

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

JUNIOR ALEJANDRO LOPEZ POLO,

Petitioner,

v.

KRISTEN SULLIVAN Field Office Director
of Enforcement and Removal Operations,
ATLANTA Field Office, Immigration and
Customs Enforcement;
MARWAYNE MULLIN, Secretary, U.S.
Department of Homeland Security; U.S.
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY;
PAMELA BONDI, U.S. Attorney General;
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION
REVIEW;
JASON STREEVAL, Warden of STEWART
DETENTION CENTER,

Respondents.

Case No.

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner **JUNIOR ALEJANDRO LOPEZ POLO** brings this petition for a writ of habeas corpus to seek enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act's (INA) provisions for bond hearings before an Immigration Judge. 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 continued to deny bond hearings under INA 236, instead treating unlawful entrants, even of longstanding residence in the U.S., under the mandatory detention scheme at INA 235.

2. Immigration Judges at Stewart Immigration Detention Center continue to decline jurisdiction, despite the fact that hundreds of Courts have found DHS's policy regarding detention of unlawful entrants without bond hearings to be unlawful. The Executive Office for Immigration Review and its subagency the Immigration Court and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) have now created a de facto procedural detour: what would previously have been a straightforward, discretionary procedure where a detained Respondent could vindicate his rights expeditiously and economically by requesting a bond hearing, EOIR now in effect requires this honorable Court to, once again, order the agency to hold the very bond hearing which the statute requires.

JURISDICTION

3. Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents. Petitioner is detained at the STEWART DETENTION CENTER in LUMPKIN, GEORGIA. Exhibit 1, Detainee Locator.

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

4 5. This Court may grant relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, the Declaratory Judgment Act,
5 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*, and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651.

6 VENUE

7 6. Pursuant to *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky*, 410 U.S. 484, 493- 500
8 (1973), venue lies in the United States District Court for the MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
9 GEORGIA, the judicial district in which Petitioner currently is detained.

10 7. Venue is also properly in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because
11 Respondents are employees, officers, and agencies of the United States, and because a
12 substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in the MIDDLE
13 DISTRICT OF GEORGIA.

14 REQUIREMENTS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2243

15 8. The Court must grant the petition for writ of habeas corpus or order Respondents to show
16 cause “forthwith,” unless the petitioner is not entitled to relief. 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If an order
17 to show cause is issued, Respondents must file a return “within three days unless for good
18 cause additional time, not exceeding twenty days, is allowed.” *Id.*

19 9. Habeas corpus is “perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law . . .
20 affording as it does a *swift* and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or
21 confinement.” *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963) (emphasis added). “The application
22 for the writ usurps the attention and displaces the calendar of the judge or justice who
23
24

1 entertains it and receives prompt action from him within the four corners of the application.”
2 *Yong v. I.N.S.*, 208 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted).

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

5 **PARTIES**

6 11. Petitioner JUNIOR ALEJANDRO LOPEZ POLO is alleged to be a citizen of
7 COLUMBIA who is in immigration detention at Stewart Immigration Detention Center
8 under the auspices of the Stewart Immigration Court in Lumpkin, Georgia, where
9 Respondents continue to require a Federal District Court Order before they will grant a bond
10 hearing.

11 12. Respondent KRISTEN SULLIVAN is the Director of the Atlanta Field Office of
12 ICE’s Enforcement and Removal Operations division; however, on information and belief,
13 the DHS is rotating their Field Office Director without publishing a schedule of rotation. As
14 such, KRISTEN SULLIVAN or his unknown, unannounced provisional replacement is
15 Petitioner’s immediate custodian and is responsible for Petitioner’s detention and removal.
16 He or his acting counterpart is named in his or her official capacity.

17 13. Respondent MARWAYNE MULLIN is the Secretary of the Department of
18 Homeland Security. She is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the
19 Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), and oversees ICE, which is responsible for
20 Petitioner’s detention. Ms. Noem has ultimate custodial authority over Petitioner and is sued
21 in her official capacity.
22
23
24

1 14. Respondent Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is the federal agency
2 responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA, including the detention and removal of
3 noncitizens.

4 15. Respondent Pamela Bondi is the Attorney General of the United States. She is
5 responsible for the Department of Justice, of which the Executive Office for Immigration
6 Review and the immigration court system it operates is a component agency. She is sued in
7 her official capacity.

