

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

Law Offices of Carlos R. Barrios & Assoc. a P.C.

Carlos R. Barrios 249654
510 West 6th Street Suite 1210
Los Angeles, CA 90014
Tel.: (213) 599-8414
Fax.: (888) 255-9710

Attorneys for Petitioner,
GERMAN ERNESTO YANEZ GOMEZ

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

GERMAN ERNESTO YANEZ GOMEZ

Petitioner,

v.

MARKWAYNE MULLIN,
Secretary, United States Department of
Homeland Security; **RODNEY S.**
SCOTT, Commissioner, United States
Customs and Border Protection;
GREGORY J. ARCHAMBEAULT, in
his official capacity as Acting Field
Office Director for San Diego, U.S.
Immigration and Customs Enforcement;
DOUG GLEN, Special Agent in Charge
for San Diego, Homeland Security
Investigations, U.S. Immigration and
Customs Enforcement; **JEREMY**
CASEY, in his official capacity as
Warden of Imperial Regional Detention
Facility

Respondents.


Case No. '26CV2420 CAB MSB

**VERIFIED 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
20
21
22
23
24
25

INTRODUCTION

1. GERMAN ERNESTO YANEZ GOMEZ is a 47-year-old male imprisoned by the federal government under color of the immigration laws under Alien Registration number A# . He is a resident of Uniondale, New York, who was arrested on February 11, 2026, while Mr. Yanez Gomez attended an asylum interview in the city of Bethpage, New York. Mr. Yanez Gomez first entered the United States in 1998. He is the father of two United States citizen children. Mr. Yanez Gomez's United States citizen daughter has filed a family immigration petition I-130 on his behalf. Mr. Yanez Gomez has no criminal history. He has always cooperated with all legal obligations. Mr. Yanez Gomez petitioned the Immigration Court for a bond re-consideration hearing. The Immigration Judge denied this bond hearing due to lack of jurisdiction.

Through this petition he seeks immediate release from his incarceration. His continued imprisonment is unlawful because of the confluence of three separate unlawful government practices: First, Respondents have held Mr. Yanez Gomez virtually incommunicado. He was denied contact with the outside world for the first five days of his incarceration, including from family and counsel, and since then has permitted him only one fifteen-minute phone call with his attorney.

Second, although Respondents have ostensibly held Mr. Yanez Gomez under color of the immigration laws, they have incarcerated him since on or about February 11, 2026. Third, Mr. Yanez Gomez has been denied a bond due to a claimed lack of jurisdiction by the Immigration Court.

1 2. Petitioner Mr. Yanez Gomez has lived in the United States since 1998
2 and was arrested by ICE on February 11, 2026, and placed in custody first at an
3 ICE processing center in the state of New York. He was then transferred across the
4 country and is now held at the Imperial ICE Processing Center in Calexico,
5 California. The Immigration Judges have denied bond jurisdiction, holding that
6 DHS classified individuals like Mr. Yanez Gomez under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)
7 as an “arriving alien[s]” subject to mandatory detention. This application of §
8 1225(b)(2)(A) to individuals like Petitioner—who were long-term residents
9 already present in the United States—is a new policy resulting from recent DHS
10 guidance and the BIA’s precedential decision in *Matter of Jonathan Javier Yajure*
11 *Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). Prior to *Yajure Hurtado*, individuals in
12 Petitioner’s position were eligible for bond hearings under § 1226(a). This
13 misclassification deprives him of a bond hearing in violation of three decades of
14 settled law, the Immigration and Nationality Act’s text and structure, and the Fifth
15 Amendment’s Due Process Clause. Multiple federal courts have already rejected
16 the government’s new policy as unlawful and ultra vires. *See Guerrero Orellana v.*
17 *Moniz*, No. 25-12664-PBS (D. Mass. Sept. 22, 2025) and *Mendoza Gutierrez v.*
18 *Baltasar*, No. 25-2720-RMR (D. Colo. Oct. 17, 2025). This Court should do the
19 same and restore Respondent’s right to a bond hearing under § 236(a).

20 Federal courts and the Supreme Court have long recognized that § 235(b)
21 governs “applicants for admission at the border or port of entry,” while § 236
22 applies to those “already present in the United States.” *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583
23 U.S. 281, 288 (2018).

