

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
COLUMBUS DIVISION

MIQUEAS VELAZQUEZ
BARTOLON,
A 

Case No. 4:26-CV-658

Petitioner,

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS**

v.

JASON STREEVAL, Warden, Stewart
Detention Center

Respondent.

INTRODUCTION

1
2 1. Petitioner Miqueas Velazquez Bartolon is in the custody of Respondent
3 at the Stewart Detention Center. Petitioner faces unlawful detention because the
4 Department of Homeland Security and the Executive Office of Immigration Review
5 have concluded Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention.
6

7 2. Petitioner is charged with, inter alia, having entered the United States
8 without admission or inspection. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i).

9 3. Based on this allegation in Petitioner's removal proceedings, DHS
10 denied Petitioner release from immigration custody, consistent with a new DHS
11 policy issued on July 8, 2025, instructing all Immigration and Customs Enforcement
12 (ICE) employees to consider anyone inadmissible under § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i)—i.e.,
13 those who entered the United States without admission or inspection—to be subject
14 to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and therefore ineligible for bond.
15

16 4. Similarly, on September 5, 2025, the Board of Immigration Appeals
17 (BIA or Board) issued a precedent decision, binding on all immigration judges,
18 holding that an immigration judge has no authority to consider bond requests for any
19 person who entered the United States without admission. *See Matter of Yajure*
20 *Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). In *Yajure Hurtado*, the BIA determined
21 that such individuals are subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) and
22 therefore ineligible to be released on bond.
23
24

1 19. First, 8 U.S.C. § 1226 governs the detention of individuals placed in
2 standard removal proceedings under § 1229a. Noncitizens detained under § 1226(a)
3 are generally entitled to a custody redetermination before an Immigration Judge
4 unless they fall into the narrow mandatory-detention categories of § 1226(c).

5
6 20. Second, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)–(2) provides for mandatory detention of
7 certain individuals seeking admission who are inspected at the border and
8 determined not “clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted.” This detention
9 framework is tied to the process of arrival inspection performed by an examining
10 immigration officer.

11
12 21. Third, 8 U.S.C. § 1231 governs detention of individuals who are subject
13 to final orders of removal.

14 22. This case turns on the proper application of § 1226(a) versus §
15 1225(b)(2) for a noncitizen like Petitioner—an individual who entered the United
16 States years ago, resided here, and was apprehended within the interior, *not* at a port
17 of entry.

18
19 23. Historically, individuals who entered without inspection and were later
20 placed in § 1229a removal proceedings were treated as detained under § 1226, not §
21 1225. EOIR regulations following IIRIRA confirm that such individuals were not
22 considered “arriving” and therefore were eligible for bond hearings. *See* 62 Fed.
23 Reg. 10312, 10323 (Mar. 6, 1997).

1 24. For decades, consistent with this framework and prior immigration law,
2 noncitizens who entered without inspection and were apprehended inside the United
3 States received custody redeterminations unless subject to § 1226(c). *See* former 8
4 U.S.C. § 1252(a) (1994); H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 229 (1996).

5
6 **The Government’s Recent Policy Shift**

7 25. On July 8, 2025, ICE—“in coordination with” DOJ—issued guidance
8 declaring that all individuals who entered without inspection must now be detained
9 under § 1225(b)(2)(A), regardless of when they entered the United States or whether
10 they were ever inspected by an immigration officer.

11 26. On September 5, 2025, the BIA adopted this new position in *Matter of*
12 *Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025), holding that any noncitizen who
13 entered without admission is subject to § 1225(b)(2)(A) and categorically barred
14 from a bond hearing.

15
16 **This Court Has Rejected Respondents’ Interpretation**

17 27. This Court has already rejected the government’s reading of §
18 1225(b)(2). In *J.A.M. v. Streeval*, Case No. 4:25-cv-342 (CDL), 2025 WL 3050094
19 (M.D. Ga. Nov. 1, 2025) and *P.R.S. v. Streeval*, No. 4:25-cv-330-CDL, 2025 WL
20 3269947 (M.D. Ga. Nov. 24, 2025), the Court held that § 1225(b)(2) applies only to
21 noncitizens who are “seeking admission” in the context of an arrival inspection by
22 an examining immigration officer.
23
24

1 28. *J.E.M.* and *P.R.S.* explained that “seeking admission” requires an
2 affirmative act at or near the time of arrival to obtain legal entry, coupled with
3 contemporaneous inspection. This Court rejected DHS’s argument that individuals
4 apprehended years after entering the United States may be treated as if they were
5 seeking admission. *Id.* at 3.

