

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Miguel Orellana-Torrez v. Todd Lyons, et al.

Miguel Orellana-Torrez v. Todd Lyons, Civil Action No. 25-18907 (SDW) (D.N.J. Feb. 10, 2026) · No. Civil Action No. 25-18907 (SDW); 2:25-cv-18907 · Decided February 10, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of New Jersey holds that Miguel Orellana-Torrez was improperly treated as subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). The court orders Respondents to treat him as detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and provide an individualized bond hearing.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Susan D. Wigenton
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
DECIDED	February 10, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 25-18907 (SDW); 2:25-cv-18907
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging immigration detention and the denial of a bond hearing.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court considered whether the petitioner was in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States for purposes of § 2241 habeas jurisdiction and reviewed the record to determine the statutory authority supporting his detention.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; District of New Jersey trial-court opinion.
PARTIES	Miguel Orellana-Torrez v. Todd M. Lyons, Kristi Noem, Pamela Bondi, Luis Soto

TOPICS

- immigration detention
- procedural due process
- due process
- removal proceedings
- immigration

PRACTICE AREAS

- immigration
- habeas corpus
- constitutional law
- civil procedure
- remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court had jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 to review Orellana-Torrez's challenge to his immigration detention.
2. Whether Orellana-Torrez was subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) or discretionary detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).
3. Whether continued detention without an individualized bond hearing violated the laws of the United States and due process.

HOLDINGS

1. The court had habeas jurisdiction because Orellana-Torrez was detained within the district by a custodian within the district and alleged that his custody violated the Constitution or laws of the United States.
2. The record did not establish that Orellana-Torrez was detained under the mandatory-detention provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).
3. Orellana-Torrez's mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2) violated federal law and due process, and he was entitled to an individualized bond hearing under § 1226(a).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Accordingly, Petitioner’s mandatory detention pursuant to § 1225(b)(2) violates the laws of the United States and Petitioner’s Due Process rights.” (at 5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Orellana-Torrez, a Nicaraguan citizen, entered the United States from Mexico in June 2022 and was released from DHS custody in July 2022. He later filed an asylum application and appeared for a credible-fear interview in October 2025, after which he was detained and transferred to Delaney Hall. Although the immigration judge denied bond on the ground that Orellana-Torrez was subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), the notice to appear identified him as present in the United States without having been admitted or paroled, and the respondents produced no documentation establishing parole under § 1182(d)(5)(A).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Orellana-Torrez was detained by Immigration and Customs Enforcement after appearing for a credible-fear interview. An immigration judge upheld his removability and denied bond based on *Matter of Hurtado*, concluding that the immigration court lacked jurisdiction to conduct a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). Orellana-Torrez filed this § 2241 petition, and after briefing the district court determined that the record supported detention under § 1226(a), not mandatory detention under § 1225(b), and ordered an individualized bond hearing.

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Respondents must treat Orellana-Torrez as detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and provide him with an individualized bond hearing before an immigration judge.

CASES CITED

- Bethancourt-Soto v. Soto, et al., No. 25-cv-16200, __ F. Supp. 3d __, 2025 WL 2976572 (D.N.J. Oct. 22, 2025)
- Maleng v. Cook, 490 U.S. 488, 490 (1989)
- Trump v. J. G. G., 604 U.S. 670, 672 (2025) (per curiam)
- Matter of Hurtado, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025)
- Martinez v. Hyde, 792 F. Supp. 3d 211, 218 (D. Mass. 2025)
- Lopez Benitez v. Francis, 795 F. Supp. 3d 475, 483-84 (S.D.N.Y. 2025)