

1 ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney
2 JACOB T. METZGER
Special Assistant U.S. Attorney
3 Ohio State Bar No. 104783
Office of the U.S. Attorney
4 880 Front Street, Room 6293
San Diego, CA 92101-8893
5 Telephone: (619) 546-8693
Mobile: (619) 885-2119
6 Facsimile: (619) 546-7751
Email: jacob.metzger@usdoj.gov

7 Attorneys for Respondents
8
9

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

11 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12 EMMA REYES-RIZO,

13
14 Petitioner,

15 v.

16 U.S. ICE, *et al.*,

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

Case No.: 26-cv-03740-JLS-JLB

**RETURN TO PETITION FOR
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS**

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

9 Petitioner was previously released from immigration custody on parole issued under
10 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5). Respondents have insufficient information regarding termination of
11 that parole, pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 212.5(e)(2), to provide to the Court. It is the
12 government's position that Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2).
13 However, the government acknowledges that this Court, and Courts in this District, have
14 repeatedly reached the opposite conclusion under the same and/or similar facts. *See, e.g.,*
15 *Arias Torres v. Bondi*, No. 25-cv-2457-BAS-MSB, 2025 WL 3214773 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 18,
16 2025); *Martinez Lopez v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-2717-JES-AHG, 2025 WL 3030457 (S.D.
17 Cal. Oct. 30, 2025); *Beltran v. Noem*, No. 25cv2650-LL-DEB, 2025 WL 3078837 (S.D.
18 Cal. Nov. 4, 2025); *Garcia v. Noem*, 803 F. Supp. 3d 1064 (S.D. Cal. 2025); *Esquivel-Ipina*
19 *v. LaRose*, No. 25-CV-2672 JLS (BLM), 2025 WL 2998361 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2025);
20 *Lucas-Miguel v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3022-RSH-JLB, 2025 WL 3251580 (S.D. Cal. Nov.
21 21, 2025); *Vasquez-Diaz v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3038-TWR-JLB, ECF No. 6 (S.D. Cal.
22 Nov. 13, 2025); *Cardoso v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3043-BJC-VET, ECF No. 7 (S.D. Cal. Dec.
23 12, 2025); *Maceda-Garcia v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-2968-JO-JLB, ECF No. 9 (S.D. Cal. Nov.
24 13, 2025); *A.S. v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-2876-RBM-VET, ECF No. 9 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 19,
25 225); *Prieto-Cordova v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-2824-CAB-DDL, 2025 WL 3228953 (S.D.
26 Cal. Nov. 19, 2025); *Lagarda-Vega v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-2970-GPC-DDL, 2025 WL
27 3558931 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2025); *Nayyer v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3111-AGS-DDL, ECF

1 No. 7 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 12, 2025); *Amaya v. Noem*, No. 25cv2892-BTM-DEB, 2025 WL
2 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,¹ and on that basis the government
6 does not oppose the petition and defers to the Court on the appropriate relief.²

7 DATED: July 22, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

8
9 ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney

10
11 s/ Jacob T. Metzger
12 JACOB T. METZGER
Special Assistant U.S. Attorney
13 Attorney for Respondents
14
15
16
17
18

19 _____
20 ¹ Petitioner also challenges their detention citing violations of the APA and Due Process.
21 Should the Court grant the petition, it should decline to address these additional
22 arguments. *INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976) ("As a general rule courts and
agencies are not required to make findings on issues the decision of which is unnecessary
to the results they reach.").

23 ² 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).