

1 ADAM GORDON
United States Attorney
2 CAMILLE SAVEDRA
Assistant U.S. Attorney
3 California State Bar No. 336490
Office of the U.S. Attorney
4 880 Front Street, Room 6293
San Diego, CA 92101-8893
5 Telephone: (619) 546-5084
Email: camille.savedra@usdoj.gov

6 Attorneys for Respondent
7
8

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

11 DICSON OBEL AGUILAR
12 MAZARIEGOS,

13 Petitioner,
14

15 v.

16 IMPERIAL REGIONAL DETENTION
FACILITY,
17

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

Case No.: 26-cv-03758-LL-AHG

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

1 Dec. 11, 2025); *Nayyer v. LaRose*, No. 25-cv-3111-AGS-DDL, ECF No. 7 (S.D. Cal. Dec.
 2 12, 2025); *Amaya v. Noem*, No. 25cv2892-BTM-DEB, 2025 WL 3182998 (S.D. Cal. Nov.
 3 13, 2025).

4 The government acknowledges that this Court's prior decisions will control the result
 5 here if the Court adheres to its prior decisions, as the facts are not materially distinguishable
 6 for purposes of the Court's decision,¹ and on that basis the government does not oppose the
 7 petition and defers to the Court on the appropriate relief.²

8
 9 DATED: July 20, 2026

ADAM GORDON
 United States Attorney

10 s/ Camille Savedra
 11 CAMILLE SAVEDRA
 12 Assistant United States Attorney
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18

19 _____
 20 ¹ Petitioner also challenges his detention citing violations of the Administrative Procedure
 21 Act and Due Process. Should the Court grant the petition, it should decline to address these
 22 additional 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), considering
 24 heavy caseloads and staffing levels, Respondents respectfully request that such order
 25 provide the government 14 days from issuance to hold such bond hearing. Respondents also
 26 respectfully note that the Ninth Circuit has confirmed that at a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C.
 27 § 1226(a), the burden is on the detainee to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence
 28 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).