Amendment  
21 has never been satisfactorily answered ... The expulsion of a race may be within the inherent  
22 powers of a despotism. History, before the adoption of this constitution, was not destitute of  
23 examples of the exercise of such a power, and its framers were familiar with history, and wisely  
24

1 ... they gave to this government no general power to banish ... Banishment is punishment in the  
2 practical sense. It may deprive a man and his family of all that makes life worthwhile.”) See also  
3 *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976) (Describing the deliberate indifference standard for  
4 Eighth Amendment claims based on deliberate indifference to serious medical needs); *Helling v.*  
5 *McKinney*, 509 U.S. 25, 33 (1933) (Even where the harm has not yet occurred, a prisoner can  
6 still file a successful Eighth Amendment claim regarding the conditions of his or her  
7 confinement, recognizing a remedy for unsafe conditions where a tragic event has not yet  
8 occurred); *see also* Carl Kenneth Lipscombe, Tylenol and an Ice Pack: An Inadequate  
9 Prescription for HIV/AIDS in Immigration Detention Centers, 11 CARDOZO PUB. L. POL’Y  
10 & ETHICS J. 529 (2013); *Jones v. Cunningham*, 371 U.S. 236, 238–40 (1963) (noting that  
11 habeas corpus is not limited to situations where the applicant is in custody, but can be used by  
12 aliens, members of the military and other situations where one’s liberty is restrained); *Bell v.*  
13 *Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520, 526 n.6 (1979) (Supreme Court has “left for another day the question of  
14 the propriety of using a writ of habeas corpus to obtain review of the conditions of confinement,  
15 as distinct from the fact or length of the confinement itself.”, also at page 535 noting pretrial  
16 detainees “may not be punished prior to an adjudication of guilt in accordance with due process  
17 of law.”)

18       59. Here, Respondents have detained Petitioner and others like him at Stewart  
19 Detention Center operated by a private company, CoreCivic. Migrants have accused that  
20 company of inhumane living conditions, medical negligence, physical and sexual abuse,  
21 overcrowding, understaffing, use of excessive force, prolonged use of solitary confinement, and  
22 CoreCivic has been sued for forcing noncitizens to work for minimal wages as low as \$1.00 per  
23  
24

1 day.<sup>3</sup> Respondents deny Petitioner his right to request or receive a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. §  
2 1226(a). This raises a colorable Eighth Amendment claim providing Petitioner with another basis  
3 for habeas relief.

4 **COUNT FOUR: Violation of the Immigration and Nationality Act**

5 60. As discussed above, Respondents are detaining the Petitioner and asserting his  
6 detention is under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) forcing Petitioner to be in ‘mandatory detention’ and  
7 ineligible for bond. This misapplies 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) to the Petitioner as 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)  
8 properly governs his detention, under which Petitioner is statutorily eligible to apply for and  
9 receive a bond at a bond hearing upon a showing of certain facts.

10 61. By violating the INA, Respondents provide Petitioner with another avenue for  
11 habeas corpus relief, because Respondents are depriving Petitioner of his statutory right to a  
12 bond hearing. Therefore, Petitioner is also eligible for habeas relief under the INA.

13 **IX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

- 15 a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- 16 b. Issue a writ of habeas corpus requiring that within one day, Respondents release  
17 Petitioner;
- 18 c. Alternatively, issue a writ of habeas corpus requiring Respondents to release  
19 Petitioner unless they provide a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within  
20 seven days;
- 21 d. 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

24 <sup>3</sup> *CoreCivic*, CorpWatch.org, available at <https://www.corpwatch.org/company/corecivic>, accessed December 11th, 2025.

1 e. Grant any other and further relief that this Court deems just and proper.  
2

3 DATED this 11<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2011.

4 Respectfully Submitted,

5 **David Kennedy & Associates, Attorneys at Law, P.C.**

6 **ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONER**

7 **Lead Counsel**

8 /s/ David S. Kennedy Jr

9 David S. Kennedy Jr., Esq.

10 Georgia Bar No.: 414377

11 675 E.E. Butler Parkway, Suite D

12 Gainesville, Georgia 30501

13 Phone: (678) 971-5888

14 Facsimile: (678) 971-5899

15 david@davidkennedylaw.com

16 **Associate Counsel**

17 /s/ Noah D. Gault

18 Noah D. Gault

19 Georgia Bar No.: 208364

20 noah.gault@davidkennedylaw.com

21 **Associate Counsel**

22 /s/ Michelle B. Park

23 Michelle B. Park

24 Georgia Bar No.: 949707

michelle@davidkennedylaw.com

