

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN DIEGO DIVISION

'26CV3854 TWR JLB

Eduardo Carillo Rivera,
Agency No. 

Petitioner,

v.

MARKWAYNE MULLIN, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, et.

al.,

Respondents.

PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Murray D. Hilts
Law Offices of Murray D. Hilts
3020 Meade Ave.
San Diego, CA 92116
(619) 688-1174 (office)
(619) 285-1977 (fax)
murrayhilts@murrayhiltslaw.com

Attorney for Petitioner,

Eduardo Carillo Rivera,

MURRAY D. HILTS, ESQ. (CA Bar No. 169690)
LAW OFFICES OF MURRAY D. HILTS
3020 MEADE AVE.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92116
TEL: (619) 688-1174
FAX: (619) 285-1977
Attorney for Petitioner

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN DIEGO DIVISION

Eduardo Carillo Rivera,

Petitioner,

v.

Markwayne Mullin, in his official capacity as Secretary
of Homeland Security, Christopher J. LAROSE,
in his official capacity as Warden of Otay Mesa
Detention Center, Gregory J. ARCHAMBEAULT,
in his official capacity as San Diego Field Office
Director, ICE Enforcement Removal Operations;
David VENTURELLA, in his official capacity as Acting
Director of ICE; and Todd BLANCHE, U.S.
Attorney General; IMMIGRATION AND
CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT; DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELAND SECURITY,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR WRIT
OF HABEAS CORPUS

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Petitioner Eduardo Carillo Rivera, ("Petitioner") is a 48-year-old Mexican national who last entered the United States around 12 years ago.

2. On July 2, 2026, Petitioner was detained by Respondents at the Otay Mesa Detention Center.

1 3. Petitioner has not requested a custody redetermination as the impact
2 of the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) decision in *Matter of Yajure*
3 *Hurtado*, 28 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025) has meant that all requests for custody
4 redetermination under Petitioner’s circumstances have been dismissed for lack
5 of jurisdiction. Accordingly, requesting a bond hearing would be frivolous.
6

7 4. Petitioner therefore seeks a writ of habeas corpus directing his
8 immediate release.
9

10 II. VENUE AND JURISDICTION

11
12 5. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (habeas corpus),
13 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), and Article I, § 9, cl. 2 of the Constitution
14 (Suspension Clause), as Petitioner is presently in custody under the authority
15 of the United States and challenging his detention as in violation of the
16 Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.
17

18 6. The federal district courts have jurisdiction under Section 2241 to
19 hear habeas claims by individuals challenging the lawfulness of their detention
20 by ICE. *See Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 290-92 (2018).
21

22 7. Venue is proper because Petitioner is detained in the Otay Mesa
23 Detention Center, within the San Diego Division, and Respondent LaRose is his
24 immediate custodian. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241(d), 1391(e).
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

III. PARTIES

8. Petitioner is a 48-year-old Mexican national who resides in San Diego, California. He is currently detained by Respondents at the Otay Mesa Detention Center in San Diego, California, pending removal proceedings.

9. Respondent Christopher J. LaRose is the Warden of Otay Mesa Detention Center. Respondent La Rose is responsible for the operation of the Detention Center where Petitioner is detained. As such, Respondent LaRose has immediate physical custody of the Petitioner. He is being sued in his official capacity.

10. Respondent Gregory J. Archambeault is the San Diego Field Office Director ("FOD") for ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations. Respondent Archambeault is responsible for the oversight of ICE operations at the Otay Mesa Detention Center. Respondent Archambeault is being sued in his official capacity.

11. Respondent Dave Venturella is the Acting Director of ICE. Respondent Lyons is responsible for the administration of ICE and the implementation and enforcement of the immigration laws, including immigrant detention. As such, Respondent Venturella is a legal custodian of Petitioner and is being sued in his official capacity.

12. Respondent Markwayne Mullin is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS"). As Secretary of DHS, Secretary Mullin is responsible for the general administration and enforcement of the immigration

1 laws of the United States. Respondent Secretary Mullin is being sued in his
2 official capacity.

3 IV. EXHAUSTION OF REMEDIES

4 13. No statutory exhaustion requirement applies. *See* 8 § U.S.C. 2241;
5 *Laing v. Ashcroft*, 370 F.3d 994, 998 (9th Cir. 2004). Therefore, exhaustion is not
6 jurisdictionally required. Moreover, exhaustion should not be required here
7 because any attempt to exhaust would be futile, as BIA appeals routinely take
8 more than six months to reach a decision.
9

10 14. Additionally, further agency steps will be futile. Recently, the BIA
11 published *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 28 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025). In its decision,
12 the BIA adopted DHS' reading of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), finding individuals
13 similarly situated to Petitioner ineligible for release on bond.
14

15 15. In Petitioner's case, any request for custody redetermination will be
16 dismissed by the Immigration Court for lack of jurisdiction and any appeal to
17 the BIA will be dismissed. *Matter of Yajure Hurtado* currently controls in
18 Petitioner's case and any attempt to request agency evaluation of his detention
19 will be futile.
20

21 V. STATEMENT OF FACTS

22 16. Petitioner is a Mexican national  He last
23 entered the United States around 12 years ago.
24

25 17. On or about July 2, 2026 Petitioner was detained by Respondents at
26
27
28

1 the Otay Mesa Detention Center.

2 18. Petitioner has remained in Respondents' custody since that time.

3 19. Petitioner's next master hearing is yet to be scheduled.

