

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

Nezdet Ozdemir v. Kristi Noem et al.

No. 1:25-cv-1910 (W.D. Mich. Jan. 22, 2026) · No. 1:25-cv-1910 · Decided January 22, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan conditionally granted Nezdet Ozdemir’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 the mandatory-detention provision in § 1225(b)(2)(A), governs his detention and concluded that his current detention violated the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause. Respondents were ordered to provide a bond hearing within five business days or release him, and to file a compliance status report.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Jane M. Beckering                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| DECIDED               | January 22, 2026                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| DOCKET                | 1:25-cv-1910                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| DISPOSITION           | writ_granted                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Petitioner filed a counseled petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and a complaint seeking emergency injunctive relief, challenging his immigration detention and requesting a bond hearing. After ordering Respondents to show cause, the court conditionally granted the habeas petition. |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | The court reviewed the legality of Petitioner’s custody under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and considered whether prudential exhaustion should be required or waived.                                                                                                                                                         |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | nonprecedential                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| PARTIES               | Nezdet Ozdemir v. Kristi Noem et al.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |

TOPICS

immigration detention

procedural due process

removal proceedings

statutory interpretation

remedies

## PRACTICE AREAS

immigration law

federal habeas corpus

constitutional law

administrative law

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether prudential exhaustion of administrative remedies should be enforced against Ozdemir's § 2241 challenge to his immigration detention.
2. Whether 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), rather than the mandatory-detention provision in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), governs the detention of a noncitizen who had resided in the United States and was apprehended within the United States.
3. Whether Ozdemir's detention under the mandatory-detention framework of § 1225(b)(2)(A) violates the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause.
4. Whether the ICE Detroit Field Office Director is the only proper respondent in the habeas action.

## HOLDINGS

1. The court declined to enforce prudential exhaustion against Ozdemir and alternatively concluded that waiver of exhaustion was appropriate.
2. Section 1226(a), rather than § 1225(b)(2)(A), governs the detention of noncitizens such as Ozdemir who had resided in the United States and were already within the United States when apprehended and arrested.
3. Ozdemir's current detention under the mandatory-detention framework of § 1225(b)(2)(A) violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.
4. The ICE Detroit Field Office Director is not the only proper respondent; the court retained the Field Office Director and the Secretary of Homeland Security as respondents.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“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”* (Discussion § V.B)

*“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

Ozdemir is a native and citizen of Turkey who entered the United States in October 2024 without inspection and was placed in removal proceedings based on alleged inadmissibility for lacking valid immigration or travel documents. He was initially released pending an immigration hearing and later filed a pending asylum application. After his November 25, 2025 arrest for driving under the influence, ICE arrested him at the Genesee

County Jail on November 26, 2025. The opinion states that the court had no information showing that Ozdemir had been convicted of a crime.

#### PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Ozdemir was detained by ICE after being arrested for driving under the influence, while removal proceedings and his asylum application remained pending. He filed this § 2241 action on December 29, 2025. The court ordered a prompt response, considered the parties' filings, declined to enforce prudential exhaustion, and ordered a bond hearing or release.

#### DISPOSITION

writ\_granted

#### REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Respondents must provide Ozdemir with a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within five business days of the Opinion and Judgment or immediately release him from custody. Respondents must file a status report within six business days certifying compliance and stating whether a bond hearing occurred, whether bond was granted or denied, the conditions of any bond, or the reasons for denial.

#### 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 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 \_\_\_\_\_ NEZDET OZDEMIR, Petitioner, Case No. 1:25-cv-1910 v. Honorable Jane M. Beckering KRISTI NOEM 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 29, 2025, by filing a counseled combined petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and complaint for emergency injunctive relief.

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

(Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.32.) Petitioner also sought a temporary restraining order compelling Respondents to conduct a bond hearing to satisfy the requirements of due process. (Id., PageID.2.) Alternatively, Petitioner asked the Court to order Respondents to show cause, within three days, why the petition should not be granted. (Id.)

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 2, 2026, (ECF No. 4.), and Petitioner filed his reply on January 2, 2026, (ECF No. 5).

II. Factual Background Petitioner is a native and citizen of Turkey. (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.4; Notice to Appear (NTA), ECF No. 4-1, PageID.64.) Petitioner entered the United States in October 2024 "without inspection." (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.4.)

On October 31, 2024, United States Border Patrol agents arrested Petitioner near San Ysidro, California, and issued Petitioner a Form I-862, Notice to Appear (NTA), charging Petitioner with inadmissibility under § 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) of the INA because Petitioner is an immigrant "who, at the time of application for admission, is not in possession of a valid unexpired [immigration or travel document]." (2024 I-213, ECF No. 4-2, PageID.69; NTA, ECF No. 4-1, PageID.64.)

Petitioner was released pending an immigration hearing. (2025 I-213, ECF No. 4-3, PageID.73.) He subsequently filed an application for asylum, which remains pending. (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.2.) On November 25, 2025, Petitioner was arrested for driving under the influence by the Richfield Township Police Department. (2025 I-213, ECF No. 4-3, PageID.73.)<sup>1</sup> On November 1 The Court has not been provided with any information to suggest that Petitioner has been convicted of any crime.

26, 2025, ICE agents arrested Petitioner at the Genesee County Jail. (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.2; 2025 I-213, ECF No. 4-3, PageID.73.) 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 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 a relatively short period of 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, 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. 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.<sup>2</sup> 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. Dated: January 22, 2026 /s/ Jane M. Beckering Jane M. Beckering 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.

