

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

Jaime Hernandez Claudio v. Kristi Noem et al.

Hernandez Claudio v. Noem · No. 1:25-cv-1661 · Decided December 17, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan conditionally granted Jaime Hernandez Claudio’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 the petitioner’s 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 the petitioner, 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	Robert J. Jonker
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division
DECIDED	December 17, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-1661
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner filed a counseled combined 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 opinion applies the standard governing habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for custody allegedly violating the Constitution or laws of the United States. No more specific standard of review is stated.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court opinion with no reporter citation and no stated precedential designation.
PARTIES	Jaime Hernandez Claudio v. Kristi Noem et al.

TOPICS

immigration detention

removal proceedings

procedural due process

statutory interpretation

remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration detention

habeas corpus

constitutional law

civil procedure

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should enforce prudential exhaustion of administrative remedies before considering petitioner's § 2241 challenge to immigration detention.
2. Whether 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) or 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) governs the detention of a noncitizen who has resided in the United States and was apprehended within the United States.
3. Whether petitioner's detention under the mandatory-detention framework of § 1225(b)(2)(A) violates the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause.
4. Whether the Detroit ICE Field Office Director is the only proper respondent, or whether the Secretary of Homeland Security may also remain as a respondent.

HOLDINGS

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

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner is a Guatemalan national who entered the United States without inspection in 2019 and lived in Illinois with his United States-citizen partner and children. He was the primary financial support for the family and worked as a construction worker. ICE encountered and arrested him without a warrant on October 21, 2025, issued a notice to appear charging inadmissibility under INA §§ 212(a)(6)(A)(i) and 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I), and detained him pending removal proceedings.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner was arrested by ICE on October 21, 2025, and detained at the North Lake Processing Center. He filed this action on December 5, 2025. The court ordered respondents to show cause on December 9, respondents filed a response on December 12, and petitioner filed a reply the same day. The court conditionally granted habeas relief and ordered a bond hearing or immediate release.

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 petitioner from custody. Respondents must file a status report within six business days certifying compliance and stating whether the 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)
- 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 _____ JAIME HERNANDEZ CLAUDIO, Petitioner, Case No. 1:25-cv-1661 v. Honorable Robert J. Jonker 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 5, 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, accept jurisdiction over this action, 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 for Petitioner’s removal proceedings.

(Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.32.) In the petition, Petitioner also sought a temporary restraining order compelling Respondents to conduct a bond hearing to ensure his due process rights. (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 9, 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 December 12, 2025, (ECF No. 4), and Petitioner filed his reply later that same day, (ECF No. 5).

II. Factual Background Petitioner is a native and citizen of Guatemala. (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.4; Notice to Appear (NTA), ECF No. 4-1, PageID.68.) Petitioner entered the United States in 2019 without inspection. (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.4; NTA, ECF No. 4-1, PageID.68.) Prior to Petitioner's present detention, he resided in Chicago, Illinois, with his United States citizen partner and two United States citizen children.

(Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.4.) Petitioner "also cares for his fiancé's four other children, all U.S. Citizens." (Id. (spelling in original retained).) Petitioner "is the primary financial support for the family," and "has been gainfully employed since his entry into the United States." (Id., PageID.2, 4.) Petitioner works as a construction worker, and on October 21, 2025, while Petitioner was working outside, ICE encountered him and arrested him without a warrant.

(Id.) At that time, ICE issued Petitioner a Form I-862, NTA, charging Petitioner with inadmissibility under §§ 212(a)(6)(A)(i) and 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) of the 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," and "who, at the time of application for admission, is not in possession of a valid unexpired [immigration or travel document]." (NTA, ECF No. 4-1, PageID.71.)

Petitioner is scheduled for a master calendar hearing on January 29, 2026, in the Detroit Immigration Court. (Notice of In-Person Hearing, ECF No. 4-2, 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 short period 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 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 the United States Secretary of Homeland Security as a Respondent.

The Court concludes that the Detroit ICE 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 Detroit ICE Field Office Director and the United States Secretary 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.

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: December 17, 2025 /s/ Robert J. Jonker Robert J. Jonker United States District Judge