8 16. Respondent Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) is the federal
9 agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA in removal proceedings,
10 including for custody redeterminations in bond hearings.

11 17. Respondent, Warden Jason Streevalis, is employed by the private, for-profit
12 detention corporation contracted by the Government as an agent to confine immigrants at
13 Stewart Detention Center, where Petitioner is detained. He has immediate physical custody
14 of Petitioner. He is sued in his official capacity.

15 **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

16 **COUNT I**

17 **Violation of the INA and Bond Regulations**

18 18. Petitioner incorporates by reference the allegations of fact set forth in preceding
19 paragraphs.

20 19. In 1997, after Congress amended the INA through IIRIRA, EOIR and the then-
21 Immigration and Naturalization Service issued an interim rule to interpret and apply
22 IIRIRA. Specifically, under the heading of “Apprehension, Custody, and Detention of
23 [Noncitizens],” the agencies explained that “[d]espite being applicants for admission,
24 [noncitizens] who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to

1 as [noncitizens] who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond
2 redetermination.” 62 Fed. Reg. at 10323 (emphasis added). The agencies thus made clear
3 that individuals who had entered without inspection were eligible for consideration for bond
4 and bond hearings before IJs under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and its implementing regulations.

5 20. Nonetheless, pursuant to *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, EOIR has a policy and
6 practice of applying § 1225(b)(2) to individual like Petitioner.

7 21. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates his continued
8 detention and violates 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1, 1236.1, and 1003.19.

9 **COUNT II**
10 **Violation of Due Process**

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

13 23. The government may not deprive a person of life, liberty, or property without due
14 process of law. U.S. Const. amend. V. “Freedom from imprisonment—from government
15 custody, detention, or other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that
16 the Clause protects.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).

17 24. Petitioner has a fundamental interest in liberty and being free from official
18 restraint.

19 25. The government’s detention of Petitioner without a bond redetermination hearing
20 to determine whether he is a flight risk or danger to others violates his right to due process.

21 **LEGAL FRAMEWORK**

22 26. The INA prescribes three basic forms of detention for the vast majority of
23 noncitizens in removal proceedings.
24

1 27. First, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 authorizes the detention of noncitizens in standard removal
2 proceedings before an IJ. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. Individuals in § 1226(a) detention are
3 generally entitled to a bond hearing at the outset of their detention, *see* 8 C.F.R. §§
4 1003.19(a), 1236.1(d), while noncitizens who have been arrested, charged with, or
5 convicted of certain crimes are subject to mandatory detention, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c).

6 28. Second, the INA provides for mandatory detention of noncitizens subject to
7 expedited removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and for other recent arrivals seeking
8 admission referred to under § 1225(b)(2).

9 29. Last, the INA also provides for detention of noncitizens who have been ordered
10 removed, including individuals in withholding-only proceedings, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)–
11 (b).

12 30. This case concerns the detention provisions at §§ 1226(a) and 1225(b)(2).

13 31. The detention provisions at § 1226(a) and § 1225(b)(2) were enacted as part of the
14 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996, Pub. L.
15 No. 104–208, Div. C, §§ 302–03, 110 Stat. 3009–546, 3009–582 to 3009–583, 3009–585.
16 Section 1226(a) was most recently amended earlier this year by the Laken Riley Act, Pub.
17 L. No. 119-1, 139 Stat. 3 (2025).

18 32. Following the enactment of the IIRIRA, EOIR drafted new regulations explaining
19 that, in general, people who entered the country without inspection were not considered
20 detained under § 1225 and that they were instead detained under § 1226(a). *See* Inspection
21 and Expedited Removal of Aliens; Detention and Removal of Aliens; Conduct of Removal
22 Proceedings; Asylum Procedures, 62 Fed. Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997).

1 33. Thus, in the decades that followed, most people who entered without inspection
2 and were placed in standard removal proceedings received bond hearings, unless their
3 criminal history rendered them ineligible pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c). That practice was
4 consistent with many more decades of prior practice, in which noncitizens who were not
5 deemed “arriving” were entitled to a custody hearing before an IJ or other hearing officer.
6 See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a) (1994); see also H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 229 (1996) (noting
7 that § 1226(a) simply “restates” the detention authority previously found at § 1252(a)).

