



1  
2 Petitioner has filed a habeas petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The government has  
3 carefully reviewed this petition and determined that the legal issues presented concern the  
4 statutory authority for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement’s (ICE) detention of  
5 Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(2)(A) or 1226(a), and whether Petitioner is entitled  
6 to a bond hearing. While reserving all rights, including the right to appeal, the government  
7 respectfully submits this abbreviated response to preserve the legal issues, to conserve  
8 judicial and party resources, and to expedite the Court’s consideration of this matter.<sup>1</sup>

9 It is the government’s position that Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under  
10 § 1225(b), because Petitioner was present in the United States without being admitted or  
11 paroled. *See Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216, 228 (BIA 2025); *see also See*,  
12 *e.g., Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi*, No. 25-20496, 2026 WL 323330 (5th Cir. 2026);  
13 *Valencia v. Chestnut*, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2025 WL 3205133 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2025);  
14 *Alonzo v. Noem*, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 3208284 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2025); *Cabanas*  
15 *v. Bondi*, No. 4:25-cv-04830, 2025 WL 3171331 (S.D. Tex. Nov. 13, 2025); *Altamirano*  
16 *Ramos v. Lyons*, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2025 WL 3199872 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2025); *Mejia*  
17 *Olalde v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-00168-JMD, 2025 WL 313942 (E.D. Mo. Nov. 10, 2025);  
18 *Silva Oliveira v. Patterson*, No. 6:25-cv-01463, 2025 WL 3095972 (W.D. La. Nov. 4,  
19 2025); *Barrios Sandoval v. Acuna*, No. 6:25-cv-01467, 2025 WL 3048926 (W.D. La. Oct.  
20 31, 2025); *Cirrus Rojas v. Olson*, No. 25-cv-1437-bhl, 2025 WL 3033967 (E.D. Wis. Oct.  
21 30, 2025); *Vargas Lopez v. Trump*, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 2780351 (D. Neb. Sept.  
22 30, 2025); *Chavez v. Noem*, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 2730228 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 24,  
23 2025); *Pena v. Hyde*, No. 25-11983-NMG, 2025 WL 2108913 (D. Mass. July 28, 2025).

24 However, the government acknowledges that Courts in this District have repeatedly  
25 reached the opposite conclusion. *See, e.g., Arias Torres v. Bondi*, No. 25-cv-2457-BAS-

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> To the extent the Court prefers a more formal response, the government respectfully  
28 requests an opportunity to submit within a reasonable timeframe.

1 MSB, 2025 WL 3214773 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 18, 2025); *Martinez Lopez v. LaRose*, No. 25-  
2 cv-2717-JES-AHG, 2025 WL 3030457 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2025); *Beltran v. Noem*, No.  
3 25cv2650-LL-DEB, 2025 WL 3078837 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2025); *Garcia v. Noem*, 803 F.  
4 Supp. 3d 1064 (S.D. Cal. 2025); *Esquivel-Ipina v. LaRose*, No. 25-CV-2672 JLS (BLM),  
5 2025 WL 2998361 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2025); *Lucas-Miguel v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3022-  
6 RSH-JLB, 2025 WL 3251580 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2025); *Vasquez-Diaz v. LaRose*, No. 25-  
7 cv-3038-TWR-JLB, ECF No. 6 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2025); *Cardoso v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-  
8 3043-BJC-VET, ECF No. 7 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 12, 2025); *Maceda-Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-  
9 cv-2968-JO-JLB, ECF No. 9 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2025); *A.S. v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-2876-  
10 RBM-VET, ECF No. 9 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2025); *Prieto-Cordova v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-  
11 2824-CAB-DDL, 2025 WL 3228953 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2025); *Lagarda-Vega v. Noem*,  
12 No. 25-cv-2970-GPC-DDL, 2025 WL 3558931 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2025); *Nayyer v.*  
13 *LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3111-AGS-DDL, ECF No. 7 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 12, 2025); *Amaya v.*  
14 *Noem*, No. 25cv2892-BTM-DEB, 2025 WL 3182998 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2025).

15 On the legal issue of which statute governs Petitioner’s detention here—whether it  
16 is 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) or 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)—the government acknowledges that this  
17 District’s prior decisions would control the result here if the Court adheres to its prior  
18 decision, as the facts are not materially distinguishable for purposes of the Court’s decision  
19 on the legal issue of which statutory provision authorizes Petitioner’s detention.

20 Thus, while the government does not consent to issuance of the writ and reserves all  
21 rights, including the right to appeal, and to conserve judicial and party resources while  
22 expediting the Court’s consideration of this case, the government hereby relies upon, and  
23 incorporates by reference, the legal arguments it presented in those cases previously  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 adjudicated by the Court,<sup>2</sup> and submits fully herein.<sup>3</sup>

2 DATED: March 24, 2026

ADAM GORDON  
United States Attorney

3  
4 s/Antonio Estrada  
ANTONIO ESTRADA  
5 Special Assistant United States Attorney

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 <sup>2</sup> Specifically, the government incorporates by reference all arguments raised in its prior  
16 oppositional brief. *See, e.g., Arias Torres v. Bondi*, No. 25-cv-2457-BAS-MSB, ECF No.  
17 15 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 5, 2025); *Martinez Lopez v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-2717-JES-AHG, ECF  
18 No. 7 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 21, 2025); *Beltran v. Noem*, No. 25cv2650-LL-DEB, ECF No. 6 (S.D.  
19 Cal. Oct. 9, 2025); *Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-2180-DMS-MMP, ECF No. 5 (S.D. Cal.  
20 Aug. 27, 2025); *Esquivel-Ipina v. LaRose*, No. 25-CV-2672 JLS (BLM), ECF No. 5 (S.D.  
21 Cal. Oct. 15, 2025); *Lucas-Miguel v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3022-RSH-JLB, ECF No. 4 (S.D.  
22 Cal. Nov. 20, 2025); *Vasquez-Diaz v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3038-TWR-JLB, ECF No. 4  
23 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2025); *Cardoso v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3043-BJC-VET, ECF No. 5 (S.D.  
24 Cal. Nov. 12, 2025); *Maceda-Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-2968-JO-JLB, ECF No. 8 (S.D.  
25 Cal. Nov. 7, 2025); *A.S. v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-2876-RBM-VET, ECF No. 6 (S.D. Cal. Nov.  
26 7, 2025); *Prieto-Cordova v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-2824-CAB-DDL, ECF No. 11 (S.D. Cal.  
27 Nov. 14, 2025); *Lagarda-Vega v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-2970-GPC-DDL, ECF No. 3 (S.D. Cal.  
28 Nov. 8, 2025); *Nayyer v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3111-AGS-DDL, ECF No. 4 (S.D. Cal. Nov.  
20, 2025); *Amaya v. Noem*, No. 25cv2892-BTM-DEB, ECF No. 4 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 6, 2025).

<sup>3</sup> Petitioner also challenges his detention citing violations of Administrative Procedure Act, Due Process, the Fourth Amendment. Should the Court grant the petition, it should decline to address these additional arguments. *INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976) (“As a general rule courts and agencies are not required to make findings on issues the decision of which is unnecessary to the results they reach.”).