

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

Hussain Ali Qurbani v. Kristi Noem et al.

No. 1:26-cv-534 (W.D. Mich. Mar. 2, 2026) · No. 1:26-cv-534 · Decided March 2, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan conditionally granted Hussain Ali Qurbani’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The court held that detention was governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), rather than the mandatory-detention framework of § 1225(b)(2)(A), and concluded that Petitioner was entitled to a bond hearing or release. Respondents were ordered to provide the hearing within five business days and file a compliance status report.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jane M. Beckering
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division
DECIDED	March 2, 2026
DOCKET	1:26-cv-534
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner brought a counseled petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging his immigration detention and seeking release or a bond hearing. After ordering Respondents to show cause and receiving their response and Petitioner's reply, the court conditionally granted the petition.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo consideration of the legal questions presented in the § 2241 habeas petition; the opinion does not identify a separately stated standard of review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district-court opinion; precedential status is not stated in the opinion.
PARTIES	Hussain Ali Qurbani v. Kristi Noem, et al.

TOPICS

immigration detention

due process

statutory interpretation

remedies

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration law

federal habeas corpus

constitutional law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should enforce prudential exhaustion of administrative remedies before considering Petitioner's § 2241 challenge to immigration detention.
2. Whether 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) or the mandatory-detention provision in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) governs the detention of a noncitizen who had resided in the United States and was already present in the country when apprehended and arrested.
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 ICE Detroit Field Office Director is the only proper respondent, or whether the Secretary of Homeland Security should remain as a respondent.

HOLDINGS

1. The court declined to enforce prudential exhaustion against Petitioner and held in the alternative that waiver of exhaustion was appropriate.
2. Section 1226(a), rather than 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), governs 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 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) violates the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause.
4. The ICE Detroit Field Office Director is not the only proper respondent; the court retained both the ICE Detroit Field Office Director and the Secretary of Homeland Security.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court concludes that Petitioner’s current detention under the mandatory detention framework set forth in § 1225(b)(2)(A) violates Petitioner’s Fifth Amendment due process rights” (Section V.B)

“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 with notice to the Parties as soon as practicable, no later than 24 hours prior to the scheduled hearing, or, in the alternative, immediately release Petitioner from custody.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner is a native and citizen of Afghanistan who entered the United States on or about November 23, 2022, without inspection and was arrested by a Border Patrol agent three days later. DHS charged him with inadmissibility under INA §§ 212(a)(6)(A)(i) and 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I), and later paroled him into the United States

for one year beginning January 9, 2023. ICE arrested him on December 23, 2025, when he appeared for a scheduled ICE check-in, and detained him at the North Lake Processing Center in Michigan.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Qurbani filed a § 2241 habeas petition challenging the lawfulness of his ICE detention and requesting release or a bond hearing. The court ordered Respondents to show cause on February 18, 2026; Respondents responded on February 23, and Petitioner replied on March 1. The court conditionally granted habeas relief and ordered a bond hearing or immediate release.

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

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)
- Antelex Cobix v. Raycraft, No. 1:25-cv-1669, 2025 WL 3562651 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025)
- Candela Bastidas v. Noem, No. 1:25-cv-1528, 2025 WL 3562638 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025)
- Acuna Sanchez v. Noem, No. 1:25-cv-1442, 2025 WL 3562577 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025)
- Penagos Robles v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec., No. 1:25-cv-1578, 2025 WL 3558128 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025)
- Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi, No. 25-20496, 2026 WL 323330 (5th Cir. Feb. 6, 2026)

OPINION

Qurbani
PER CURIAM.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

HUSSAIN ALI QURBANI,
Petitioner, Case No. 1:26-cv-534 v. Honorable Jane M. Beckering KRISTI NOEM et al.,
Respondents. _____/

OPINION

Petitioner, a United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) detainee currently detained at the North Lake Processing Center located in Baldwin, Lake County, Michigan, initiated this action by filing a counseled petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. (Pet., ECF No. 1.) For the following reasons, the Court will conditionally grant

Petitioner's petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Discussion I. Procedural History In Petitioner's § 2241 petition, Petitioner challenges the lawfulness of his current detention and asks the Court to, inter alia, assume jurisdiction over this matter and issue a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 either ordering Respondents to release Petitioner or ordering Respondents to conduct a bond hearing to satisfy the requirements of due process. (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.3.) In an Order entered on February 18, 2026, the Court directed Respondents to show cause, within three business days, why the writ of habeas corpus and other relief requested by Petitioner should not be granted. (Order, ECF No. 3.) Respondents filed their response on February 23, 2026. (ECF No. 4.) Petitioner filed his reply on March 1, 2026 (ECF No. 5.) II. Factual Background Petitioner is a native and citizen of Afghanistan. (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.2; Notice to Appear (NTA), ECF No. 4-2, PageID.70) Petitioner entered the United States on or about November 23, 2022, at an unknown location without inspection. (NTA, ECF No. 4-2, PageID.70.) On November 26, 2022, a Border Patrol agent encountered and arrested Petitioner. (2022 I-213, ECF No. 4-1, PageID.68.) The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) issued Petitioner a Form I-862, NTA, charging Petitioner with inadmissibility under §§ 212(a)(6) (A)(i) and 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) because Petitioner is an immigrant "present in the United States without being admitted or paroled, or who arrived in the United States at any time or place other than as designated by the Attorney General," and "who, at the time of application for admission, is not in possession of a valid unexpired [immigration or travel document]." (NTA, ECF No. 4-2, PageID.70.) DHS then paroled Petitioner into the United States on January 9, 2023, for a period of one year. (Interim Notice Authorizing Parole, ECF No. 4-3, PageID.73.) On December 23, 2025, ICE agents arrested Petitioner when Petitioner appeared for his scheduled ICE check-in. (2025 I-213, ECF No. 4-4, PageID.77.) III. Habeas Corpus Legal Standard The Constitution guarantees that the writ of habeas corpus is "available to every individual detained within the United States." *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507, 525 (2004) (citing U.S. Const., Art I, § 9, cl. 2). Section 2241 of Title 28 confers the federal courts with the power to issue writs of habeas corpus to persons "in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2241. This includes challenges by non-citizens in immigration- related matters. See *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 687 (2001); see also *A. R. P. v. Trump*, 145 S. Ct. 1364, 1367 (2025). IV. Exhaustion Respondents argue that the Court should deny Petitioner's request for habeas corpus relief because Petitioner has not exhausted his administrative remedies. Specifically, Respondents argue that Petitioner should pursue a bond hearing and, if necessary, appeal any unfavorable decision to the Board of Immigration Appeals. The Court declines to enforce the doctrine of prudential exhaustion against Petitioner, and even if the Court were to conclude that exhaustion is warranted, the Court concludes in the alternative that waiver of exhaustion is appropriate, for the reasons set forth in the Court's exhaustion analysis in each of the following cases: *Antele Cobix v. Raycraft*, No. 1:25-cv-1669, 2025 WL 3562651, at *2-3 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025); *Candela Bastidas v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv- 1528, 2025 WL

