

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
GEORGIA, COLUMBUS DIVISION

Y.O.P. v. Warden, Stewart Detention Center

Case No. 4:26-cv-17-CDL-AGH (M.D. Ga. Jan. 12, 2026) · No. 4:26-cv-17-CDL-AGH · Decided January 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia granted a habeas petition in part, holding that the petitioner was detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) rather than mandatory detention provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). The court ordered the respondent to provide a bond hearing to determine whether the petitioner could be released on bond under § 1226(a)(2) and applicable regulations.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Columbus Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Clay D. Land
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Columbus Division
DECIDED	January 12, 2026
DOCKET	4:26-cv-17-CDL-AGH
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner filed a 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition challenging immigration detention and seeking a bond hearing and possible pre-removal release.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the habeas application and determined the statutory basis for petitioner's detention.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- immigration detention
- removal proceedings
- immigration
- remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether petitioner was subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) or § 1225(b)(2).
2. Whether petitioner was entitled to a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) while removal proceedings were pending.
3. Whether any purported membership in the bond-eligible class certified in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz* affected the court's decision.

HOLDINGS

1. Petitioner was detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), not under the mandatory-detention provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).
2. Respondent must provide petitioner with a bond hearing to determine whether petitioner may be released on bond under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2) and the applicable regulations.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner was detained at the Stewart Detention Center while awaiting removal proceedings. He sought habeas relief because the respondent refused to provide a bond hearing or an opportunity for pre-removal release. The respondent contended that detention was mandatory under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and/or § 1225(b)(2).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Y.O.P. was detained at the Stewart Detention Center while awaiting removal proceedings. The district court reviewed the habeas application and granted relief to the extent that the respondent must provide a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2) and applicable regulations.

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

CASES CITED

- *J.A.M. v. Streeval*, No. 4:25-CV-342-CDL, 2025 WL 3050094 (M.D. Ga. Nov. 1, 2025)
- *P.R.S. v. Streeval*, No. 4:25-CV-330-CDL, 2025 WL 3269947 (M.D. Ga. Nov. 24, 2025)
- *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, 2025 WL 3713987 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025)
- *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 446 (2004)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
COLUMBUS DIVISION Y.O.P.; Petitioner,: v.: Case No. 4:26-cv-17-CDL-AGH: 28 U.S.C. §

ORDER Petitioner is a detainee at the Stewart Detention Center awaiting removal proceedings. Petitioner seeks habeas corpus relief based on Respondent's refusal to provide Petitioner with a bond hearing and the opportunity for pre-removal release while the removal proceedings are pending.

Respondent contend that Petitioner's detention is mandatory under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and/or 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). The Court reviewed Petitioner's application. The Court finds that Petitioner is currently detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and therefore not subject to mandatory detention as required by 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).¹ See *J.A.M. v. Streeval*, No. 4:25-CV- 342-CDL, 2025 WL 3050094 (M.D.

Ga. Nov. 1, 2025); *P.R.S. v. Streeval*, No. 4:25-CV- 1 To the extent that the parties make arguments based on a belief that Petitioner is a member of the "Bond Eligible Class" certified in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, No. 5:25-CV-01873-SSS-BFM, 2025 WL 3713987 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025), any membership in that class has no effect on the Court's decision for several reasons.

First, only the named petitioners sought habeas relief in *Maldonado Bautista*. Second, the named petitioners did not seek nationwide habeas relief. Third, in granting declaratory relief, the California District Court correctly noted that habeas relief could only be afforded to class members who were located within the boundaries of the Central District of California.

Id. at *14 (citing *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426, 446 (2004) for the proposition that "habeas jurisdiction lie[s] 'in only one district: the district of confinement'"). 330-CDL, 2025 WL 3269947 (M.D. Ga. Nov. 24, 2025).

Accordingly, Petitioner's application for habeas corpus relief is granted to the extent that Respondent shall provide Petitioner with a bond hearing to determine if the Petitioner may be released on bond under § 1226(a)(2) and the applicable regulations. See 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1 & 1236.1.2 IT IS SO ORDERED, this 12th day of January, 2026. s/Clay D. Land CLAY D. LAND U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA 2 The brevity of this order is appropriate given that the issue presented is exactly the same as the issue previously decided on numerous occasions by the Court and yet Respondent insists upon denying the relief that the Court has found is required.