

1 Tina Malek, Esq. (CSBN 265543)
2 MALEK LAW GROUP, APC
3 402 W. Broadway, Ste 1260
4 San Diego, CA 92101
5 Tel: 619-565-0600
6 Fax: 619-374-8573
7 tmalek@malek-law.com

8 Attorney for Petitioner

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 Francisco ZAFRA SALINAS,

12 Petitioner,

13 v.

14 Patrick, DIVVER, Field Office Director
15 of Enforcement and Removal
16 Operations, San Diego Field Office,
17 Immigration and Customs Enforcement;
18 Todd M. LYONS, Acting Director, U.S.
19 Immigration and Customs Enforcement;
20 Markwayne MULLIN, Secretary, U.S.
21 Department of Homeland Security; U.S.
22 DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
23 SECURITY; Todd BLANCHE, U.S.
24 Attorney General; EXECUTIVE
OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION
REVIEW; Christopher J. LAROSE,
Warden of Otay Mesa Detention Facility,

Respondents.

Case No. '26CV3770 JAO JLB

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS**

INTRODUCTION

1
2 1. Petitioner, Francisco Zafra Salinas, brings this petition for a writ of
3 habeas corpus to seek enforcement of their rights as members of the Bond Denial
4 Class certified in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM
5 (C.D. Cal.) Petitioner is in the physical custody of Respondents at the Otay Mesa
6 Detention Facility. He now faces unlawful detention because the Department of
7 Homeland Security (DHS) and the Executive Office for Immigration Review
8 (EOIR) have refused to abide by the declaratory judgment issued on behalf of the
9 certified class in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*.
10

11 2. On November 20, 2025, the district court granted partial summary
12 judgment on behalf of individual plaintiffs and on November 25, 2025, certified a
13 nationwide class and extended declaratory judgment to the certified class.
14 *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, --- F. Supp. 3d -
15 ---, 2025 WL 3289861, at *11 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2025) (order granting partial
16 summary judgment to named Plaintiffs-Petitioners); *Maldonado Bautista v.*
17 *Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 3288403,
18 at *9 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2025) (order certifying Plaintiffs-Petitioners' proposed
19 nationwide Bond Eligible Class, incorporating and extending declaratory judgment
20 from Order Granting Petitioners' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment).
21
22
23
24

1 3. The declaratory judgment held that the Bond Denial Class members
2 are detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), and thus may not be denied consideration
3 for release on bond under § 1225(b)(2)(A). *Maldonado Bautista*, 2025 WL
4 3289861, at *11.

5
6 4. On December 18, 2025, the Central District of California entered a
7 final judgment in *Maldonado Bautista*, certifying the nationwide class and
8 declaring the policy of detaining those individuals that entered the United States
9 without inspection under § 1225(b)(2) unlawful.

10 5. Nonetheless, the Executive Office for Immigration Review and its
11 subagency the Immigration Court and the Department of Homeland Security
12 (DHS) have blatantly refused to abide by the declaratory relief and have
13 unlawfully ordered that Petitioner be denied the opportunity to be released on
14 bond.
15

16 6. Petitioner, Francisco Zafra Salinas, is a member of the Bond Eligible
17 Class, as he:

- 18
19 a. does not have lawful status in the United States and is currently
20 detained at the Otay Mesa Detention Facility. He was apprehended by
21 immigration authorities on June 25, 2026,
22 b. entered the United States without inspection on or about 2008, and
23 was not apprehended upon arrival, *cf. id.*; and
24 c. is not detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231.

25 7. Prior to apprehending Petitioner on June 25, 2026, the DHS placed
26 him in removal proceedings pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. DHS has charged

1 Petitioner as being inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i), as someone
2 who entered the United States without inspection.

3 8. The Court should expeditiously grant this petition.

4 9. Respondents are bound by the judgment in *Maldonado Bautista*, as it
5 has the full “force and effect of a final judgment.” 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a).
6

7 Nevertheless, Respondents continue to flagrantly defy the judgment in that case
8 and continue to subject Petitioner to unlawful detention despite his clear
9 entitlement to consideration for release on bond as a Bond Eligible Class member.

10 10. Immigration judges have informed class members in bond hearings
11 that they have been instructed by “leadership” that the declaratory judgment in
12 *Maldonado Bautista* is not controlling, even with respect to class members, and
13 that instead IJs remain bound to follow the agency’s prior decision in *Matter of*
14 *Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).
15

16 11. Because Respondents are detaining Petitioner in violation of the
17 declaratory judgment issued in *Maldonado Bautista*, the Court should accordingly
18 order that within one day, Respondent DHS must release Petitioner.
19

20 12. Alternatively, the Court should order Petitioner’s release unless
21 Respondents provide a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven days.

