

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Fernando Castillo Fuentes v. Luis Soto, et al.

Castillo Fuentes · No. 2:25-cv-18842 (JXN) · Decided January 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The court grants Fernando Castillo Fuentes’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging his detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) without an individualized bond hearing. Relying on its prior decision in Velasquez v. Noem, the court holds that because Fuentes had been residing in the United States and was arrested in the interior, his detention is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), and orders respondents to provide an individualized bond hearing.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Julien Xavier Neals
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
DECIDED	January 8, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-18842 (JXN)
DISPOSITION	granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, arguing that his continued immigration detention without an individualized bond hearing violated due process. Respondents submitted a letter response and did not dispute the material facts.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court interpreted the statutory detention provisions and applied its prior statutory interpretation in Velasquez; no separate standard of review was expressly stated.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential district court memorandum and order
PARTIES	Fernando Castillo Fuentes v. Luis Soto, et al.

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- immigration law
- habeas corpus
- constitutional law
- administrative law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a noncitizen who entered the United States without inspection in 2004 and was arrested in the interior in 2025 may be held under the mandatory-detention provision of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), rather than the discretionary detention authority of § 1226(a).
2. Whether Petitioner was entitled to an individualized bond hearing before an immigration judge under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).
3. Whether the court was required to defer to the Board of Immigration Appeals' interpretation of § 1225(b)(2) in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*.

HOLDINGS

1. A noncitizen who has long resided in the United States and is arrested in the interior, rather than while seeking admission or arriving at the border, is detained under the discretionary authority of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), not the mandatory-detention provision of § 1225(b)(2).
2. Respondents must provide Petitioner with an individualized bond hearing before an immigration judge under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), at which the judge must assess flight risk and danger to the community.
3. The court was not required to defer to the BIA's interpretation of § 1225(b)(2) because the court's role was to interpret the statutory text enacted by Congress.

KEY QUOTATIONS

*“The line historically drawn between these two sections . . . is that section 1225 governs detention of non-citizens ‘seeking admission into the country,’ whereas section 1226 governs detention of non-citizens ‘already in the country.’” (at *8)*

“§ 1225 as the detention statute for noncitizens affirmatively “seeking admission” into the United States, and § 1226 as the detention statute for noncitizens who are “already in the country.”” (at 289)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner, a citizen of Mexico, entered the United States without inspection in December 2004. ICE arrested him on December 20, 2025, and detained him continuously thereafter. He was denied an individualized bond hearing because Respondents classified him as subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Fernando Castillo Fuentes filed a § 2241 petition challenging his detention under the mandatory-detention provision of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). The District of New Jersey ordered Respondents to answer; Respondents filed a letter response relying on the same statutory interpretation rejected by the court in *Velasquez v. Noem*. The court granted the petition, ordered Respondents to treat Fuentes as detained under § 1226(a), and required an individualized bond hearing.

DISPOSITION

granted

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Respondents must treat Petitioner as detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and provide an individualized bond hearing before an immigration judge as soon as practicable and no later than seven days after January 8, 2026. The immigration judge must assess whether Petitioner presents a flight risk or danger to the community. Respondents must file written notice of the hearing's outcome within three days after the hearing, and the Clerk was directed to close the case.