24 The Massachusetts class petition in *Guerrero-Orellana* held that DHS’s new
25 practice of applying § 235(b) to interior arrests is “contrary to almost 30 years of

1 settled law and practice.” Similarly, *Mendoza Gutierrez* found that DHS lacks
2 statutory authority to classify such individuals as “arriving aliens” and ordered
3 release pending a bond hearing.

4 Mr. Yanez Gomez was arrested in the Bethpage area of New York—several
5 miles from any port of entry—and is plainly detained under § 236(a).

6 The BIA’s decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* (2025) abruptly overturned
7 decades of interpretation without reasoned analysis, violating the Administrative
8 Procedure Act and *Encino Motorcars v. Navarro*, 579 U.S. 211 (2016). Under
9 *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369 (2024), courts owe no
10 Chevron deference to such agency redefinitions.

11 The 1997 interim rule explicitly stated that EWIs “will be eligible for bond
12 and bond redetermination.” 62 Fed. Reg. 10,323 (Mar. 6, 1997). The BIA’s attempt
13 to read this history out of existence is entitled to no weight.

14 2. Under these unique circumstances, the Constitution requires his
15 immediate release from further imprisonment.

16 3. Petitioner challenges his detention as unlawful because:

17 (a) The application of § 1225(b)(2)(A) to his is ultra vires, inconsistent with
18 statutory text and longstanding regulatory practice;

19 (b) His continued detention without bond violates the Immigration and
20 Nationality Act (INA) and the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause; and

21 (c) The new policy violates the Administrative Procedure Act because it was
22 adopted without notice-and-comment and in excess of statutory authority.

23 Petitioner respectfully requests an order:

24 (1) Declaring that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b)(2)(A), governs his detention; and
25

1 (2) Requiring that he receive a prompt individualized bond hearing before an
2 Immigration Judge where the Government bears the burden of proving flight risk
3 or danger by clear and convincing evidence.
4

5 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

6 This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, § 1331, and § 1651,
7 because Petitioner is “in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties
8 of the United States.” Venue lies in the Southern District of California under 28
9 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because Petitioner is detained at Imperial and the responsible ICE
10 officials reside in this district. This petition challenges only the legality of custody,
11 not any final order of removal, and is therefore not barred by 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(5)
12 or § 1252(b)(9). *See Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281 (2018); *Nielsen v. Preap*,
13 586 U.S. 392 (2019); *Crespin De Paz v. Noem*, No. 2:25-cv-06649, slip op. at 5
14 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 10, 2025).
15
16
17

18 **PARTIES**

19 Petitioner Mr. Yanez Gomez is a noncitizen currently detained by the U.S.
20 Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) through U.S. Immigration and
21 Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) at the Imperial ICE Processing Center in Imperial,
22 California. Petitioner has resided in the United States for many years and is
23 seeking release from custody pending resolution of his immigration proceedings.
24
25

1 Respondent MARKWAYNE MULLIN is the Secretary of the United States
2 Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”). As Secretary, Respondent NOEM
3 exercises ultimate authority over DHS and its component agencies, including U.S.
4 Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) and U.S. Immigration and Customs
5 Enforcement (“ICE”), and is responsible for the administration and enforcement of
6 the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”). He is sued in his official capacity.
7

8
9 Respondent RODNEY S. SCOTT is the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and
10 Border Protection (“CBP”), a component agency of DHS. In this capacity,
11 Respondent SCOTT is responsible for the policies, practices, and operations of
12 CBP, including the apprehension and initial processing of individuals alleged to be
13 inadmissible under the INA. He is sued in his official capacity.
14

15 Respondent GREGORY J. ARCHAMBEAULT, is the Field Office Director
16 for the San Diego Field Office of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement
17 (“ICE”), a component agency of DHS. In this role, Respondent Archambault
18 exercises direct supervisory authority over ICE Enforcement and Removal
19 Operations (“ERO”) officers responsible for the detention, transfer, and release of
20 individuals within this District, including those held at the Imperial ICE Processing
21 Center. He is the immediate custodian of Petitioner and is sued in his official
22 capacity.
23
24
25

