

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN DIEGO DIVISION**

'26CV2264 TWR DDL

JOSE MAXIMO ARECHIGA GUTIERREZ,

Agency No. 

Petitioner,

v.

MARKWAYNE MULLIN, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, et.

al.,

Respondents.

PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Murray D. Hilts
Law Offices of Murray D. Hilts
3020 Meade Ave.
San Diego, CA 92116
(619) 688-1174 (office)
(619) 285-1977 (fax)
murrayhilts@murrayhiltslaw.com

Attorney for Petitioner,

JOSE MAXIMO ARECHIGA
GUTIERREZ,

1 MURRAY D. HILTS, ESQ. (CA Bar No. 169690)
2 LAW OFFICES OF MURRAY D. HILTS
3 3020 MEADE AVE.
4 SAN DIEGO, CA 92116
5 TEL: (619) 688-1174
6 FAX: (619) 285-1977
7 *Attorney for Petitioner*

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN DIEGO DIVISION**

9 JOSE MAXIMO ARECHIGA GUTIERREZ,)
10)
11 Petitioner,)
12)
13 v.)
14)
15 Markwayne MULLIN, in his official capacity as)
16 Secretary of Homeland Security, Christopher J.)
17 LAROSE, in his official capacity as Warden of Otay)
18 Mesa Detention Center, Gregory J.)
19 ARCHAMBEAULT, in his official capacity as San)
20 Diego Field Office Director, ICE Enforcement)
21 Removal Operations; Todd LYONS, in his official)
22 capacity as Acting Director of ICE; and Todd)
23 BLANCHE, U.S. Attorney General;)
24 IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS)
25 ENFORCEMENT; DEPARTMENT OF)
26 Respondents.)

**PETITION FOR WRIT
OF HABEAS CORPUS**



I. INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner JOSE MAXIMO ARECHIGA GUTIERREZ, (“Petitioner”) is a 28-year-old Mexican national who last entered the United States on September 25, 2023.

2. On April 1, 2026, Petitioner was detained by Respondents at the Otay

1 Mesa Detention Center on April 1, 2026.

2 3. Petitioner previously sought a custody redetermination, which was
3 granted on December 8, 2023. For the most recent detention, Petitioner has not
4 requested a custody redetermination because the Board of Immigration Appeals'
5 decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 28 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), has resulted
6 in all such requests under Petitioner's circumstances being dismissed for lack of
7 jurisdiction.
8

9 4. Petitioner therefore seeks a writ of habeas corpus directing his
10 immediate release.
11

12 II. VENUE AND JURISDICTION

13 5. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus),
14 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), and Article I, § 9, cl. 2 of the Constitution
15 (Suspension Clause), as Petitioner is presently in custody under the authority
16 of the United States and challenging his detention as in violation of the
17 Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.
18

19 6. The federal district courts have jurisdiction under Section 2241 to
20 hear habeas claims by individuals challenging the lawfulness of their detention
21 by ICE. *See Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 290-92 (2018).
22

23 7. Venue is proper because Petitioner is detained in the Otay Mesa
24 Detention Center, within the San Diego Division, and Respondent LaRose is his
25 immediate custodian. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241(d), 1391(e).
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

III. PARTIES

8. Petitioner is a 28-year-old Mexican national who resides in San Diego, California. He is currently detained by Respondents at the Otay Mesa Detention Center in San Diego, California, pending removal proceedings.

9. Respondent Christopher J. LaRose is the Warden of Otay Mesa Detention Center. Respondent La Rose is responsible for the operation of the Detention Center where Petitioner is detained. As such, Respondent LaRose has immediate physical custody of the Petitioner. He is being sued in his official capacity.

10. Respondent Gregory J. Archambeault is the San Diego Field Office Director (“FOD”) for ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations. Respondent Archambeault is responsible for the oversight of ICE operations at the Otay Mesa Detention Center. Respondent Archambeault is being sued in his official capacity.

11. Respondent Todd Lyons is the Acting Director of ICE. Respondent Lyons is responsible for the administration of ICE and the implementation and enforcement of the immigration laws, including immigrant detention. As such, Respondent Lyons is a legal custodian of Petitioner and is being sued in his official capacity.

12. Respondent Markwayne Mullin is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”). As Secretary of DHS, Secretary Mullin is responsible for the general administration and enforcement of the immigration

1 laws of the United States. Respondent Secretary Mullin is being sued in his
2 official capacity.


3
4 **IV. EXHAUSTION OF REMEDIES**

5 13. No statutory exhaustion requirement applies. *See* 8 § U.S.C. 2241;
6 *Laing v. Ashcroft*, 370 F.3d 994, 998 (9th Cir. 2004). Therefore, exhaustion is not
7 jurisdictionally required. Moreover, exhaustion should not be required here
8 because any attempt to exhaust would be futile, as BIA appeals routinely take
9 more than six months to reach a hearing.

10
11 14. Additionally, further agency steps will be futile. Recently, the BIA
12 published *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 28 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). In its decision,
13 the BIA adopted DHS' reading of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), finding individuals
14 similarly situated to Petitioner ineligible for release on bond.