6
7 29. Applying that interpretation, *J.E.M.* and *P.R.S.* held that § 1225(b)(2)
8 does not apply to individuals like Petitioner, whose alleged inadmissibility is based
9 on conduct occurring long after entry and *not* in connection with an arrival
10 inspection.

11 **Courts Nationwide Have Rejected the Government’s Theory**

12
13 30. Federal courts across the country have agreed that § 1226(a)—not §
14 1225(b)—governs detention of individuals apprehended inside the United States,
15 even when they originally entered without inspection. *See, e.g., Rodriguez Vazquez*
16 *v. Bostock*, 779 F. Supp. 3d 1239 (W.D. Wash. 2025); *Gomes v. Hyde*, 2025 WL
17 1869299 (D. Mass. July 7, 2025); *Diaz Martinez v. Hyde*, 2025 WL 2084238 (D.
18 Mass. July 24, 2025); *Rosado v. Figueroa*, 2025 WL 2337099 (D. Ariz. Aug. 11,
19 2025); *Ramirez Clavijo v. Kaiser*, 2025 WL 2419263 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2025);
20 *Vasquez Garcia v. Noem*, 2025 WL 2549431 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2025); *Pizarro*
21 *Reyes v. Raycraft*, 2025 WL 2609425 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 9, 2025).

1 31. These courts uniformly conclude that Respondent's interpretation
2 contradicts the statutory text, structure, and decades of agency practice.

3 **Stewart Immigration Court's Continued Refusal to Exercise Jurisdiction**

4 32. Despite this Court's recent decisions, the Stewart Immigration Court
5 continues to decline jurisdiction over custody redeterminations for noncitizens like
6 Petitioner, based on the BIA's erroneous decision in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*.

7 33. Because Petitioner has no administrative avenue to challenge her
8 custody, habeas corpus is the only remedy capable of addressing the ongoing
9 violation of federal law.
10

11 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

12 34. Petitioner entered the United States in 2010 without inspection or
13 admission. Since that time, she has established a life and family in the United States.

14 35. Petitioner has two United States citizen children in the United States.
15 Petitioner is a single father raising his two United States children ages 14 and 12
16 years old.
17

18 36. Petitioner's young children are all attending school. Since Petitioner's
19 detention, the children have been staying with various extended family members
20 awaiting the release of their father.
21

22 37. Petitioner's wife was removed from the United States and thus is not
23 available to assist with the children.
24

1 38. Petitioner has no disqualifying criminal convictions that would make
2 him mandatory detention.

3 39. Petitioner's ongoing detention imposes severe financial and emotional
4 hardship on his U.S. citizen family.

5 40. Prior to his detention, Petitioner worked full-time and has a history of
6 steady employment. He is known as a hard-working individual who supports his
7 family and contributes to his community.

8 41. Petitioner and her family regularly attend church, where she is known
9 as a peaceful, responsible, and respected member of her faith community.

10 42. Petitioner poses no danger to the community and is not a flight risk. His
11 family ties, employment history, lack of criminal record, and consistent community
12 involvement demonstrate that he is an appropriate candidate for release under §
13 1226(a).

14 43. Petitioner's continued detention also violates due process because it is
15 based on an unlawful statutory interpretation already rejected by this Court and by a
16 certified nationwide class action. In *J.A.M. and P.R.S.* this Court held that 8 U.S.C.
17 § 1225(b)(2) applies only when a noncitizen is "seeking admission" in the context
18 of an arrival inspection by an examining immigration officer. Petitioner, however,
19 was apprehended inside the United States years after his entry and falls squarely
20 within the detention framework of § 1226(a), which entitles her to a bond hearing.
21
22
23
24

44. Nevertheless, ICE continues to detain Petitioner under § 1225(b)(2), and the Stewart Immigration Court refuses to exercise jurisdiction to conduct a bond hearing. Because Petitioner is a long-term resident with deep family ties, no criminal history, including two young U.S. citizen children who depend on him, his prolonged imprisonment without any opportunity for individualized custody review violates the fundamental requirements of due process and reinforces the necessity of habeas relief.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I

Violation of the INA

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

46. The mandatory detention provision at 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) does not apply to all noncitizens residing in the United States who are subject to the grounds of inadmissibility. As relevant here, it does not apply to those who previously entered the country and have been residing in the United States prior to being apprehended and placed in removal proceedings by Respondents. Such noncitizens are detained under § 1226(a), unless they are subject to § 1225(b)(1), § 1226(c), or § 1231.

