

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
KENTUCKY, NORTHERN DIVISION AT COVINGTON

Yun Qui v. Jason Maydak, et al.

Qui · No. Civil Action No. 26-199-DLB · Decided June 24, 2026

SUMMARY

The court denied Yun Qui’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging his immigration detention. It held that Boone County Jailer Jason Maydak was a proper respondent and that Qui was subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii) after a credible-fear determination and transfer to full removal proceedings. The court also rejected Qui’s due-process, parole, and Administrative Procedure Act claims and dismissed the matter.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, Northern Division at Covington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	David L. Bunning
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, Northern Division at Covington
DECIDED	June 24, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 26-199-DLB
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging immigration detention and seeking immediate release.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the habeas petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and considered whether Qui's detention was authorized by statute and violated due process.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court memorandum opinion and order with no reported citation.
PARTIES	Yun Qui v. Jason Maydak, Samuel Olson, Todd Blanche, Markwayne Mullin, Todd Lyons

TOPICS

- immigration detention
- removal proceedings
- asylum
- due process
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration

habeas corpus

constitutional law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Boone County jailer was a proper respondent to Qui's habeas petition.
2. Whether Qui was subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii) after being found to have a credible fear and transferred to full removal proceedings.
3. Whether Qui's prior humanitarian parole created an exception to mandatory detention or rendered his detention unlawful when he did not receive written notice of parole termination.
4. Whether Qui's detention violated the Fifth Amendment because it was prolonged, indefinite, or terminated his parole without adequate notice or an opportunity to be heard.
5. Whether Qui could obtain relief under the Administrative Procedure Act when habeas corpus provided an adequate remedy.

HOLDINGS

1. The detainee's jailer, Jason Maydak, was a proper respondent because he had day-to-day custody and control over the facility where Qui was detained.
2. Qui was mandatorily detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii) because he was found to have a credible fear and was transferred from expedited removal proceedings to full removal proceedings for adjudication of his asylum claim.
3. Qui's prior humanitarian parole did not exempt him from mandatory detention because the parole had expired, either by its stated one-year term or when its stated purpose was completed.
4. Qui's current mandatory detention did not violate the Fifth Amendment because his asylum and removal proceedings remained pending and he was not detained under the post-removal-order statute addressed in *Zadvydas v. Davis*.
5. Any failure to provide written notice of parole termination did not warrant habeas relief because Qui was independently subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(1)(B)(ii), and release would not redress the alleged notice violation.
6. Qui could not obtain relief under the APA because habeas corpus supplied an adequate remedy for his detention challenge.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"[T]he federal habeas statute straightforwardly provides that the proper respondent to a habeas petition is 'the person who has custody over the petitioner.'" (at 4)

"shall be detained" until his asylum claim is adjudicated." (at 9)

"Should Petitioner be subject to a final order of removal, and his detention continues for a prolonged and indefinite amount of time, he may well have a due process claim at that time." (at 13)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Qui entered the United States near San Ysidro, California, in November 2024 and was placed in expedited removal proceedings after being deemed inadmissible for lack of valid entry documents. He was paroled into the country, later underwent a credible-fear interview, and was detained by ICE on November 6, 2025. After receiving a Notice to Appear and being denied bond by an immigration judge, Qui filed a habeas petition asserting that his detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1), the termination of his parole, and the duration of his detention violated the INA and the Fifth Amendment.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Qui, a Chinese national detained at the Boone County Jail, filed a habeas petition challenging his detention under the Immigration and Nationality Act and the Fifth Amendment. Respondents filed responses, including a contention by the Boone County jailer that he was not a proper respondent, and Qui filed a reply. The district court held that the jailer was a proper respondent, denied the habeas petition, and dismissed and struck the matter from the active docket.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 434, 447 (2004)
- *M.T.B. v. Byers*, No. 2:24-cv-082-DCR, 2024 WL 3881843, at *1 (E.D. Ky. Aug. 20, 2024)
- *Roman v. Ashcroft*, 340 F.3d 314, 319 (6th Cir. 2003)
- *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 287-88, 599 (2018)
- *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2025 WL 3289861 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2025)
- *Singh v. Noem*, No. 2:25-cv-157-SCM, 2026 WL 74558, at *7 (E.D. Ky. Jan. 9, 2026)
- *Haines v. Fed. Motor Carrier Safety Admin.*, 814 F.3d 417, 427 (6th Cir. 2016)
- *Choy v. Woosley*, No. 4:25-cv-197-DJH, 2026 WL 324601, at *6 (W.D. Ky. Feb. 6, 2026)
- *Brito-Goncalvez v. Field Office Director*, No. 1:26-cv-94, 2026 WL 1077448, at *3, *5 (S.D. Ohio Apr. 21, 2026)
- *Pambukhchyan v. United States Immigration & Customs Enforcement*, No. 26-0136, 2026 WL 980250, at *3 (W.D. La. Mar. 23, 2026)
- *Paredes Padilla v. Galovich*, No. 25-cv-865-jdp, 2025 WL 3640960, at *3 (W.D. Wis. Dec. 16, 2025)
- *Matter of M-S*, 27 I&N Dec. 509, 510, 515 (A.G. 2019)
- *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 523 (2003)
- *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 690, 701 (2001)