

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 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
11

12 ARMANDO GONZALEZ GONZALEZ,

13 Petitioner,
14

15 v.
16

17 CHRISTOPHER J. LAROSE, *et al.*,
18

19 Respondents.
20

Case No.: 26-cv-03844-RSH-GC

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

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

It is the government's position that Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention under
§ 1225(b)(2). However, the government acknowledges that Petitioner appears to be a

1 member of the Bond Eligible Class certified in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, 813 F.
2 Supp. 3d 1084 (C.D. Cal. 2025). The Ninth Circuit has stayed application of the Order
3 beyond the Central District of California. However, Respondents acknowledge the prior
4 orders from this District directing bond hearings pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) in similar
5 cases.¹ Respondents therefore do not oppose an order from this Court directing a bond
6 hearing be held pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).²

7
8 DATED: July 8, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

9 ADAM GORDON
10 United States Attorney

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

19 ¹ Petitioner also challenges their detention citing violations of the Due Process Clause of
20 the Fifth Amendment. Should the Court grant the petition, it should decline to address these
21 additional arguments. *INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976) (“As a general rule
22 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 such
25 order provide the government 14 days from issuance to hold such bond hearing. The Ninth
26 Circuit has confirmed that at a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), the burden is on the
27 detainee to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that he is not a flight risk or
28 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).