

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

Ricardo Paumier Sanchez v. Kevin Raycraft et al.

No. 1:25-cv-1908 (W.D. Mich. Jan. 20, 2026) · No. 1:25-cv-1908 · Decided January 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan conditionally granted Ricardo Paumier Sanchez’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The court held that detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) violated due process and ordered Respondents to provide a bond hearing under § 1226(a) within five business days or release the Petitioner, while dismissing several named Respondents.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Robert J. Jonker
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division
DECIDED	January 20, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-1908
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner brought a counseled petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, challenging his immigration detention and seeking release or a constitutionally adequate bond hearing. The district court conditionally granted the petition and dismissed several named respondents.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the legality of petitioner's detention under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and considered whether prudential exhaustion should be required. The opinion does not state a separate formal standard of review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion; persuasive value only
PARTIES	Ricardo Paumier Sanchez v. Kevin Raycraft, et al.

TOPICS

immigration detention

due process

statutory interpretation

removal proceedings

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration law

habeas corpus

constitutional law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether prudential exhaustion of administrative remedies should bar or delay petitioner's § 2241 challenge to his immigration detention.
2. Whether petitioner was detained under the mandatory-detention provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) or instead under the discretionary-detention provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).
3. Whether petitioner's detention under the § 1225(b)(2)(A) mandatory-detention framework violated the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause.
4. Whether the ICE Detroit Field Office Director was the only proper respondent in the habeas action.

HOLDINGS

1. The court declined to enforce prudential exhaustion and alternatively held that waiver of exhaustion was appropriate.
2. 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), rather than 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 ICE Detroit Field Office Director was not the only proper respondent. The court retained the Field Office Director and the Secretary of Homeland Security and dismissed the Department of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, and the Executive Office for Immigration Review as respondents.

KEY QUOTATIONS

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

“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.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Ricardo Paumier Sanchez is a Cuban citizen who entered the United States at the Brownsville, Texas Port of Entry on or about November 20, 2023. DHS issued him a notice to appear charging inadmissibility under INA § 212(a)(6)(A)(i), and he was subsequently paroled into the United States. ICE arrested him in December 2025, and he had not received a bond hearing by the time he filed his petition.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed the § 2241 petition on December 27, 2025. The court ordered respondents to show cause, respondents filed a response, and the court proceeded to the merits after declining to enforce prudential exhaustion and alternatively determining that waiver was appropriate.

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 outcome and conditions or reasons for the bond decision. The court dismissed the United States Department of Homeland Security, the United States Attorney General, and the Executive Office for Immigration Review as respondents.

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 _____ RICARDO PAUMIER SANCHEZ, Petitioner, Case No. 1:25-cv-1908 v. Honorable Robert J. Jonker 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 on December 27, 2025, by filing a counseled petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

(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, declare that Respondents’ actions to detain Petitioner violate the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment and the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), and issue a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 either ordering Respondents to release

Petitioner or ordering Respondents to conduct a bond hearing to satisfy the requirements of due process.

(Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.22–23.) In an order entered on December 31, 2025, 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. 3.) Respondents filed their response on January 6, 2026, (ECF No. 4). II. Factual Background Petitioner is a native and citizen of Cuba.

(Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.2; Notice to Appear (NTA), ECF No. 4-2, PageID.55.) Petitioner last entered the United States on or about November 20, 2023, at the Brownsville, Texas Port of Entry. (I-213, ECF No. 4-1, PageID.51.)

The Department of Homeland Security issued Petitioner a Form I-862, NTA, charging Petitioner with inadmissibility under § 212(a)(6)(A)(i) of the INA because Petitioner is an “who, at the time of application for admission, is not in possession of a valid unexpired [immigration or travel document].” (NTA, ECF No. 4-2, PageID.58.) Petitioner was subsequently “paroled... into the US.” (I-213, ECF No. 4-1, PageID.51.)¹ Petitioner was arrested by ICE agents in December 2025.

(Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.1; I- 213, ECF No. 4-1, PageID.51.) He has not been provided with a bond hearing. (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.3.) 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 1 The parties do not contend that Petitioner’s parole remained in effect at the time of his December 2025 arrest. 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 less than two months.

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 all of the other named Respondents. The Court concludes that the ICE Detroit 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 ICE Detroit Field Office Director and the Secretary for the Department 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 20, 2026 /s/ Robert J. Jonker Robert J. Jonker 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.