

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
MICHIGAN, SOUTHERN DIVISION

Angel Brizuela Lozano v. Kevin Raycraft et al.

Brizuela Lozano v. Raycraft · No. 1:25-cv-1579 · Decided January 9, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan conditionally granted Angel Brizuela Lozano’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The court held that 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), rather than the mandatory-detention provision in § 1225(b)(2)(A), governs the petitioner’s detention and concluded that the detention framework violated his Fifth Amendment due process rights. Respondents were ordered to provide a bond hearing within five business days or immediately release the petitioner, and the United States Department of Homeland Security was dismissed as a respondent.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Robert J. Jonker
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division
DECIDED	January 9, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-1579
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner, an ICE detainee, sought habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, challenging his detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) and requesting a bond hearing or release.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the § 2241 petition to determine whether Petitioner was in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States. The court also considered whether to enforce prudential exhaustion and whether waiver was appropriate.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court opinion with no reporter or neutral citation in the source.
PARTIES	Angel Brizuela Lozano v. Kevin Raycraft et al.

TOPICS

immigration detention

removal proceedings

due process

procedural due process

statutory interpretation

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration law

habeas corpus

constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether prudential exhaustion should bar Petitioner's § 2241 challenge to his immigration detention.
2. Whether 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), rather than 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), governs the detention of a noncitizen who has resided in the United States and was apprehended within the United States.
3. Whether Petitioner's detention under the mandatory-detention framework of § 1225(b)(2)(A) violates the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause.
4. Whether the Detroit ICE Field Office Director was the only proper respondent.
5. Whether the United States Department of Homeland Security should remain a respondent.

HOLDINGS

1. The court declined to enforce prudential exhaustion against Petitioner and alternatively concluded that waiver of exhaustion was appropriate.
2. Section 1226(a), not 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), governs the detention of noncitizens who have resided in the United States and were already within the United States when apprehended and arrested.
3. Petitioner's current detention under the mandatory-detention framework of § 1225(b)(2)(A) violates the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause.
4. The Detroit ICE Field Office Director was not the only proper respondent; the court retained the Field Office Director and the Secretary of Homeland Security, while dismissing the United States Department of Homeland Security as a respondent.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Constitution guarantees that the writ of habeas corpus is “available to every individual detained within the United States.”” (Section III)

“The Court will order Respondents to provide Petitioner with a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within five business days of the date of this Court’s opinion and judgment or, in the alternative, immediately release Petitioner from custody.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner is a Mexican citizen who entered the United States without inspection in 1983 and was residing in Illinois with his United States-citizen spouse and four adult United States-citizen children. ICE arrested him on September 29, 2025, issued a notice to appear charging inadmissibility under INA §§ 212(a)(6)(A)(i) and 212(a)

(7)(A)(i)(I), and detained him at the North Lake Processing Center in Michigan. He was scheduled for a master calendar hearing in the Detroit Immigration Court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed a counseled § 2241 petition challenging the lawfulness of his immigration detention. The court ordered Respondents to show cause, Respondents filed a response, and Petitioner filed a reply. The district court conditionally granted the petition, ordered a bond hearing under § 1226(a) within five business days or immediate release, required a compliance report, and dismissed the United States Department of Homeland Security as a respondent.

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Respondents must provide Petitioner with a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within five business days of the opinion and judgment or immediately release him from custody. Respondents must file a status report within six business days certifying compliance, including whether and when the hearing occurred, whether bond was granted or denied, the conditions of any bond, or the reasons for denial. The United States Department of Homeland Security is dismissed as a respondent.

CASES CITED

- Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, 542 U.S. 507, 525 (2004)
- Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678, 687 (2001)
- A. A. R. P. v. Trump, 145 S. Ct. 1364, 1367 (2025)
- Antele Cobix v. Raycraft, No. 1:25-cv-1669, 2025 WL 3562651, at *2–9 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025)
- Candela Bastidas v. Noem, No. 1:25-cv-1528, 2025 WL 3562638, at *2–9 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025)
- Acuna Sanchez v. Noem, No. 1:25-cv-1442, 2025 WL 3562577, at *2–10 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025)
- Penagos Robles v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec., No. 1:25-cv-1578, 2025 WL 3558128, at *2–10 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025)