15
16 15. In Petitioner's case, any request for custody redetermination have
17 been dismissed by the Immigration Court for lack of jurisdiction and any appeal
18 to the BIA will be dismissed. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* currently controls in
19 Petitioner's case and any attempt to request agency evaluation of his detention
20 will be futile.

21
22 **V. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

23 16. Petitioner is an Mexican national born on  He last
24 entered the United States on September 25, 2023.

25 17. On April 1, 2026, Petitioner was detained by Respondents at the
26 Otay Mesa Detention Center.

1 18. Petitioner has remained in Respondents' custody since that time.

2 19. Petitioner was ordered removed on December 5, 2024. As a result,
3 there are no pending proceedings before the Immigration Court. Petitioner
4 currently has an appeal pending before the Board of Immigration Appeals.
5

6 20. Petitioner now seeks habeas relief because continuing his detention
7 exceeds statutory authority and violates the Fifth Amendment.
8

9 **VI. LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR RELIEF SOUGHT**

10 21. Habeas corpus relief extends to a person "in custody under or by color
11 of the authority of the United States" if the person can show he is "in custody
12 in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28
13 U.S.C. § 2241 (c)(1), (c)(3); see also *Antonelli v. Warden, U.S.P. Atlanta*, 542
14 F.3d 1348, 1352 (11th Cir. 2008) (holding a petitioner's claims are proper under
15 28 U.S.C. section 2241 if they concern the continuation or execution of
16 confinement).
17
18

19 22. "[H]abeas corpus is, at its core, an equitable remedy," *Schlup v.*
20 *Delo*, 513 U.S. 298, 319 (1995), that "[t]he court shall ... dispose of [] as law
21 and justice require," 28 U.S.C. § 2243. "[T]he court's role was most extensive
22 in cases of pretrial and noncriminal detention." *Boumediene v. Bush*, 553
23 U.S. 723, 779–80 (2008). "[W]hen the judicial power to issue habeas corpus
24 properly is invoked the judicial officer must have adequate authority to make
25 a determination in light of the relevant law and facts and to formulate and
26
27
28

1 issue appropriate orders for relief, including, if necessary, an order directing
2 the prisoner's release." *Id.* at 787.

3
4
5 **VII. CAUSES OF ACTION**

6 **COUNT ONE**

7 **8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), NOT 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), APPLIES TO PETITIONER**

8 23. Petitioner incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 as if fully set out
9 herein.

10 24. Recently, Respondents began arguing that those in situations similar
11 to Petitioner are detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), which mandates
12 the detention of an "applicant for admission" throughout the entirety of
13 removal proceedings.

14 25. Respondents' newly formulated definition of "applicant for
15 admission," which would include any noncitizen who has not been formally
16 admitted regardless of years of residence in the United States, directly
17 contradicts both the plain text of the statute and controlling Ninth Circuit
18 precedent.
19

20 26. As the Ninth Circuit explained in interpreting the phrase "applicant
21 for admission" under § 1225(b)(1), "*an immigrant submits an 'application for*
22 *admission' at a distinct point in time,"* and stretching that phrase to apply
23 "*potentially for years or decades ... would push the statutory text beyond its*
24 *breaking point."* *United States v. Gambino-Ruiz*, 91 F.4th 981, 988–89 (9th Cir.
25 2024) (citing *Torres v. Barr*, 976 F.3d 918, 922–26 (9th Cir. 2020) (en banc)).
26
27
28

1 27. Because Petitioner has resided continuously in the United States
2 since September 25, 2023, his period as an “applicant for admission” has long
3 since closed.

4
5 28. Numerous courts across the United States have considered this issue
6 subsequent to Respondents’ new policy of treating the vast majority of
7 immigrants in their custody as being detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §
8 1225(b)(2) and the BIA’s decision supporting this interpretation in *Matter of*
9 *Yajure Hurtado*, 28 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).

10
11 29. This Court, joining the general consensus with other courts across
12 this country, has previously held those similarly situated to Petitioner are
13 being held under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and therefore are not subject to mandatory
14 detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). *See e.g., Martinez Lopez v. Noem, et al.*, No:
15 25-cv-2717-JES-AHG, 2025 WL 3030457 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2025).

16
17
18 **COUNT TWO**
19 **(PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS)**

20 30. Petitioner incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 as if fully set out
21 herein.

22 31. The Fifth Amendment forbids deprivation of liberty without notice
23 and a meaningful opportunity to be heard before a neutral decision-maker. Due
24 process protects “all ‘persons’ within the United States, including [non-
25 citizens], whether their presence here is lawful, unlawful, temporary, or
26 permanent.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 698 (2001).

1 supervision;

- 2 3) Order Respondents to refrain from transferring Petitioner out of the
3 jurisdiction of this court during the pendency of these proceedings and while
4 the Petitioner remains in Respondents' custody;
5
6 4) Order Respondents to file a response within 3 business days of the filing of
7 this petition;
8
9 5) Award attorneys' fees to Petitioner; and
10 6) Grant any other and further relief which this Court deems just and proper.

11 I affirm, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct.

12 Respectfully submitted this 9th day of April, 2026.

13
14 /s/ Murray D. Hilts

15 The Law Offices of Murray D. Hilts
16 3020 Meade Ave.
17 San Diego, CA 92116
18 CA Bar # 2169690

19 *Attorney for Petitioner*
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28