

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
COLUMBUS DIVISION

RAFAEL PACHECO ROMAN,

Petitioner,

v.

JASON STREEVAL, Warden of Stewart Detention  
Center; KRISTEN SULLIVAN, Field Office  
Director of Enforcement and Removal Operations,  
Atlanta Field Office, Immigration and Customs  
Enforcement; TODD M. LYONS, Acting Director,  
U.S. Immigrations & Customs Enforcement;  
KRISTI NOEM, Secretary, U.S. Department of  
Homeland Security; U.S. Department of Homeland  
Security; PAMELA BONDI, U.S. Attorney  
General; and DAREN K. MARGOLIN, Director,  
Executive Office for Immigration Review,

Respondents.

Case No.:

VERIFIED PETITION  
FOR WRIT OF  
HABEAS CORPUS  
UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 2241

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

## INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner, Rafael Pacheco Roman, brings this petition for a writ of habeas corpus to seek enforcement of Petitioner's rights as a member of the Bond Eligible Class certified in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM (C.D. Cal.). Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents at the Stewart Detention Center in Lumpkin, Georgia. Petitioner now faces unlawful detention because the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) have refused to abide by the declaratory judgment issued on behalf of the certified class in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*.

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

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

1 4. Nevertheless “Respondents have violated and continue to violate the law by  
2 detaining Bond Eligible Class members in contravention of the Final Judgment.” *Maldonado*  
3 *Bautista*, Case No. 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM (C.D. Cal. Feb. 18, 2026), at 13.

4 5. On February 18, 2026, the district court issued an Order Granting Plaintiff  
5 Petitioners’ Motion to Enforce Judgment. *Maldonado Bautista*, Case No. 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-  
6 BFM (C.D. Cal. Feb. 18, 2026). In its Order, the district court vacated *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*  
7 under the Administrative Procedures Act (“APA”). *Maldonado Bautista*, Case No. 5:25-cv-  
8 01873-SSS-BFM (C.D. Cal. Feb. 18, 2026), at \*16.

9 6. The Executive Office for Immigration Review and its subagency the Immigration  
10 Court and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) have blatantly refused to abide by the  
11 declaratory relief and have unlawfully ordered those detained noncitizens, who entered the  
12 United States without inspection, be denied the opportunity to be released on bond. We  
13 anticipate the Executive Office for Immigration Review and DHS will also blatantly refuse to  
14 abide by declaratory relief and unlawfully deny Petitioner the opportunity to be released on  
15 bond.

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

- 17 a. does not have lawful status in the United States and is currently detained  
18 at the Stewart Detention Center in Lumpkin, Georgia;
- 19 b. was apprehended by immigration authorities on or about March 18, 2026;
- 20 c. entered the United States without inspection approximately 22 years ago  
21 and was not apprehended upon arrival, *cf. id.*; and
- 22 d. is not detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231.
- 23
- 24

1           8.       After apprehending Petitioner on or about March 18, 2026, the DHS placed  
2 Petitioner in removal proceedings pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. DHS has charged Petitioner as  
3 being inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) and 1182(a)(7)(A)(i)(I), as someone who  
4 entered the United States without inspection.

5           9.       The Court should expeditiously grant this petition.

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

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

16           12.       Because Respondents are detaining Petitioner in violation of the declaratory  
17 judgment issued in *Maldonado Bautista*, the Court should accordingly order that within one day,  
18 Respondent DHS must release Petitioner.

19           13.       Alternatively, the Court should order Petitioner’s release unless Respondents  
20 provide a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven days.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**JURISDICTION**

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

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

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

**VENUE**

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

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

**REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243**

19. The Court should grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus “forthwith,” as the legal issues have already been resolved for class members in *Maldonado Bautista*.

20. Habeas corpus is “perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law . . . affording as it does a *swift* and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or

1 confinement.” *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963) (emphasis added). “The application for the  
2 writ usurps the attention and displaces the calendar of the judge or justice who entertains it and  
3 receives prompt action from him within the four corners of the application.” *Yong v. I.N.S.*, 208  
4 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted).