1 Respondent Doug Glen is the Special Agent in Charge for the San Diego
2 office of Homeland Security Investigations (“HSI”), a component division of ICE
3 within DHS. In this capacity, Respondent Wang oversees investigations and
4 enforcement operations in the San Diego area that lead to the apprehension and
5 referral of individuals to ERO for detention. He is sued in his official capacity.
6

7 Respondent, JEREMY CASEY, in his official capacity as Warden of
8 Imperial Regional Detention Facility. In this capacity Respondent Casey oversees
9 the Imperial Regional Detention Facility where Petitioner is currently housed. He
10 is sued in his official capacity.
11

12 Each Respondent is an officer or employee or agent or subcontractor of the
13 United States acting under color of federal law and within the scope of their
14 respective official duties. Collectively, Respondents have legal custody over
15 Petitioner and are responsible for the policies, practices, acts, and omissions giving
16 rise to this Petition.
17
18

19 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

20 Petitioner is a resident of Uniondale, New York, who was arrested on
21 February 11, 2026, while Mr. Yanez Gomez attended an asylum interview in the
22 city of Bethpage, New York. Mr. Yanez Gomez first entered the United States in
23 1998. He is the father of two United States citizen children. Mr. Yanez Gomez’s
24 United States citizen daughter has filed a family immigration petition I-130 on his
25

1 behalf. Mr. Yanez Gomez has no criminal history. He has always cooperated with
2 all legal obligations. Mr. Yanez Gomez petitioned the Immigration Court for a
3 bond re-consideration hearing. The Immigration Judge denied this bond hearing
4 due to lack of jurisdiction. DHS has issued a Notice to Appear charging
5 inadmissibility under § 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) (“present without admission”).
6

7 The Imperial Immigration Court has ruled that the Court lacks bond
8 jurisdiction, citing *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* and the DHS memorandum extending
9 § 1225(b)(2)(A) to “arriving aliens” already present in the U.S. The Immigration
10 Court has further ruled that is lacks jurisdiction in light of *Matter of Maldonado*
11 *Bautista v. Santacruz*, Case No. 5:25-cv-01873-SSS-BFM. As a result, Petitioner
12 has remained in custody without any opportunity for a bond determination, despite
13 strong family and community ties and no danger to the community.
14
15

16 LEGAL CLAIMS

17 **A. This Court Has Jurisdiction**

18 As held in *Crespin De Paz and Doe v. Garland*, 109 F.4th 1188 (9th Cir.
19 2024), a habeas petition seeking a bond hearing lies “within the core of habeas”
20 jurisdiction under § 2241. The claim is collateral to removal and not barred by §
21 1252(g) or § 1252(b)(9).
22
23

24 //

1 **B. Petitioner’s Detention Is Governed by § 1226(a), Not § 1225(b)(2)(A)**

2 The statutory structure and decades of agency practice distinguish § 1225(b)
3 (for “arriving” or “recently encountered” aliens at the border) from § 1226(a) (for
4 arrests inside the country).
5

6 Until 2025, DHS consistently treated long-term residents arrested inside the
7 U.S. as § 1226(a) detainees eligible for bond hearings. See 62 Fed. Reg. 10312,
8 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997) (“aliens present without admission ... will be eligible for
9 bond”). The new DHS policy, endorsed in *Yajure Hurtado*, reverses nearly 30
10 years of practice without statutory amendment or rulemaking.
11

12 Courts addressing this precise issue in 2025 have overwhelmingly rejected
13 DHS’s position. See *Rodriguez v. Bostock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239 (W.D. Wash.
14 2025); *Barrera v. Tindall*, 2025 WL 2690565 (W.D. Ky.); *Vazquez v. Feeley*, 2025
15 WL 2676082 (D. Nev.); *Crespin De Paz*, slip op. at 7–8. Each held that § 1226(a),
16 not § 1225(b), governs detention of long-term residents.
17

18 Because Petitioner’s arrest occurred well inside U.S. territory after many
19 years of residence, § 1225(b)(2)(A) cannot lawfully apply. His detention under that
20 provision is therefore *ultra vires*.
21

