

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

Uriel Mendoza Araiza v. Laura Hermosillo, Seattle Field Office
Director, Enforcement and Removal Operations, U.S. Immigration
and Customs Enforcement (Acting), et al.

Case No. 2:25-cv-02139-TL (W.D. Wash. Dec. 8, 2025) · No. 2:25-cv-02139-TL · Decided December 8, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Washington granted Uriel Mendoza Araiza’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging his immigration detention. The court treated him as a member of the Bond Denial Class identified in Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock and concluded that he was detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), rather than subject to mandatory detention under §§ 1225(b)(2) or 1226(c). The court ordered his release unless respondents conducted a bond hearing under § 1226(a) within seven days.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Tana Lin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
DECIDED	December 8, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-02139-TL
DISPOSITION	granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging his mandatory immigration detention. After briefing, the district court granted the petition and ordered release unless Respondents provided a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A habeas petitioner must establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion

PARTIES

Uriel Mendoza Araiza v. Laura Hermosillo, Seattle Field Office
Director, Enforcement and Removal Operations, U.S. Immigration and
Customs Enforcement (Acting), et al.

TOPICS

federal habeas corpus

immigration detention

removal proceedings

statutory interpretation

immigration

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration detention

federal habeas corpus

removal proceedings

statutory interpretation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Laken Riley Act applies retroactively to Petitioner's 2006 shoplifting conviction.
2. Whether Petitioner is a member of the Bond Denial Class defined in *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*.
3. Whether Petitioner is detained in violation of the Immigration and Nationality Act and is entitled to a bond redetermination hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).

HOLDINGS

1. Because Respondents agreed that Petitioner was a member of the Rodriguez Vazquez Bond Denial Class, the court treated Respondents as having conceded that the Laken Riley Act did not apply to Petitioner or his 2006 conviction.
2. Petitioner was detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and was not subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Bond Denial Class members are detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and are not subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). The Court further declares that the Tacoma Immigration Court’s practice of denying bond to Bond Denial Class members on the basis of § 1225(b)(2) violates the Immigration and Nationality Act.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Uriel Mendoza Araiza, a native and citizen of Mexico, entered the United States without inspection more than twenty years before the proceedings and had no lawful immigration status. ICE apprehended him in Washington on September 29, 2025, and DHS charged him as inadmissible for entering without inspection. An immigration judge denied bond based on mandatory-detention provisions, relying in part on Araiza's 2006 California shoplifting conviction.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

ICE apprehended Petitioner on September 29, 2025, and placed him in removal proceedings as inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i). An immigration judge denied bond for lack of jurisdiction, concluding that

Petitioner was subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. §§ 1225(b)(2)(A) and 1226(c)(1)(E), as amended by the Laken Riley Act, based on his 2006 shoplifting conviction. Petitioner filed this habeas action on October 30, 2025; the petition became ripe on November 24, 2025, and the court granted relief on December 8, 2025.

DISPOSITION

granted

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Respondents must release Petitioner unless they administer a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven days of the order. At the hearing, Respondents may not conclude or argue that 8 U.S.C. §§ 1226(c) or 1225(b)(2) govern Petitioner's detention and must treat him as detained under § 1226(a).

CASES CITED

- Davis v. Woodford, 384 F.3d 628, 638 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock, No. C25-5240, 2025 WL 2782499 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 30, 2025)
- Hernandez Ramos v. Hermosillo, No. C25-2273, 2025 WL 3251159, at *2 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 21, 2025)