

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
FORT MYERS DIVISION**

EVELIO SOSA SOLER,

Petitioner,

v.

Case No. 2:26-cv-728-JES-DNF

MATTHEW MORDANT, et al.

Respondents.

RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner Evelio Sosa Soler 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

Sosa Soler is a national and citizen of Cuba who last entered the United States without inspection on or about November 10, 2021. Composite Exhibit, Ex. 1 at 1. He was placed in immigration custody on February 25, 2026. *Id.* He was served with a Notice to Appear on or about February 26, 2026. *Id.* at 7. Sosa Soler is currently detained at California City Corrections Center. *Id.* at 12.

On March 13, 2026, Sosa Soler filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus alleging his custody violates the Immigration and Nationality Act and the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. Dkt. 1.

CERTIFIED HABEAS RETURN

ICE is detaining Sosa Soler under the mandatory detention provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). *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.”). Sosa Soler 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.

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.). Respondents submit *Yajure Hurtado* remains persuasive authority in this Court

Respondents acknowledge that questions of law in this case, and the challenges to the government's policy and practice, substantially overlap with *Patel v. Hardin*, No. 2:25-cv-00870-JES-NPM (M.D. Fla.) (Doc. 22) (granting habeas in part). 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).

Significantly, two circuits have now 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)(A) 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); *Avila v. Bondi*, No. 25-3248, 2026 WL 819258 (8th Cir. Mar. 25, 2026). Other circuits—including the Eleventh—have active appeals on the matter. *See e.g., Pizzaro*

regarding the proper interpretation of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). 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). Respondents nevertheless note that on March 6, 2026, the Ninth Circuit temporarily stayed the *Bautista* district court's February 18, 2026, order vacating *Yajure Hurtado*. *Bautista v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Security*, 26-1044, Dkt Entry 5.1 ¶ 2 (9th Cir.).

Reyes v. ERO, No. 25-1982 (6th Cir.); *Hernandez Alvarez v. Warden*, No. 25-14065 (11th Cir.).

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

1. Title 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) bars review of Sosa Soler's claims. *Patel v. Hardin*, No. 2:25-cv-00870-JES-NPM, Doc. 15 at 4-7 (M.D. Fla. Oct. 22, 2025).²
2. Title 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(9) bars review Sosa Soler's claims. *Id.* at 7-8.
3. Sosa Soler failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. *Id.* at 8-9.
4. Sosa Soler is properly detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225. *Id.* at 10-16.

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., *Garcia v. Noem*, No. 2:25-CV-00879-SPC-NPM, 2025 WL 3041895, at *6 (M.D. Fla. Oct. 31, 2025)—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,

² Respondents acknowledge Local Rule 3.01(h) prohibits incorporation by reference of any other motion, legal memorandum, or brief. To achieve the purpose of efficiency, Respondents respectfully request the Court to suspend application of the rule in this instance. See Local Rule 1.01(a) and 1.01(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

434-36 (2004) (noting that for habeas petitions challenging detention, “the default rule is that the proper Respondents is the warden of the facility where the prisoner is being held, not the Attorney General or some other remote supervisory official”).

CONCLUSION

Sosa Soler’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus should be denied.

DATED this 6th day of April, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

GREGORY W. KEHOE
United States Attorney

By: /s/ Mamie V. Wise
MAMIE V. WISE
Assistant United States Attorney
Florida Bar No. 65570
400 North Tampa Street, Suite 3200
Tampa, Florida 33602
Telephone: 813-274-6000
Facsimile: 813-274-6200
E-mail: mamie.wise@usdoj.gov

Lead Counsel for Federal Respondents