

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

Pedro Morales Gonzalez v. Kevin Raycraft et al.

Morales Gonzalez v. Raycraft · No. 1:26-cv-103 · Decided January 28, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan conditionally granted Pedro Morales Gonzalez’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), governed his detention and concluded that his detention violated the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause. Respondents were ordered to provide a bond hearing within five business days or release him, and certain respondents were dismissed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Paul L. Maloney
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division
DECIDED	January 28, 2026
DOCKET	1:26-cv-103
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner, an ICE detainee, filed a counseled petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging the statutory basis and constitutionality of his detention and seeking release or a bond hearing. The district court conditionally granted the petition.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The opinion does not state a separately denominated standard of review. It considers whether Petitioner’s custody violated the Constitution or laws of the United States under 28 U.S.C. § 2241.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion

TOPICS

- immigration detention
- procedural due process
- statutory interpretation
- remedies
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration law

habeas corpus

constitutional law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether prudential exhaustion of administrative remedies should be enforced against Petitioner's § 2241 challenge to immigration detention.
2. Whether 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), rather than 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), governed Petitioner's detention.
3. Whether Petitioner's detention under the mandatory-detention framework of § 1225(b)(2)(A) violated the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause.
4. Whether the Detroit ICE Field Office Director was the only proper respondent and whether other respondents should be dismissed.

HOLDINGS

1. The court declined to enforce prudential exhaustion against Petitioner and alternatively held that waiver of exhaustion was appropriate.
2. Section 1226(a), not 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), governs 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) violated the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause.
4. The Detroit ICE Field Office Director was not the only proper respondent. The court retained the Detroit ICE Field Office Director and the Secretary of Homeland Security, while dismissing the Department of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, and the Executive Office for Immigration Review.

KEY QUOTATIONS

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

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner is a native and citizen of Guatemala who entered the United States without inspection in June 2019 and previously lived in Michigan. ICE detained him on December 13, 2025, and issued a notice to appear charging inadmissibility under INA §§ 212(a)(6)(A)(i) and 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I). He was detained at the North Lake Processing Center and was scheduled for a master calendar hearing in the Detroit Immigration Court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner was one of six individuals originally named in a single § 2241 petition. The court severed the petitioners' claims into separate actions, ordered the respondents to show cause, received the respondents' response and Petitioner's reply, and then adjudicated the detention claims. The court conditionally granted habeas relief, retained certain respondents, dismissed others, and ordered a bond hearing or immediate release.

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. Respondents must file a status report within six business days certifying compliance and reporting the hearing date and outcome, bond conditions if granted, or reasons for denial if denied.

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 (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)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION _____ PEDRO MORALES GONZALEZ, Petitioner, Case No. 1:26-cv-103 v. Honorable Paul L. Maloney KEVIN RAYCRAFT 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 writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241.1 (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, accept jurisdiction over this action and issue a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 ordering Respondents to release Petitioner or to conduct a bond hearing.

(Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.31–32.) 1 Petitioner was one of six petitioners named in the § 2241 petition. In an order entered on January 9, 2026, the Court severed the claims of the petitioners into six separate actions. (Order, ECF No. 4.) Petitioner’s claims proceed in the present action.

In an order entered on January 13, 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. 6.) Respondents filed their response on January 15, 2026, (ECF No. 7), and Petitioner filed his reply on January 21, 2026, (ECF No. 8).

II. Factual Background Petitioner is a native and citizen of Guatemala. (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.13; Notice to Appear (NTA), ECF No. 7-1, PageID.107.) Petitioner entered the United States in June 2019 without inspection. (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.13; NTA, ECF No. 7-1, PageID.107.) Prior to Petitioner's present detention, he resided in Michigan. (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.14.)

On December 13, 2025, ICE took Petitioner into custody, and Petitioner states that "upon information and belief,... [ICE] took him into custody in the Detroit area based on his Hispanic appearance." (Id.) At that time, ICE 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. 7-1, PageID.107, 110.)

Petitioner is scheduled for a master calendar hearing on January 26, 2026, in the Detroit Immigration Court. (Notice of Internet-Based Hearing, ECF No. 7-2, PageID.112.) 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. 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 (BIA).

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). 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, is scheduled to 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 short period 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). 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 other named Respondents. The Court concludes that the Detroit ICE 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 Detroit ICE Field Office Director and the United States Secretary of Homeland Security as Respondents.

The Court will dismiss the United States Department of Homeland Security, the United States Attorney General, and the Executive Office for Immigration Review 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 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. Further, the Court will dismiss the United States Department of Homeland Security, the United States Attorney General, and the Executive Office for Immigration Review as Respondents.

Dated: January 28, 2026 /s/ Paul L. Maloney Paul L. Maloney 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.