8 34. In *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) explicitly
9 acknowledged that individuals who have already entered the United States and are not
10 apprehended within 100 miles of the border or within 14 days of entry are subject to
11 discretionary detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), not mandatory detention under § 1225(b).
12 During oral argument on November 30, 2016, then-Solicitor General Ian Gershengorn
13 stated: “If they are not detained within 100 miles of the border or within 14 days... then
14 they are under 1226(a) and not 1226(c)” and further clarified, in response to a question
15 concerning “an alien who has come into the United States illegally without being admitted
16 [and] who takes up residence 50 miles from the border,” the Government responded, “The
17 answer is they are held under 1226(a) and that they get a bond hearing...” Transcript of Oral
18 Argument at 7–8, *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. ____ (2018) (No. 15-1204). DHS
19 reiterated that such individuals “would be held under 1226(a)” and cited the administrative
20 record to support that position. *Id.* These statements reflect DHS’s prior litigation stance that
21 § 1226(a) governs detention for noncitizens who have entered and are residing in the United
22 States, a position directly contrary to the agency’s current interpretation applying §
23 1225(b)(2)(A) to such individuals. Having prevailed in *Jennings* after taking this position,
24

1 they should be estopped from taking the contrary position now simply because their political
2 or litigation interests have changed. Estoppel in this case is necessary to preserve the
3 predictability inherent in the rule of law and due process under the Fifth Amendment, as
4 well as to protect the integrity of the judicial system.

5 35. On July 8, 2025, ICE, “in coordination with” DOJ, announced a new policy that
6 rejected well-established understanding of the statutory framework and reversed decades of
7 practice.

8 36. The new policy, entitled “Interim Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for
9 Applicants for Admission,”¹ claims that all persons who entered the United States without
10 inspection shall now be subject to mandatory detention provision under § 1225(b)(2)(A).
11 The policy applies regardless of when a person is apprehended, and affects those who have
12 resided in the United States for months, years, and even decades.

13 37. On September 5, 2025, the BIA adopted this same position in a published
14 decision, *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*. There, the Board held that all noncitizens who entered
15 the United States without admission or parole are subject to detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A)
16 and are ineligible for IJ bond hearings.

17 38. Since Respondents adopted their new policies, several federal courts have rejected
18 their new interpretation of the INA’s detention authorities. Courts have likewise rejected
19 *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, which adopts the same reading of the statute as ICE.

20 39. A growing number of federal courts have rejected ICE and EOIR’s expanded
21 interpretation of the Immigration and Nationality Act’s detention provisions. These courts
22 have consistently held that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b)(2), governs the detention authority

23 _____
24 ¹ Available at <https://www.aila.org/library/ice-memo-interim-guidance-regarding-detention-authority-for-applications-for-admission>.

1 applicable in these cases. For example, courts in Massachusetts, Arizona, New York,
2 Minnesota, California, and Nebraska have reached this conclusion. See: *Gomes v. Hyde*, No.
3 1:25-CV-11571-JEK (D. Mass. July 7, 2025); *Rosado v. Figueroa*, No. CV 25-02157 PHX
4 DLR (CDB) (D. Ariz. Aug. 11, 2025); *Lopez Benitez v. Francis*, No. 25 CIV. 5937 (DEH)
5 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2025); *Maldonado v. Olson*, No. 0:25-cv-03142-SRN-SGE (D. Minn.
6 Aug. 15, 2025); *Romero v. Hyde*, No. 25-11631-BEM (D. Mass. Aug. 19, 2025); *Ramirez*
7 *Clavijo v. Kaiser*, No. 25-CV-06248-BLF (N.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2025); *Palma Perez v. Berg*,
8 No. 8:25CV494 (D. Neb. Sept. 3, 2025).

9 40. As of December 18th, 2025, the DHS policy was VACATED. *Maldonado*
10 *Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL
11 3549826, at *8–9 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025) (vacating DHS’s July 8, 2025 “Interim
12 Guidance Regarding Detention Authority for Applicants for Admission” under the
13 Administrative Procedure Act); *id.*, 2025 WL 3549854, at *2 (entering final judgment as to
14 Counts I–III).

15 41. These decisions reflect a clear judicial consensus, now binding nationally as to
16 class members, that the government’s reliance on § 1225(b)(2) is misplaced in cases
17 involving those whose immigration status lawfully falls under § 1226(a).

18 42. Section 1226 therefore leaves no doubt that it applies to people who face charges
19 of being inadmissible to the United States, including those who are present without
20 admission or parole.

