

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
FORT MYERS DIVISION

YOLEXY RODRIGUEZ BELTRAN,

Petitioner,

Case No. 2:26-cv-713-KCD-DNF

v.

ATTORNEY GENERAL PAM
BONDI, ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES, et al.,

Respondents.

RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner Yolexy Rodriguez Beltran (“Petitioner”) challenges his detention by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, arguing he is entitled to a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226. While reserving all rights, including the right to appeal, Respondents submit this abbreviated brief in lieu of an exhaustive memorandum to preserve the Respondents’ arguments and to conserve judicial resources. Should the Court prefer a more exhaustive discussion, Respondents request leave to submit additional briefing.

FACTS

Yolexy Rodriguez Beltran is a national and citizen of Cuba who last entered the United States on or about December 21, 2023 at the Brownsville, Texas Port of Entry. (*See* Composite Ex. 1 at 1, 7-8.) On or around December 19, 2025, Petitioner

was arrested for Domestic Battery and he was placed in immigration custody the following day. *Id.* at 9-14. The battery charge was dismissed on January 20, 2026. *Id.* at 17. He was served with a Notice to Appear on or about December 23, 2025. *Id.* at 1-4.

On March 11, 2026, Yolexy Rodriguez Beltran filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus (Doc. 1.) He is currently detained at Florida Soft Side South. *Id.*

CERTIFIED HABEAS RETURN

ICE is detaining Yolexy Rodriguez Beltran under the mandatory detention provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2243 (“The person to whom the writ or order is directed shall make a return certifying the true cause of the detention.”). Yolexy Rodriguez Beltran bears the burden to prove his custody violates federal law. *Whitfield v. U.S. Sec’y of State*, 853 F. App’x 327, 329 (11th Cir. 2021).

ARGUMENT

In *In re Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (B.I.A. 2025) the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) examined the plain language of Section 1225, the INA’s statutory scheme, Supreme Court and BIA precedent, the legislative history of the INA and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (“IIRIRA”), Pub L. No. 104-208, and DHS’s prior practices. After doing so, the BIA held that “under a plain language reading of section 235(b)(2)(A) of the INA, 8 U.S.C.

§ 1225(b)(2)(A), Immigration Judges lack authority to hear bond requests or to grant bond to aliens, like the petitioner, who are present in the United States without admission.” 29 I&N Dec. at 225.¹ This Court should rule the same.

Respondents acknowledge that questions of law in this case, and the challenges to the government’s policy and practice, substantially overlap with *Hernandez-Lopez v. Hardin, et al.*, No. 2:25-CV-830-KCD-NPM, 2025 WL 3022245 (M.D. Fla. Oct. 29, 2025). It should be noted, however, that courts have recently ruled against petitioners in similar cases. *See, E.g., Lopez v. Dir. of Enft & Removal Operations*, No. 3:25-CV-1313-JEP-SJH, 2026 WL 261938, at *1 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 26, 2026); *Iraheta Morales v. Noem*, No. 25-62598-CIV-SINGHAL, 2026 WL 236307, at *3-9 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 29, 2026). Some decisions have started recognizing that there is no jurisdiction over this question to begin with. *Munoz Nataren v. Raycraft*, No. 4:26-cv-212, 2026 WL 214368, at *2 (N.D. Ohio Jan. 28, 2026); *Amaya-Velis v. Raycraft*, No. 4:26-cv-73, 2026 WL 100596, at *2-3 (N.D. Ohio Jan. 14, 2026).

¹ On February 18, 2026, U.S. District Court for the Central District of California issued an order stating the court “hereby VACATES *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* as contrary to law under the APA.” *See Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, 2026 WL 468284, at *12 (C.D. Cal.). This order has been temporarily stayed pending a ruling on the government’s emergency motion for a stay pending appeal, insofar as the district court’s judgment extends beyond the Central District of California. *See Bautista et al. v. Dep’t. of Homeland Sec., et al.*, No. 26-1044 (9th Cir. 2026), Dkt. 5. The Federal Respondents submit *Yajure Hurtado* remains persuasive authority in this Court regarding the proper interpretation of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) and further, the Court does not need to decide the issue of *Bautista*’s preclusive effect. *See Avendano v. Warden, Fla. Soft Side S.*, No. 2:25-CV-01221-SPC-NPM, 2026 WL 145499, at *1 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 20, 2026) (declining to rule on *Bautista*’s preclusive effect).

Significantly, the Fifth Circuit recently ruled that aliens who have not been admitted to the United States are subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) regardless of whether the alien is already present in the United States. *Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi*, No. 25-20496, 2026 WL 323330 (5th Cir. Feb. 6, 2026). At least four circuits—including the Eleventh—have active appeals on the matter. *Martinez v. Hyde*, No. 25-1902 (1st Cir.); *Pizzaro Reyes v. ERO*, No. 25-1982 (6th Cir.); *Cortes Alonzo v. Noem*, No. 25-7348 (9th Cir.); *Hernandez Alvarez v. Warden*, No. 25-14065 (11th Cir.).

Respondents respectfully disagree with the Court's decision in *Hernandez-Lopez*. That said, in the interest of judicial economy and to expedite the Court's consideration of this matter, Respondents make the following arguments for preservation purposes:

1. Title 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) bars review of Yolexy Rodriguez Beltran's claims. *Hernandez-Lopez v. Hardin, et al.*, No. 2:25-CV-830-KCD-NPM (M.D. Fla. Oct. 29, 2025) (Doc. 19 at 5-6).
2. Title 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9) bars review of Yolexy Rodriguez Beltran's claims. *Id.* at 7-8.
3. Yolexy Rodriguez Beltran failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. *Id.* at 8.
4. Yolexy Rodriguez Beltran is properly detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225. *Id.* at 8-14.

Finally, Respondents contend that should this Court determine that Petitioner's detention is subject to 8 U.S.C. § 1226, outright release is inappropriate. To the extent the Court orders a bond hearing before an Immigration Judge for the purpose of determining whether Petitioner is a flight risk or danger to the community—see, e.g., *Hernandez-Lopez*, 2025 WL 3022245, at *5—Respondents aver that such bond hearings are not conducted or managed by ICE, rather by the Executive Office for Immigration Review, which is not a proper party to this suit. See *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 434-36 (2004) (noting that for habeas petitions challenging detention, “the default rule is that the proper respondent is the warden of the facility where the prisoner is being held, not the Attorney General or some other remote supervisory official”).

CONCLUSION

The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus should be denied

DATED this 1st day of April, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

GREGORY W. KEHOE
United States Attorney

By: /s/ Sean P. Keefe
SEAN P. KEEFE
Assistant United States Attorney
Florida Bar No. 0413828
400 N. Tampa Street, Suite 3200
Tampa, FL 33602
Ph: (813) 274-6000

Fax: (813) 274-6200

Email: Sean.Keefe@usdoj.gov

Lead Counsel for Federal Respondents