4 20. Petitioner now seeks habeas relief because continuing his detention
5 exceeds statutory authority and violates the Fifth Amendment.
6

7 8 VI. LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR RELIEF SOUGHT

9 21. Habeas corpus relief extends to a person "in custody under or by color
10 of the authority of the United States" if the person can show he is "in custody
11 in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28
12 U.S.C. § 2241 (c)(1), (c)(3); see also *Antonelli v. Warden, U.S.P. Atlanta*, 542
13 F.3d 1348, 1352 (11th Cir. 2008) (holding a petitioner's claims are proper under
14 28 U.S.C. section 2241 if they concern the continuation or execution of
15 confinement).
16

17 22. "[H]abeas corpus is, at its core, an equitable remedy," *Schlup v.*
18 *Delo*, 513 U.S. 298, 319 (1995), that "[t]he court shall ... dispose of [] as law
19 and justice require," 28 U.S.C. § 2243. "[T]he court's role was most extensive
20 in cases of pretrial and noncriminal detention." *Boumediene v. Bush*, 553
21 U.S. 723, 779–80 (2008). "[W]hen the judicial power to issue habeas corpus
22 properly is invoked the judicial officer must have adequate authority to make
23 a determination in light of the relevant law and facts and to formulate and
24 issue appropriate orders for relief, including, if necessary, an order directing
25
26
27
28

1 the prisoner's release." *Id.* at 787.

2
3 **VII. CAUSES OF ACTION**

4 **COUNT ONE**

5 **8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), NOT 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b), APPLIES TO PETITIONER**

6 23. Petitioner incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 as if fully set out
7 herein.

8
9 24. Recently, Respondents began arguing that those in situations similar
10 to Petitioner are detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), which mandates
11 the detention of an "applicant for admission" throughout the entirety of
12 removal proceedings.

13
14 25. Respondents' newly formulated definition of "applicant for
15 admission," which would include any noncitizen who has not been formally
16 admitted regardless of years of residence in the United States, directly
17 contradicts both the plain text of the statute and controlling Ninth Circuit
18 precedent.

19
20 26. As the Ninth Circuit explained in interpreting the phrase "applicant
21 for admission" under § 1225(b)(1), "*an immigrant submits an 'application for*
22 *admission' at a distinct point in time,*" and stretching that phrase to apply
23 "*potentially for years or decades ... would push the statutory text beyond its*
24 *breaking point.*" *United States v. Gambino-Ruiz*, 91 F.4th 981, 988–89 (9th Cir.
25 2024) (citing *Torres v. Barr*, 976 F.3d 918, 922–26 (9th Cir. 2020) (en banc)).

26
27 27. Because Petitioner has resided continuously in the United States for
28

1 12 years, his period as an “applicant for admission” has long since closed.

2 28. Numerous courts across the United States have considered this issue
3 subsequent to Respondents’ new policy of treating the vast majority of
4 immigrants in their custody as being detained pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §
5 1225(b)(2) and the BIA’s decision supporting this interpretation in *Matter of*
6 *Yajure Hurtado*, 28 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025).
7

8 29. This Court, joining the general consensus with other courts across
9 this country, previously held those similarly situated to Petitioner are being
10 held under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and therefore are not subject to mandatory
11 detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). *See e.g., Martinez Lopez v. Noem, et al.*, No:
12 25-cv-2717-JES-AHG, 2025 WL 3030457 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2025).
13

14
15 **COUNT TWO**
16 **(PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS)**

17 30. Petitioner incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 as if fully set out
18 herein.
19

20 31. The Fifth Amendment forbids deprivation of liberty without notice
21 and a meaningful opportunity to be heard before a neutral decision-maker. Due
22 process protects “all ‘persons’ within the United States, including [non-
23 citizens], whether their presence here is lawful, unlawful, temporary, or
24 permanent.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 698 (2001).
25

26 32. Subsection 1003.19(i)(2) strips Petitioner of that protection by
27 allowing the prosecuting agency—after losing at the bond hearing—to veto the
28

1 Immigration Judge's order with a one-page notice that requires no showing of
2 danger, flight risk, or likelihood of success on appeal.

3 33. Applying the *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976), test,
4 Petitioner's liberty interest is paramount; the risk of erroneous deprivation is
5 extreme considering the Immigration Judge's determination that Petitioner is
6 not subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c) and does not pose
7 a danger to the community. Likewise, the risk of erroneous deprivation of
8 liberty is great due to the lack of a non-independent adjudicator. *Marcello v.*
9 *Bonds*, 39 U.S. 302, 305-306 (1955). In filing Form EOIR-43, ICE is acting as
10 both the prosecutor as well as the adjudicator.
11

12 34. While the government has discretion to detain individuals under 8
13 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and to revoke custody decisions under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(b), this
14 discretion is not "unlimited" and must comport with constitutional due process.
15
16 See *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 698.
17

18
19 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

- 21 1) Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
22
23 2) Grant Petitioner a writ of habeas corpus directing the Respondents to
24 immediately release him from custody, under reasonable conditions of
25 supervision;
26 3) Order Respondents to refrain from transferring Petitioner out of the
27
28

jurisdiction of this court during the pendency of these proceedings and while the Petitioner remains in Respondents' custody;

4) Order Respondents to file a response within 3 business days of the filing of this petition;

5) Award attorneys' fees to Petitioner; and

6) Grant any other and further relief which this Court deems just and proper.

I affirm, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Respectfully submitted this 2th day of July, 2026.

/s/ Murray D. Hilts

The Law Offices of Murray D. Hilts

3020 Meade Ave.

San Diego, CA 92116

CA Bar # 169690

Attorney for Petitioner