22 **JURISDICTION**
23
24

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

19. Habeas corpus is “perhaps the most important writ known to the constitutional law . . . affording as it does a *swift* and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or confinement.” *Fay v. Noia*, 372 U.S. 391, 400 (1963) (emphasis added). “The application for the writ usurps the attention and displaces the calendar of the judge or justice who entertains it and receives prompt action from him within the four corners of the application.” *Yong v. I.N.S.*, 208 F.3d 1116, 1120 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted).

PARTIES

20. Petitioner, Francisco Zafra Salinas, is a citizen of Mexico who has been in immigration detention since June 25, 2026. Petitioner's removal proceedings have been pending since January 14, 2025 where he had attended a master calendar hearing and his case was set to an individual hearing on October 14, 2026. After Petitioner was arrested, ICE did not set bond. Petitioner did not request review of his custody by an IJ as any such request would be futile. The Court in *Maldonado Bautista* entered a final judgment specifically because it found "troubling" evidence that the Department of Justice issued a memorandum instructing Immigration Judges to disregard the federal court's prior orders and

1 "hold the position that *Yajure-Hurtado* remains good law." This judicial finding
2 confirms that administrative exhaustion is futile, as the agency has prejudged the
3 issue in bad faith.

4
5 21. Respondent Patrick Divver ("Divver") is the Director of the San
6 Diego Field Office of ICE's Enforcement and Removal Operations division. As
7 such, Divver is Petitioner's immediate custodian and is responsible for Petitioner's
8 detention and removal. He is named in his official capacity.

9
10 22. Respondent Markwayne Mullin is the Secretary of the Department of
11 Homeland Security. He is responsible for the implementation and enforcement of
12 the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), and oversees ICE, which is
13 responsible for Petitioner's detention. Mr. Mullin has ultimate custodial authority
14 over Petitioner and is sued in her official capacity.

15
16 23. Respondent Todd Blanche is the Attorney General of the United
17 States. He is responsible for the Department of Justice, of which the Executive
18 Office for Immigration Review and the immigration court system it operates is a
19 component agency. He is sued in her official capacity.

20
21 24. Respondent Christopher LaRose ("LaRose") is the Senior Warden at
22 the Otay Mesa Detention Center as Warden of the, where Petitioner is detained.
23 He has immediate physical custody of Petitioner. He is sued in his official
24 capacity.

1 **CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

2 **Violation of the INA:**

3 **Request for Relief Pursuant to *Maldonado Bautista***

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

5 26. As a member of the Bond Eligible Class, Petitioner is entitled to
6 consideration for release on bond under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).

7 27. The order granting partial summary judgment in *Maldonado Bautista*
8 holds that Respondents violate the INA in applying the mandatory detention statute
at § 1225(b)(2) to class members.

9 28. The order granting class certification in *Maldonado Bautista* further
10 orders that “[w]hen considering this determination with the MSJ Order, the Court
11 extends the same declaratory relief granted to Petitioners to the Bond Eligible
12 Class as a whole.”

13 29. Respondents are parties to *Maldonado Bautista* and bound by the
14 Court’s declaratory judgment, which has the full “force and effect of a final
15 judgment.” 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a).

16 30. By denying Petitioner bond hearing under § 1226(a) and asserting that
17 he is subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2), Respondents violate
18 Petitioner’s statutory rights under the INA and the Court’s judgment in *Maldonado*
Bautista.

19 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

- 21 a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
22 b. Issue a writ of habeas corpus requiring that within one day,
23 Respondents release Petitioner;
24

- c. Alternatively, issue a writ of habeas corpus requiring Respondents to release Petitioner unless they provide a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven days where the Government bears the burden of establish risk of flight and dangerousness;
- d. Order that Petitioner shall not be transferred outside the Southern District of California.
- e. Order that Respondents shall not re-detain or continue to detain Petitioner absent a material change in circumstances;
- f. Order that Respondents shall provide Petitioner's counsel with advance written notice of their position in advance of any bond hearing;
- g. Award Petitioner attorney's fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA), as amended, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and on any other basis justified under law; and
- h. Grant any other and further relief that this Court deems just and proper.

DATED this 28 of June 2026

Respectfully Submitted:

/s/ Tina Malek
Tina Malek
402 W. Broadway, Ste 1260
619-566-0600
CA Bar No. 265543
Counsel for Petitioner