47. The application of § 1225(b)(2) to Petitioner unlawfully mandates her continued detention and violates the INA.

COUNT II

Violation of the Bond Regulations

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

49. In 1997, after Congress amended the INA through IIRIRA, EOIR and the then-Immigration and Naturalization Service issued an interim rule to interpret and apply IIRIRA. Specifically, under the heading of “Apprehension, Custody, and Detention of [Noncitizens],” the agencies explained that “[d]espite being applicants for admission, [noncitizens] who are present without having been admitted or paroled (formerly referred to as [noncitizens] who entered without inspection) will be eligible for bond and bond redetermination.” 62 Fed. Reg. at 10323 (emphasis added). The agencies thus made clear that individuals who had entered without inspection were eligible for consideration for bond and bond hearings before IJs under 8 U.S.C. § 1226 and its implementing regulations.

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

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

COUNT III

Violation of Due Process

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

3 53. The government may not deprive a person of life, liberty, or property
4 without due process of law. U.S. CONST. AMEND. V. “Freedom from
5 imprisonment—from government custody, detention, or other forms of physical
6 restraint—lies at the heart of the liberty that the Clause protects.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*,
7 533 U.S. 678, 690 (2001).
8

9 54. Petitioner has a fundamental interest in liberty and being free from
10 official restraint.

11 55. The government’s detention of Petitioner without a bond
12 redetermination hearing to determine whether she is a flight risk or danger to others
13 violates her right to due process.
14

15 PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

- 17 a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- 18 b. Order that Petitioner shall not be transferred outside the Southern
19 District of Georgia while this habeas petition is pending;
- 20 c. Issue an Order to Show Cause ordering Respondents to show cause why
21 this Petition should not be granted within three days;
- 22 d. Issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus requiring that Respondents release
23 Petitioner or, in the alternative, provide Petitioner with a bond hearing
24 pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven days;

- 1 e. Declare that Petitioner's detention is unlawful;
- 2 f. Award Petitioner attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to
- 3 Justice Act ("EAJA"), as amended, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and on any other
- 4 basis justified under law; and
- 5 g. Grant any other and further relief that this Court deems just and proper.

6 DATED this 21st day of April, 2026.

7 /s/ Matthew K. Winchester

8 Matthew K. Winchester
9 Georgia Bar No. 399094
10 Garland Law Building
11 3151 Maple Drive, NE
12 Atlanta, Georgia 30305
13 T: (678) 517-6894
14 E: K.Winchestercb@gmail.com

15 /s/ Uriel N. Delgado

16 Uriel N. Delgado
17 GA BAR 832306
18 Delgado Law Firm LLC
19 6050 Peachtree Pkwy, Suite 240
20 Box 200, Norcross, GA 30092
21 T: (770) 815-7597
22 F: (678) 819-4410
23 E: uriel@delgadolaw.law

24 *Attorneys for Petitioner*

VERIFICATION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. 2242

I represent Petitioner, Mr. Miqueas Velazquez Bartolon, and submit this verification on his behalf. I hereby verify that the factual statements made in the foregoing Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

DATED this 21st day of April, 2026.

/s/ Matthew K. Winchester

Matthew K. Winchester
Georgia Bar No. 399094
Garland Law Building
3151 Maple Drive, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30305
T: (678) 517-6894
E: K.Winchestercb@gmail.com

/s/ Uriel N. Delgado

Uriel N. Delgado
GA BAR 832306
Delgado Law Firm LLC
6050 Peachtree Pkwy, Suite 240
Box 200, Norcross, GA 30092
T: (770) 815-7597
F: (678) 819-4410
E: uriel@delgadolaw.law

Attorneys for Petitioner