

1 ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney
2 MICHAEL D. WALLACE
Assistant United States Attorney
3 Maryland Bar No. 9912160256
Office of the U.S. Attorney
4 880 Front Street, Room 6293
San Diego, CA 92101-8893
5 Telephone: 619-546-8714
Email: michael.wallace4@usdoj.gov

6 Attorneys for Respondents
7
8

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 ELIAN XOL VALLE,
12

13 Petitioner,

14 v.

15 CHRISTOPHER J. LAROSE, et al.,
16

17 Respondents.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No.: 26-cv-3437-RBM-JAC

RESPONSE TO PETITION

1 Petitioner has filed a habeas petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The government has
2 carefully reviewed this petition and determined that the legal issues presented concern the
3 statutory authority for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement's (ICE) detention of
4 Petitioner under 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(2)(A) or 1226(a). While reserving all rights, including
5 the right to appeal, the government respectfully submits this abbreviated response to
6 preserve the legal issues, to conserve judicial and party resources, and to expedite the
7 Court's consideration of this matter.

8 Petitioner was previously released from immigration custody on conditional parole
9 issued under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). Exhibits 1 (OREC); 2 (I-213). ICE detained petitioner
10 after a review of his criminal history involving numerous arrests and periods of detention
11 as a juvenile, and his conviction for possession of a weapon soon after becoming an adult,
12 It is the government's position that Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under
13 § 1225(b)(2). However, the government acknowledges that this Court, and Courts in this
14 District, have repeatedly reached the opposite conclusion under the same and/or similar
15 facts. *See, e.g., Arias Torres v. Bondi*, No. 25-cv-2457-BAS-MSB, 2025 WL 3214773
16 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 18, 2025); *Martinez Lopez v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-2717-JES-AHG, 2025
17 WL 3030457 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2025); *Beltran v. Noem*, No. 25cv2650-LL-DEB, 2025
18 WL 3078837 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2025); *Garcia v. Noem*, 803 F. Supp. 3d 1064 (S.D. Cal.
19 2025); *Esquivel-Ipina v. LaRose*, No. 25-CV-2672 JLS (BLM), 2025 WL 2998361 (S.D.
20 Cal. Oct. 24, 2025); *Lucas-Miguel v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3022-RSH-JLB, 2025 WL
21 3251580 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2025); *Vasquez-Diaz v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3038-TWR-JLB,
22 ECF No. 6 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2025); *Cardoso v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3043-BJC-VET, ECF
23 No. 7 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 12, 2025); *Maceda-Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-2968-JO-JLB, ECF
24 No. 9 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2025); *A.S. v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-2876-RBM-VET, ECF No. 9
25 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2025); *Prieto-Cordova v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-2824-CAB-DDL, 2025
26 WL 3228953 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2025); *Lagarda-Vega v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-2970-GPC-
27 DDL, 2025 WL 3558931 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2025); *Nayyer v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3111-

1 AGS-DDL, ECF No. 7 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 12, 2025); *Amaya v. Noem*, No. 25cv2892-BTM-
2 DEB, 2025 WL 3182998 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2025).

3 The government acknowledges that this Court's prior decisions will control the
4 result here if the Court adheres to its prior decisions, as the facts are not materially
5 distinguishable for purposes of the Court's decision, and on that basis the government does
6 not oppose the petition and avers that a bond hearing is the appropriate remedy based on
7 Petitioner's consistent failure to obey the laws of the United States and California.¹

8 DATED: June 17, 2026

ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney

10 s/ Michael D. Wallace
11 MICHAEL D. WALLACE
Assistant United States Attorney

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 ¹ To the extent the Court issues an order directing a bond hearing under 1226(a),
24 considering heavy caseloads and staffing levels, Respondents respectfully request that
25 such order provide the government 14 days from issuance to hold such bond hearing.
26 Respondents also respectfully note that the Ninth Circuit has confirmed that at a bond
27 hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), the burden is on the detainee to demonstrate by a
28 preponderance of the evidence that he is not a flight risk or danger to the community. *See*
Rodriguez Diaz v. Garland, 53 F.4th 1189, 1197 (9th Cir. 2022); *see also Dos Santos v.*
Becerra, No. 26-cv-01423-GPC-VET, 2026 WL 800201 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 23, 2026).