5  
6 **PARTIES**

7 21. Petitioner is a citizen of Mexico who has been in immigration detention since on  
8 or about March 18, 2026. After Petitioner was detained by ICE, ICE did not set bond. Petitioner  
9 has resided in the United States since 2004.

10 22. Respondent Jason Streeval is employed by CoreCivic as Warden of the Stewart  
11 Detention Center, where Petitioner is detained. The Warden of the Stewart Detention Center has  
12 immediate physical custody of Petitioner. The Warden of the Stewart Detention Center is sued in  
13 his official capacity.

14 23. Respondent Kristen Sullivan is the Acting Director of the Atlanta Field Office of  
15 ICE’s Enforcement and Removal Operations division. As such, Acting Director Sullivan is  
16 Petitioner’s immediate custodian and is responsible for Petitioner’s detention and removal. She is  
17 named in her official capacity.

18 24. Respondent Todd Lyons is the acting Director of U.S. Immigration & Customs  
19 Enforcement (ICE). He is responsible for the administration of ICE and the implementation and  
20 enforcement of the immigration laws, including immigrant detention. As such, Mr. Lyons is a  
21 legal custodian of Petitioner. He is sued in his official capacity.

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

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

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

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

16          29.     Respondent Daren K. Margolin is the Director of EOIR, which is the federal  
17 agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA in removal proceedings, including  
18 for custody redeterminations in bond hearings. Respondent Margolin is sued in his official  
19 capacity.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

**Violation of the INA:**

**Request for Relief Pursuant to *Maldonado Bautista***

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

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

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

33. The order granting class certification in *Maldonado Bautista* further orders that “[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.”

34. Respondents are parties to *Maldonado Bautista* and bound by the Court’s declaratory judgment, which has the full “force and effect of a final judgment.” 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a).

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

36. Assuming, *arguendo*, that *Maldonado Bautista* does not apply, find that Petitioner is currently detained under § 1226(a) and therefore not subject to mandatory detention as required by § 1225(b)(2). *See J.A.M. v. Streeval*, No. 4:25-CV-342-CDL, 2025 WL 3050094

1 (M.D. Ga. Nov. 1, 2025); *P.R.S. v. Streeval*, No. 4:25-CV-330-CDL, 2025 WL 3269947 (M.D.  
2 Ga. Nov. 24, 2025).

3  
4 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

- 6 a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- 7 b. Issue a writ of habeas corpus requiring that within one day, Respondents release  
8 Petitioner;
- 9 c. Alternatively, issue a writ of habeas corpus requiring Respondents to release  
10 Petitioner unless they provide a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within  
11 seven days;
- 12 d. Award Petitioner attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act  
13 (EAJA), as amended, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and on any other basis justified under  
14 law; and
- 15 e. Grant any other and further relief that this Court deems just and proper.
- 16

17 DATED this 24th day of March 2026.

18 *//s// Colin Robert Nisbet*

19  
20 

---

Colin Robert Nisbet, Esq.  
Georgia Bar No. 913136  
Wannamaker Crimmigration  
3740 Davinci Court, Suite 150  
Peachtree Corners, GA 30092  
21 Tel.: 470-749-9996  
22 Fax: 404-990-4936  
23 colin.n@sternlawfirm.us

24 *Attorney for Petitioner*

1 **VERIFICATION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2242**

2 I represent Petitioner, Rafael Pacheco Roman, and submit this verification on Petitioner's  
3 behalf. I verify that the factual statements made in the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas  
4 Corpus are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

5 Dated this 24th day of March 2026.

6  
7 Respectfully submitted,

8  
9 *//s// Colin Robert Nisbet*

10 \_\_\_\_\_  
11 Colin Robert Nisbet, Esq.  
12 Georgia Bar No. 913136  
13 Wannamaker Crimmigration  
14 3740 Davinci Court, Suite 150  
15 Peachtree Corners, GA 30092  
16 Tel.: 470-749-9996  
17 Fax: 404-990-4936  
18 colin.n@sternlawfirm.us

19 *Attorney for Petitioner*  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24