Kara Hartzler
Cal. Bar No. 293751
Federal Defenders of San Diego, Inc.
225 Broadway, Suite 900
San Diego, California 92101-5030
Telephone: (619) 234-8467
Facsimile: (619) 687-2666
Kara_hartzler@fd.org

Counsel for Mr. Pioquinto Alonso

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SIRIACO PIOQUINTO ALONSO,

Petitioner,

v.

KRISTI NOEM, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, PAMELA JO BONDI, Attorney General, TODD M. LYONS, Acting Director, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, JESUS ROCHA, Acting Field Office Director, San Diego Field Office, CHRISTOPHER LAROSE, Warden at Otay Mesa Detention Center,

Respondents.

Civil Case No.: 26-cv-1599-JLS

Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus

[Civil Immigration Habeas, 28 U.S.C. § 2241]

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

"For decades, and across administrations, DHS has acknowledged that § 1226(a) applies to individuals who entered the United States unlawfully, but who were later apprehended within the borders of the United States long after their entry." *Rodriguez v. Bostock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239, 1260 (W.D. Wash. 2025). But in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), the Board of Immigration Appeals ("BIA") accepted the government's new position that inadmissible immigrants are not eligible for bond under § 1226(a), even if they have been living in the United States for years or decades. Instead, the BIA held that all inadmissible immigrants are subject to the mandatory detention provisions in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

But in November 2025, District Judge Sunshine S. Sykes of the U.S. District Court for Central District of California issued an order certifying a nationwide class consisting of noncitizens who have entered the United States without inspection and who were not apprehended upon arrival and who are not otherwise subject to detention under INA §§ 236(c), 235(b)(1), or 241. *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz,* No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, 2025 WL 3288403, at *9 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2025). Judge Sykes also issued an order granting declaratory relief concluding that the detention of class members is governed by INA § 236(a) and that class members are not subject to mandatory detention pursuant to INA § 235(b)(2). *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM (Nov. 20, 2025 C.D. Cal.) *Maldonado Bautista* rejected the Board of Immigration Appeal's (BIA) decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). And on February 18, 2026, Judge Sykes vacated *Matter of Yahure Hurtado* altogether.[1]

[1] Order available at: chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cacd.980210/gov.uscourts.cacd.980210.116.0.pdf.

Mr. Pioquinto Alonso is a member of the *Maldonado Bautista* class, as he is alleged to have entered the United States without inspection and is not otherwise subject to mandatory detention. Although the Ninth Circuit recently stayed the district court's decision in *Maldonado Bautista,* that does not prevent this Court from granting relief on the merits.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Mr. Pioquinto Alonso was born in Mexico and entered the United States unlawfully in 1993 when he was 16 years old. Exhibit A, Declaration of Siriaco Pioquinto Alonso, at ¶ 1. For over thirty years, he has lived in Poway, California. *Id.* at ¶ 1. He has never been deported. *Id* at ¶ 1.

Mr. Pioquinito Alonso has four children who were born in the United States. *Id.* at ¶ 2. One of these children died in an automobile accident. *Id.* at ¶ 2. As a result of his death, Mr. Pioquinto Alonso has struggled with alcohol abuse. *Id.* at ¶ 2.

On October 22, 2025, when Mr. Pioquinto Alonso left his house to go to work, ICE agents were waiting for him. *Id.* at ¶ 3. They arrested him and took him into custody. *Id.* at ¶ 3.

Mr. Pioquinto Alonso was transferred to Otay Mesa Detention Center and put into removal proceedings. *Id* at ¶ 4. However, to his knowledge he has never had a bond hearing before an immigration judge. *Id.* at ¶ 4. His next master calendar hearing is on April 6, 2026. *Id.* at ¶ 5.

ARGUMENT

I. Mr. Pioquinto Alonso is not subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

A. Courts disagree with the BIA's reasoning in *Yajure Hurtado*, that stripped most noncitizens who enter without inspection of the right to seek bond.

In *Yajure Hurtado*, the BIA concluded that noncitizens who enter without

inspection have no right to seek bond from an IJ, regardless of how long they have been residing in the country and irrespective of whether they were apprehended by immigration authorities. 29 I&N Dec. at 228.

Since *Yajure Hurtado* was decided, many immigrants who otherwise would have received bond hearings under § 1226(a) have challenged that decision in the federal courts. As mentioned above in the introduction and as the government recognizes in its Return, numerous courts disagree with the BIA's decision. Doc. 6 at 12-13. Courts broadly agree that the BIA's novel constructions of § 1225(b)(2)(A) and § 1226(a) are not correct.

On the one hand, § 1225(b)(2)(A) is best read to apply to immigrants who are at or near the border or other ports of entry, for at least three reasons.

