

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

Daritza Esquerra-Toledo v. Kevin Raycraft

Esquerra-Toledo · No. 1:26-cv-434 · Decided February 25, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan conditionally granted Daritza Esquerra-Toledo’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 § 1225(b)(2)(A), governs her detention and ordered Respondent to provide a bond hearing within five business days or release her, subject to filing a compliance status report.

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	February 25, 2026
DOCKET	1:26-cv-434
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging her immigration detention and requesting release or a bond hearing.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the legality of Petitioner’s detention under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and considered whether the detention violated the Constitution or laws of the United States.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion

TOPICS

- immigration detention
- removal proceedings
- due process
- statutory interpretation
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- immigration law
- habeas corpus
- constitutional law
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether prudential exhaustion should bar Petitioner's § 2241 challenge to her 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. What relief should be ordered if the detention was unlawful.

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 § 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 § 1225(b)(2)(A) violated the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court will order Respondent 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 with notice to the Parties as soon as practicable, no later than 24 hours prior to the scheduled hearing, or, in the alternative, immediately release Petitioner from custody.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner, a native and citizen of Cuba, entered the United States without inspection in June 2022 and was charged as inadmissible under INA § 212(a)(6)(A)(i). DHS initially released her on her own recognizance, and her application to adjust status remained pending. ICE later arrested her at the Macomb County Jail after her release on local criminal charges, and she was detained at the North Lake Processing Center while removal proceedings were pending before the Detroit Immigration Court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed a counseled § 2241 petition challenging the lawfulness of her detention. The court ordered Respondent to show cause; Respondent filed a response and Petitioner filed a reply. The district court declined to enforce prudential exhaustion, or alternatively waived exhaustion, reached the merits, and conditionally granted the petition.

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Respondent must provide Petitioner with a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within five business days of the opinion and judgment, with notice to the parties as soon as practicable and no later than 24 hours before the hearing, or immediately release Petitioner. Respondent must file a status report within six business days certifying compliance and stating whether the hearing occurred, whether bond was granted or denied, and the conditions or reasons for that result.

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)
- Antelex 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. Department of Homeland Security, No. 1:25-cv-1578, 2025 WL 3558128 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 12, 2025)
- Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi, No. 25-20496, 2026 WL 323330 (5th Cir. Feb. 6, 2026)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION _____ DARITZA ESQUERRA-TOLEDO, Petitioner, Case No. 1:26-cv-434 v. Honorable Paul L. Maloney KEVIN RAYCRAFT, Respondent. _____/ 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 a 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 her 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 Respondent to release Petitioner or to conduct a bond hearing for Petitioner's removal proceedings.

(Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.13–14.) In an order entered on February 10, 2026, the Court directed Respondent 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.) Respondent filed his response on February 13, 2026, (ECF No. 4), and Petitioner filed her reply on February 17, 2026, (ECF No. 5).

II. Factual Background Petitioner is a native and citizen of Cuba. (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.1; Notice to Appear (NTA), ECF No. 4-1, PageID.89.) Petitioner entered the United States in June

2022 without inspection. (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.2; NTA, ECF No. 4-1, PageID.89.)

After Petitioner entered the United States, Department of Homeland Security (DHS) agents encountered Petitioner, and at that time, DHS issued Petitioner a Form I-862, NTA, charging Petitioner with inadmissibility under § 212(a)(6)(A)(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.” (NTA, ECF No. 4-1, PageID.89.)

DHS then released Petitioner into the United States on her own recognizance “[i]n accordance with section 236 of the [INA].” (Order Release Recognizance, ECF No. 4-3.) Thereafter, Petitioner filed a “Form I-485, Application to Adjust to a Lawful Permanent Resident,” which remains pending. (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.7.)

On January 16, 2026, ICE arrested Petitioner “at the Macomb County Jail after she was released on local criminal charges.” (2026 Form I-213, ECF No. 4-2, PageID.94.) Petitioner’s removal proceedings are now pending before the Detroit Immigration Court. (See Automatic Case Information, ECF No. 4-4.) 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 Respondent argues that the Court should deny Petitioner’s request for habeas corpus relief because Petitioner has not exhausted her administrative remedies. Specifically, Respondent argues that Petitioner should pursue a bond hearing and, if necessary, appeal any unfavorable decision to the Board of Immigration Appeals.

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 Respondent has 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). Respondent, however, contends that Petitioner meets every element for detention under § 1225(b)(2), and that the statute's structure and history support Respondents' interpretation.¹ 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).² B. Fifth Amendment Due Process Considerations Petitioner also argues that her detention violates the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause.

Respondent counters Petitioner's arguments by stating that Petitioner has received notice of the charges against her, 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 relatively short 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, 1 Respondent does not argue that Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c). 2 The Court is aware of *Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi*, No. 25-20496, --- F.4th ---, 2026 WL 323330 (5th Cir. Feb. 6, 2026), which was recently issued by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. At this time, this non-binding case does not change the Court's analysis.

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.

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 Respondent 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 with notice to the Parties as soon as practicable, no later than 24 hours prior to the scheduled hearing, or, in the alternative, immediately release Petitioner from custody.³ The Court will also order Respondent 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. Dated: February 25, 2026 /s/ Paul L. Maloney Paul L. Maloney United States District Judge 3 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.