22 **C. Mandatory Detention Under § 1225(b)(2)(A) Violates Due Process**

23 Even if § 1225(b)(2)(A) were construed to apply, its application without
24 individualized review violates the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause.
25

1 “Freedom from imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or
2 other forms of physical restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty the Due Process
3 Clause protects.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).
4

5 The government’s categorical denial of bond hearings to long-term
6 residents, based solely on its re-characterization of them as “arriving aliens,” is
7 arbitrary and disproportionate to any legitimate immigration purpose.
8

9 **D. The 2025 DHS Policy and Yajure Hurtado Decision Violate the APA**

10 The DHS policy expanding § 1225(b)(2)(A) detention to individuals long
11 present in the U.S. constitutes a substantive rule adopted without notice-and-
12 comment. It exceeds the statutory authority granted by Congress and is arbitrary
13 and capricious under 5 U.S.C. § 706(2). The BIA’s decision in *Matter of Yajure*
14 *Hurtado* (2025) abruptly overturned decades of interpretation without reasoned
15 analysis, violating the Administrative Procedure Act and *Encino Motorcars v.*
16 *Navarro*, 579 U.S. 211 (2016). Under *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*, 603
17 U.S. 369 (2024), courts owe no Chevron deference to such agency redefinitions.
18
19

20 The 1997 interim rule explicitly stated that EWIs “will be eligible for bond
21 and bond redetermination.” 62 Fed. Reg. 10,323 (Mar. 6, 1997). The BIA’s attempt
22 to read this history out of existence is entitled to no weight.
23

24 No other court or administrative tribunal can provide Petitioner any relief.
25 Under ordinary circumstances, an individual detained under color of the

1 immigration laws could seek redress for unreasonable delay in the government's
2 pursuit of removal proceedings by filing a motion to terminate before an
3 Immigration Judge. *See, e.g., In re Qayyum*, 2004 WL 848576 (B.I.A. Feb. 25,
4 2004) (considering motion to terminate based on government delay and finding, on
5 the facts of that case, no unreasonable delay).
6

7 Respondents have further demonstrated their fundamental inability to
8 provide even rudimentarily safe or humane conditions of confinement at the
9 Imperial ICE Processing Center. Conditions within the facility—overcrowding,
10 inadequate medical care, and the heightened risk of harm to detainees—have
11 rendered continued detention not merely unlawful but dangerous.
12

13 Under these circumstances, any remedy short of immediate judicial
14 intervention would be insufficient. Petitioner's continued detention violates
15 statutory, constitutional, and humanitarian standards. Simply put, Mr. Yanez
16 Gomez cannot wait.
17

18
19 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

20 WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court:

- 21 1. Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus declaring Petitioner's detention under 8
22 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) unlawful;
23
24 2. Order Respondents to release Petitioner immediately in light of the
25 pending I-130; or

1 3. Order that Petitioner be provided a prompt individualized bond hearing
2 before a neutral Immigration Judge within 7 days, at which:

3 (a) The government bears the burden of proving flight risk or danger by
4 clear and convincing evidence; and
5

6 (b) The IJ must consider less restrictive alternatives to detention;

7 4. Award any further relief this Court deems just and proper.

8 Date: 4/16/2026

Carlos Barrios

9
10 Carlos Barrios

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

2
3 I, CARLOS BARRIOS am submitting this verification on behalf of
4 GERMAN ERNESTO YANEZ GOMEZ, who is currently detained by the U.S.
5 Department of Homeland Security at the Imperial Regional Detention center in
6 Calexico, California. Petitioner is being held under conditions that severely restrict
7 or prevent meaningful communication with the outside world. As a result, he is
8 unable to review or sign this petition personally or to prepare and file it on his own
9 behalf.
10

11
12 I have communicated with Petitioner to the extent possible and have
13 obtained the factual information contained in this Petition from my direct
14 knowledge, records, and reliable sources. I hereby verify that, to the best of my
15 knowledge and belief, the factual statements contained in the attached Petition for
16 Writ of Habeas Corpus are true and correct, and that I could testify to those facts if
17 called upon to do so.
18

19 Executed this 16th day of April, 2026, at Los Angeles, California.

20
21 *Carlos Barrios*

22 _____
23 Carlos Barrios
24
25