First, § 1225(b)(2)(A)'s statutory context strongly suggests that it applies only to persons apprehended at or near the border. As the Supreme Court recognized in *Jennings*, § 1225(b) is concerned "primarily [with those] seeking entry," and is generally imposed "at the Nation's borders and ports of entry, where the Government must determine whether [a noncitizen] seeking to enter the country is admissible." *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281 at 297, 287(2018). Throughout its text, the statute refers to "inspections"—a term not defined in the INA but which typically connotes an examination upon or soon after physical entry. 8 U.S.C. § 1225 ("Inspection by immigration officers; expedited removal of inadmissible arriving [noncitizens]; referral for hearing"); *id.* § 1225(b)(1)–(2) (referring to "inspections" in their titles); *id.* § 1225(d)(1) (authorizing immigration officials to search certain conveyances in order to conduct "inspections" where noncitizens "are being brought into the United States"). Many statutory provisions, various regulations, and BIA precedent discuss "inspection" in the context of admission processes at ports of entry, further supporting the conclusion that § 1225 has a limited temporal and geographic scope. 8 U.S.C. § 1187(h)(2)(B)(i); 8 U.S.C. § 1225a; 8 U.S.C. § 1752a; 8 C.F.R.

§ 235.1; *Matter of Quilantan*, 25 I&N Dec. 285 (BIA 2010). Petitioner's interpretation accords.

Second, consistent with the statute's overall focus on the moment of physical entry, § 1225(b)(2)'s plain language limits the statute's reach to persons actively attempting to enter the United States. The statute applies only to those who are *both* "applicants for admission" *and* in the process of "seeking admission." 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Because the statute's first clause already limits the provision to "applicants for admission," the phrase "seeking admission" must have a different meaning. Any other reading would constitute "an obvious violation of the rule against surplusage." *Romero*, 2025 WL 2403827, at *10.

On its face, the phrase "seeking admission" suggests an active attempt to enter the country. Congress's use of the present and present progressive tenses "necessarily requires some sort of present-tense action," excluding noncitizens in the interior who are no longer in the process of seeking admission to the U.S. *Romero*, 2025 WL 2403827, at *9 (cleaned up); *accord Rosado*, 2025 WL 2337099, at *11 (similar); *Lopez Benitez*, 2025 WL 2371588, at *6 (noting the statute's "present-tense active language"). "Realistically speaking," it is hard to accept that the statute's plain language could mean anything else: "[I]f Congress's intention" to detain everyone who entered without inspection "was so clear, why did it take thirty years to notice?" *Romero*, 2025 WL 2403827, at *12.

Third, the statutory history supports a limited reading of § 1225(b)'s reach. When Congress amended § 1225(b)'s predecessor statute—which authorized detention only of arriving noncitizens—to include individuals who had not been admitted, legislators expressed concerns about recent arrivals to the United States who lacked the documents to remain in the country. H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 157–58, 228–29 (1996); H.R. Rep. No. 104-828, at 209 (1996) (Conf. Rep.). There was no suggestion in the legislative history that Congress intended to subject all people present in the United States after an unlawful entry to

mandatory detention and thereby transform immigration detention and sweep millions of noncitizens into § 1225(b).

The BIA's contrary reading of the legislative history is not persuasive. True, IIRIRA "altered the typology of immigration *proceedings* to 'place[ ] on equal footing' 'all immigrants who have not been lawfully admitted.'" *Romero*, 2025 WL 2403827, at *12 (emphasis added) (quoting *Torres v. Barr*, 976 F.3d 918, 928 (9th Cir. 2020)). But that "says nothing about *detention* pending the outcome of those proceedings." *Id.* (emphasis added). All these indicators suggest that § 1225(b)(2)(A) applies only to recent arrivals at the border or ports of entry, not people who have already entered the country.

On the other hand, § 1226(a) is best read to apply to some inadmissible persons. It cannot plausibly be the case that all inadmissible persons fall under § 1225(b)(2)(A) and none fall under § 1226(a).

First, § 1226(a)'s statutory structure makes clear that it reaches some individuals who have not been admitted and have entered without inspection. Section 1226(c) exempts specific categories of noncitizens from the default eligibility to seek release on bond in § 1226(a). "Among the individuals carved out and subject to mandatory detention are certain categories of 'inadmissible' noncitizens." *Rodriguez*, 779 F. Supp. 3d at 1246 (quoting 8 § 1226(c)(1)(A), (D), (E)). The 2025 Laken Riley Act ("LRA") added to that list. "This 'new' category" of persons not eligible for bond "includes those noncitizens who are deemed inadmissible, including for being 'present in the United States without being admitted or paroled,' and who have been arrested, charged with, or convicted of certain crimes." *Rosado*, 2025 WL 2337099, at *9 (citing 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c)(1)(E); LRA, Pub. L. No. 119-1). If § 1226(a) did not apply to inadmissible noncitizens, then the longstanding carve outs that refer to inadmissibility and Congress' most recent amendments would all be surplusage. *See Garcia*, 2025 WL 2549431, at *6. The better reading is the Supreme Court's

in *Jennings*: that § 1226(a) "applies to aliens already present in the United States." 583 U.S. at 303.