21 43. By contrast, § 1225(b) applies to people arriving at U.S. ports of entry or who
22 recently entered the United States and were not free to mingle with the general population
23 after being free from official restraint. The statute’s entire framework is premised on
24

1 inspections at the border of people who are “seeking admission” to the United States. 8
2 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Indeed, the Supreme Court has explained that this mandatory
3 detention scheme applies “at the Nation’s borders and ports of entry, where the Government
4 must determine whether [a] [noncitizen] seeking to enter the country is admissible.”
5 *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287 (2018).

6 44. One quirk in this case would present an additional issue for this honorable Court
7 were it not easily explained as an irregularity, whether by policy or mistake: the Petitioner is
8 simultaneously charged as an Arriving Alien and as having entered the U.S. without
9 inspection. An individual in removal proceedings cannot simultaneously be charged as an
10 arriving alien and as one who entered without inspection, because the two classifications
11 rest on mutually exclusive legal predicates. “Entry” is a term of art that requires physical
12 presence combined with freedom from official restraint. *Matter of Patel*, 20 I. & N. Dec.
13 368, 370 (B.I.A. 1991). An arriving alien, however, has not effected an “entry” at all,
14 because applicants for admission—even those physically located just inside the border—
15 remain legally treated as seeking to enter, not as persons who have entered the United
16 States. As Justice Alito explained, “§ 1225(b) ... authorizes the detention of certain aliens
17 seeking to enter the country,” emphasizing that such individuals are processed as applicants
18 for admission even when already within U.S. territory. *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. ____,
19 slip op. at 3 (2018). One cannot both seek to enter the country as an arriving alien and also
20 enter the country – for the immigrant to be classified as an Arriving Alien who seeks entry
21 precludes the factual allegation of unlawful entry without inspection. Clearly, the box
22 designation was in error.

1 45. Because arriving aliens are processed under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) and remain under
2 official restraint, the government cannot charge them simultaneously under 8 U.S.C.
3 § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) as individuals who “entered without inspection,” a charge that
4 presupposes the completion of an “entry” as defined in *Patel*. The distinct statutory
5 detention regimes further underscore this incompatibility: arriving aliens fall within the
6 mandatory § 1225(b) framework, whereas those alleged to have entered without inspection
7 fall under § 1226. Consequently, DHS must select a single, legally coherent classification
8 and may not pursue allegations premised on contradictory theories of entry status.
9

10 **FACTS**

11 46. Petitioner JUNIOR ALEJANDRO LOPEZ POLO is a citizen of COLOMBIA
12 who has resided in the United States for years, having arrived in the U.S. at the age of
13 seventeen (17). He entered without inspection and was not apprehended upon arrival. On
14 September 20th, 2024, Petitioner was served with a Notice to Appear by DHS, he was then
15 arrested and transferred to DHS custody at the Stewart Detention Center. ICE did not set
16 bond.

17 47. DHS’s charging document designates Petitioner as an Arriving Alien while also
18 charging him with unlawful entry. Exhibit 2, NTA. There is no date or time listed for
19 Petitioner’s entry or arrival.

20 48. Petitioner is not detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231. DHS
21 has charged Petitioner as inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) and placed him in
22 removal proceedings pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. Petitioner is a member of the Bond
23 Eligible Class certified in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM
24

1 (C.D. Cal.), which includes noncitizens without lawful status who entered without
2 inspection and are not subject to mandatory detention under the INA.

3 49. Despite the intervention of hundreds of Federal District Courts holding that class
4 members are detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and entitled to consideration for release on
5 bond—Respondents continue to apply § 1225(b)(2) and deny bond hearings to class
6 members, including Petitioner. Immigration Judges at Stewart Detention Center have
7 refused jurisdiction, citing agency directives to disregard the Court’s earlier rulings, and
8 insisting on awaiting guidance from the 11th Circuit or EOIR to assume jurisdiction.
9 Respondents’ continued detention of Petitioner violates the INA.

10
11 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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

21
22 DATED this 26th day of March 2026.

23
24 **/s/ Sarah Cornejo, Esq.**

1 Sarah Cornejo, Esq.
Attorney for Defendant
2 Georgia Bar No. 641971
Cornejo & Cornejo, LLC
3 3380 Trickum Road, 1100
Woodstock, Georgia 30188
4 Telephone: (770) 709-5778
5 Email: Sarah@SCornejoLaw.com

6 *Attorney for Petitioner*

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24