

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Jose Alonso Espinoza Ruiz v. Baltazar

Civil Action No. 1:25-cv-03642-CNS · No. 1:25-cv-03642-CNS · Decided November 26, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Colorado granted Jose Alonso Espinoza Ruiz’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging his mandatory immigration detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). The court held that, because he had lived in the United States for nearly twenty years and was awaiting removal proceedings, he should instead be detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and provided a bond hearing. Respondents were ordered to provide a bond hearing within seven days or release him under reasonable supervision conditions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Colorado
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Charlotte N. Sweeney
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Colorado
DECIDED	November 26, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-03642-CNS
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 from his mandatory immigration detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). The district court granted the petition without holding an evidentiary hearing and ordered a bond hearing or release under reasonable conditions.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the legality of Petitioner's detention under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and considered the statutory interpretation issue de novo. The petitioner bore the burden of proving that his detention was unlawful.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order
PARTIES	Jose Alonso Espinoza Ruiz v. Juan Baltazar, Warden of the Denver Contract Detention Facility, Robert Hagan, Field Office Director, Denver Field Office, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Kristi Noem, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Todd

TOPICS

immigration detention

removal proceedings

statutory interpretation

immigration

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration law

habeas corpus

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A)'s mandatory-detention provision applies to a noncitizen who has lived in the United States for nearly two decades, has no disqualifying criminal convictions, and is awaiting removal proceedings.
2. Whether Petitioner was entitled to a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).

HOLDINGS

1. Section 1225(b)(2)(A)'s mandatory-detention provision does not apply to a noncitizen like Petitioner who has been present in the United States for nearly two decades and is awaiting the outcome of removal proceedings.
2. Petitioner must be detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and provided a bond hearing at which the government bears the burden of proving that continued detention is justified by flight risk or danger to the community.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In sum, U.S. immigration law authorizes the Government to detain certain [noncitizens] seeking admission into the country under §§ 1225(b)(1) and (b)(2). It also authorizes the Government to detain certain [noncitizens] already in the country pending the outcome of removal proceedings under §§ 1226(a) and (c).”
(Analysis)

“Respondents are ordered to either (1) provide Petitioner with a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within SEVEN DAYS (on or before December 3, 2025), at which the government shall bear the burden of justifying Petitioner’s continued detention by clear and convincing evidence of dangerousness or flight risk; or (2) in the alternative, immediately release Petitioner from custody under reasonable conditions of supervision.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner is a native of Mexico who had lived in the United States for nearly twenty years, resided in Colorado, supported his wife and two U.S.-citizen children, and had no criminal history requiring mandatory detention. ICE detained him on October 30, 2025, charged him as inadmissible, and subjected him to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). He had no final removal order, and an immigration judge declined to redetermine his custody status.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

ICE detained Petitioner and charged him as inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i). An immigration judge concluded that she lacked jurisdiction to redetermine Petitioner's custody status. Petitioner then filed a verified petition for a writ of habeas corpus seeking release or a bond hearing. The district court granted relief on the statutory detention claim and declined to reach the remaining claims.

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Respondents must provide Petitioner with a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven days, on or before December 3, 2025. At the hearing, the government must justify continued detention by clear and convincing evidence of dangerousness or flight risk. Alternatively, Respondents must immediately release Petitioner under reasonable conditions of supervision and file a status report within eight days certifying compliance.

CASES CITED

- Walker v. Johnston, 312 U.S. 275, 286 (1941)
- Nava Hernandez v. Baltazar, No. 1:25-CV-03094-CNS, 2025 WL 2996643 (D. Colo. Oct. 24, 2025)
- Hernandez Vazquez v. Baltasar, No. 1:25-cv-3049-GPG, ECF No. 22 (D. Colo. Oct. 23, 2025)
- Loa Caballero v. Baltazar, No. 1:25-cv-3120-NYW, 2025 WL 2977650 (D. Colo. Oct. 22, 2025)
- Moya Pineda v. Baltasar, No. 1:25-cv-2955-GPG, ECF No. 21 (D. Colo. Oct. 20, 2025)
- Mendoza Gutierrez v. Baltasar, No. 1:25-cv-2720-RMR, 2025 WL 2962908 (D. Colo. Oct. 17, 2025)
- Garcia Cortes v. Noem, No. 1:25-cv-02677-CNS, 2025 WL 2652880 (D. Colo. Sept. 16, 2025)
- Jimenez v. FCI Berlin, Warden, No. 25-CV-326-LM-AJ, 2025 WL 2639390 (D.N.H. Sept. 8, 2025)
- Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft, No. 2:25-CV-12486, 2025 WL 2496379 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025)
- Romero v. Hyde, Civil Action No. 25-11631-BEM, 2025 WL 2403827 (D. Mass. Aug. 19, 2025)
- Lopez Benitez v. Francis, No. 25 Civ. 5937 (DEH), 2025 WL 2371588 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2025)
- Jennings v. Rodriguez, 583 U.S. 281, 289 (2018)
- Guerrero Orellana v. Moniz, 2025 WL 2809996, at *3 (D. Mass. Oct. 3, 2025)