Second, § 1226(a)'s legislative history supports Petitioner's reading. "After passing the IIRIRA, Congress declared the new § 1226(a) 'restates the current provisions in [the predecessor statute] regarding the authority of the Attorney General to arrest, detain, and release on bond' a noncitizen 'who is not lawfully in the United States.'" *Rosado*, 2025 WL 2337099, at *9. Because noncitizens deemed inadmissible "were entitled to discretionary detention under § 1226(a)'s predecessor statute, and Congress declared the statute's scope unchanged by IIRIRA," § 1226(a) must "allow for a discretionary release on bond for" inadmissible noncitizens, too. *Id.*

Thus, the best reading of 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225, 1226 shows that petitioner is eligible for bond. And under the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Loper Bright v. Raimondo*, this Court must independently interpret the meaning and scope of §§ 1225(b), 1226(a) using the traditional tools of statutory construction. 603 U.S. 369, 385, 401 (2024); *see also Rodriguez*, 779 F. Supp. 3d at 1251; *Kostak*, 2025 WL 2472136, at *2 n.29; *Gomes v. Hyde*, No. 1:25-CV-11571-JEK, 2025 WL 1869299, at *8 n.9 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025). Because the BIA's decision in *Yajure Hurtado* is a deviation from the agency's long-standing interpretation of §§ 1225, 1226; is not guidance issued contemporaneously with enactment of the relevant statutes; and contradicts the statutory interpretations of dozens of federal courts, this Court should give it no weight. If anything, the government's "decades of practice" providing bond hearings to those who entered without inspection is a more persuasive guide to the proper outcome here. *Martinez*, 2025 WL 2084238, at *4.

B. Detaining Mr. Pioquinto Alonso without a bond hearing violates 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), associated regulations, the administrative procedures act, and the Fifth Amendment right to due process.

Both the 8 U.S.C.§ 1226(a) and its associated regulations entitle Petitioner

to a bond hearing. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 326.1(d), 1236.1, 1003.19(a)-(f). Accordingly, the Fifth Amendment's due process clause requires the government to provide the legally required bond hearing before Petitioner is detained. *See Hernandez-Lara v. Lyons*, 10 F.4th 19, 27 (1st Cir. 2021).

The statute and regulations implement the due process protection that attends any civil detention. *See Rodriguez v. Marin*, 909 F.3d 252, 256 (9th Cir. 2018) (expressing "grave doubts that any statute that allows for arbitrary prolonged detention without any process is constitutional or that those who founded our democracy precisely to protect against the government's arbitrary deprivation of liberty would have thought so"). The Supreme Court has "repeatedly recognized that civil commitment for any purpose constitutes a significant deprivation of liberty that requires due process protection," including an individualized detention hearing. *Addington v. Texas*, 441 U.S. 418, 425 (1979); *see also United States v. Salerno,* 481 U.S. 739, 755 (1987); *Foucha v. Louisiana*, 504 U.S. 71, 81–83 (1992); *Kansas v. Hendricks*, 521 U.S. 346, 357 (1997).

Here, Mr. Pioquinto Alonso has not received a bond hearing. That violated the statute, regulations, due process, and the Administrative Procedures Act.

C. The Ninth Circuit's stay in *Maldonado Bautista* does not prevent this Court from granting relief.

In *Maldonado-Bautista v. DHS*, 25-cv-1873-SSS-BFM (C.D. Cal.), a district judge granted national, class-wide relief to plaintiffs challenging the BIA's interpretation of §§ 1225, 1226. *Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, 2025 WL 3713987, at *32 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025), *judgment entered sub nom. Maldonado Bautista v. Noem*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, 2025 WL 3678485 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025). The Ninth Circuit subsequently stayed the order, "insofar as the district court's judgment extends beyond the Central District of California." *Maldonado Bautista v. DHS*, No. 26-1044, Dkt.

No. 5.1 (Mar 6, 2026). The Ninth Circuit left the judgement in place in the Central District. *Id.*

Because of the stay order, the government is no longer required to follow *Maldonado Bautista* in this district. But the stay order does not indicate any opinion on the stay order's merits or prevent this Court from finding in Petitioner's favor. It means only that this Court must do an independent evaluation on the merits. For the reasons given above, that independent evaluation demands relief here.

II. This Court must hold an evidentiary hearing on any disputed facts.

Resolution of a prolonged-detention habeas petition may require an evidentiary hearing. *Owino v. Napolitano*, 575 F.3d 952, 956 (9th Cir. 2009). Mr. Pioquinto Alonso hereby requests such a hearing on any material, disputed facts.

III. Prayer for relief

Petitioner respectfully asks that this Court order Respondents to provide him a bond hearing before a neutral immigration judge, as well as any other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 23, 2026

s/ Kara Hartzler

Federal Defenders of San Diego, Inc.
Attorneys for Mr. Pioquinto Alonso
Email: kara_hartzler@fd.org