

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
TEXAS, HOUSTON DIVISION**

Abraham Flores Carranza v. Raymond Thompson, et al.

Carranza v. Thompson · No. 4:26-CV-01896 · Decided March 25, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas denied and dismissed without prejudice Abraham Flores Carranza’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition challenging his mandatory immigration detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b). The court held that the petitioner’s statutory arguments were foreclosed by Fifth Circuit precedent and that his due process claim was precluded at that stage by Supreme Court precedent permitting detention during removal proceedings.

OPINION

Southern District of Texas ENTERED March 25, 2026 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
ethos Clerk SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION ABRAHAM
FLORES CARRANZA, § § Petitioner, § § VS. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:26-CV-01896 §
RAYMOND THOMPSON, ef al., § § Respondents. § ORDER OF DISMISSAL The petitioner,
Abraham Flores Carranza, is a detainee in the custody of United States Department of Homeland
Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) officials.

Through counsel, he filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241,
challenging his continued detention. Doc. No. 1. The Court may dismiss a habeas petition on the
pleadings “[i]f it plainly appears from the petition and any attached exhibits that the petitioner is
not entitled to relief.” Rule 4 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases in the United States District
Courts (authorizing preliminary review and summary dismissal of habeas petitions on the
pleadings).

The pleadings reflect that Petitioner is a noncitizen who entered the United States without
inspection around 2011, was apprehended in February 2026, and is being held 1 A district court
may apply any of the rules governing habeas petitions filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 to those filed
under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. See Rule 1(b), Rules Governing § 2254 Cases in the United States
District Courts.

1/3 without bond under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b) as an applicant for admission. See Doc. No. | at 6.
Petitioner contends that he is entitled to a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), the statute
permitting discretionary bond in removal proceedings prior to a final order of removal, and that he
has been miscategorized as a detainee subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)
(2).

Petitioner's arguments regarding sections 1225 and 1226 and their implementing regulations are foreclosed by the Fifth Circuit's decision in *Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi*, 166 F.4th 494 (Sth Cir. Feb. 6, 2026). Likewise, his arguments regarding the class action in *Maldonado Bautista v. Santacruz*, --- F.Supp.3d ----, 2025 WL 3713987 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2025), fail because, among other things, they are based on an interpretation of sections 1225 and 1226 that was rejected in *Buenrostro-Mendez*.

See *Maldonado Bautista*, 2025 WL 3713987, at *8-12, appeal pending sub nom. *Bautista, et al. v. United States Department of Homeland Security, et al.*, No. 26-1044 (9th Cir. Mar. 6, 2026) (temporarily staying the declaratory judgment insofar as it extends beyond the Central District of California pending a ruling on the motion to stay).

In addition, Petitioner's Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause claim is precluded, at this juncture, by *Demore v. Kim*, 538 U.S. 510, 531 (2003), because "[d]etention during removal proceedings is a constitutionally permissible part of that process." /d. (citations omitted); see also *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. 281, 297 (2018) (explaining that *§§1225(b)(1) and 1225(b)(2) thus mandate detention of applicants for admission until certain proceedings have concluded").

2/3 Accordingly, the Court ORDERS as follows: 1. The petition (Doc. No. 1) is DENIED. 2. This case is DISMISSED without prejudice. 3. All other pending motions, if any, are DENIED as MOOT. SIGNED on this ev day of March 2026. ANDREW S. HANEN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 3/3