3562638, at *2–4 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025); *Acuna Sanchez v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-1442, 2025 WL 3562577, at *2–4 (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 *2–3 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025). Accordingly, the Court will proceed to address the merits of Petitioner’s § 2241 petition.

V. Merits Discussion A. Statutory Basis for Petitioner’s Detention Petitioner contends that Respondents have violated the INA by concluding that Petitioner is detained pursuant to the mandatory detention provisions set forth in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). Respondents, however, contend that Petitioner meets every element for detention under § 1225(b)(2), and that the statute’s structure and history support Respondents’ interpretation. The Court concludes that § 1226(a), not § 1225(b)(2)(A), governs noncitizens, such as Petitioner, who have resided in the United States and were already within the United States when apprehended and arrested for the reasons set forth in the Court’s statutory analysis in each of the following cases: *Antele Cobix v. Raycraft*, No. 1:25-cv-1669, 2025 WL 3562651, at *3–6 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025); *Candela Bastidas v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-1528, 2025 WL 3562638, at *4–6 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025); *Acuna Sanchez v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-1442, 2025 WL 3562577, at *4–7 (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 *3–6 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025).

1 B. Fifth Amendment Due Process Considerations Petitioner also argues that his detention violates the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause. Respondents counter Petitioner’s arguments by stating that Petitioner has received notice of the charges against him, has access to counsel, may attend hearings with an immigration judge, has the right to appeal the denial of any request for bond, and has been detained by ICE for a relatively short period of time. The Court concludes that Petitioner’s current detention under the mandatory detention framework set forth in § 1225(b)(2)(A) violates Petitioner’s Fifth Amendment due process rights for the reasons set forth in the Court’s constitutional analysis in each of the following cases: *Antele Cobix v. Raycraft*, No. 1:25-cv-1669, 2025 WL 3562651, at *6–8 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025); *Candela Bastidas v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-1528, 2025 WL 3562638, at *7–8 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025); *Acuna Sanchez v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-1442, 2025 WL 3562577, at *7–9 (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 *6–8 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025).

1 The Court is aware of *Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi*, No. 25-20496, --- F.4th ---, 2026 WL 323330 (5th Cir. Feb. 6, 2026), which was recently issued by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. At this time, this non-binding case does not change the Court’s analysis.

VI. Other Claims and Other Forms of Relief Because the Court will conditionally grant Petitioner’s § 2241 petition as set forth herein, the Court does not address other claims and other requested relief in Petitioner’s § 2241 petition.

VII. Proper Respondents Respondents argue that the Detroit ICE Field Office Director is the only proper Respondent in this action, and they seek the dismissal of the Secretary of DHS. The Court concludes that the ICE Detroit Field Office Director is not the only proper Respondent for the reasons set forth in the Court’s analysis of the same argument in each of the following cases: *Antele Cobix v. Raycraft*, No. 1:25-cv-1669, 2025 WL 3562651, at *8–9

(W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025); *Candela Bastidas v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-1528, 2025 WL 3562638, at *8–9 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025); *Acuna Sanchez v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-1442, 2025 WL 3562577, at *9–10 (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 *9–10 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025). To ensure that this Court’s orders regarding a hearing or release will bind at least one Respondent with authority to act in the event that Petitioner is transferred out of the Western District of Michigan, the Court will retain the ICE Detroit Field Office Director and the Secretary of DHS as Respondents. Conclusion For the reasons discussed above, the Court will enter a Judgment conditionally granting Petitioner’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. (ECF No. 1.) 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 with notice to the Parties as soon as practicable, no later than 24 hours prior to the scheduled hearing, or, in the alternative, immediately release Petitioner from custody.² The Court will also order Respondents to file a status report within six business days of the date of this Court’s Opinion and Judgment to certify compliance with this Opinion and the corresponding Judgment. The status report shall include if and when the bond hearing occurred, if bond was granted or denied, and if bond was granted, the conditions of the bond, or if bond was denied, the reasons for the denial. Dated: March 2, 2026 /s/ Jane M. Beckering Jane M. Beckering United States District Judge 2 This Court has adopted a standard practice of requiring such a hearing within five business days, even if the Petitioner requests a deadline that is shorter or longer or only release.