CASES CITED

- Velasquez v. Noem, No. 25-16797, 2025 WL 3653657 (D.N.J. Dec. 17, 2025)
- Matter of Yajure Hurtado, 29 I&N Dec. 216 (BIA 2025)
- Martinez v. Hyde, No. 25-cv-11613, 2025 WL 2084238, at *8 (D. Mass. July 24, 2025)
- Jennings v. Rodriguez, 583 U.S. 281, 288–89, 303 (2018)
- Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft, 2025 WL 2496379, at *8 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025)
- Lopez Benitez v. Francis, No. 25-cv-5937, 2025 WL 2371588, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2025)
- Soto, 2025 WL 2976572, at *7
- Belsai D.S. v. Bondi, No. 25-cv-3682, 2025 WL 2802947, at *6 (D. Minn. Oct. 1, 2025)
- Zumba, 2025 WL 2753496, at *3
- Salazar v. Dedos, No. 25-cv-835, 2025 WL 2676729 (D.N.M. Sept. 17, 2025)
- Lepe v. Andrews, No. 25-cv-01163, 2025 WL 2716910 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2025)
- Roman v. Noem, No. 25-cv-01684, 2025 WL 2710211 (D. Nev. Sept. 23, 2025)
- Giron Reyes v. Lyons, No. 25-cv-4048, 2025 WL 2712427 (N.D. Iowa Sept. 23, 2025)
- Singh v. Lewis, No. 25-cv-0096, 2025 WL 2699219 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 22, 2025)
- Barrera v. Tindall, No. 25-cv-541, 2025 WL 2690565 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 19, 2025)
- Hasan v. Crawford, No. 25-cv-1408, 2025 WL 2682255 (E.D. Va. Sept. 19, 2025)
- Vazquez v. Feeley, No. 2:25-cv-01542, 2025 WL 2676082 (D. Nev. Sept. 17, 2025)
- Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo, 603 U.S. 369, 385 (2024)
- Decatur v. Paulding, 39 U.S. 497, 503 (1840)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY FERNANDO CASTILLO FUENTES, Civil Action No. 25-18842 (JXN) Petitioner, v. MEMORANDUM AND ORDER LUIS SOTO, et al., Respondents. NEALS, District Judge Before the Court is Petitioner Fernando Castillo Fuentes’ (“Petitioner”) Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (“Petition”) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging his continued detention by immigration authorities without an individualized bond hearing (ECF No. 1) and Respondents’ letter response (ECF No. 5).

Petitioner, a citizen of Mexico, entered the United States without inspection in December 2004. (ECF No. 5 at 1.) On December 20, 2025, Petitioner was arrested by Immigration Customs and Enforcement (“ICE”) agents. (Id.) Petitioner has been detained in ICE custody since his arrest. (Id.) Following Petitioner’s arrest and detention by ICE, he has not been afforded an individualized bond hearing because he is being held in mandatory detention under 8 U.S. C. § 1225(b)(2).

(Id.) The Court ordered Respondents to file an answer. (See ECF No. 3.) On January 2, 2026, Respondents filed a letter response. (ECF No. 5.) The Petition contends Respondents have violated Petitioner’s due process rights. (See generally ECF No. 1.) Respondents do not dispute the salient facts and acknowledge that here they assert the same position they have in many other similar cases in this District, including the position they took before this Court in the recent matter *Velasquez v. Noem*, No. 25-16797, 2025 WL 3653657 (D.N.J.

Dec. 17, 2025). In *Velasquez*, Respondents argued the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) has implemented a new policy interpreting the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) § 235, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), to require mandatory detention of noncitizens who entered the United States without admission or inspection and to render them ineligible for release on bond, a position that the Board of Immigration Appeals recently adopted in *Matter of Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I&N Dec.

216 (BIA 2025). See *Velasquez*, 2025 WL 3653657, at *2–4. In *Velasquez*, this Court rejected Hurtado’s interpretation of 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). *Id.* at *4–5. In a factually similar situation, the Court held that *Fuentes Velasquez* was unlawfully held in mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2) and must be treated as being held under the discretionary authority of 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).

See *id.* In *Velasquez*, this Court explained the following: The issue of whether Petitioner is properly detained under § 1225(b) or § 1226(a) is similar to that of many cases in this District and around the country. “The line historically drawn between these two sections... is that section 1225 governs detention of non-citizens ‘seeking admission into the country,’ whereas section 1226 governs detention of non-citizens ‘already in the country.’” *Martinez v. Hyde*, No. 25-cv-11613, 2025 WL 2084238, at *8 (D.

Mass. July 24, 2025) (citing *Jennings*, 583 U.S. at 288–89); see also *Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft*, 2025 WL 2496379, at *8 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025) (“There can be no genuine dispute that Section 1226(a), and not Section 1225(b)(2)(A), applies to a noncitizen who has resided in this country for over twenty-six years and was already within the United States when apprehended and arrested during a traffic stop, and not upon arrival at the border.”). “[T]he provisions at issue here are mutually exclusive—a noncitizen cannot be subject to both mandatory detention under § 1225 and discretionary detention under § 1226....” *Lopez Benitez v. Francis*, No. 25-cv-5937, 2025 WL 2371588, at *4 (S.D.N.Y.

Aug. 13, 2025). For nearly 30 years, § 1225 has applied to noncitizens who are either seeking entry to the United States or have a close nexus to the border, and § 1226 has applied to those aliens arrested within the interior of the United States.

The Supreme Court in *Jennings* explicitly adopted this distinction, describing § 1225 as the detention statute for noncitizens affirmatively “seeking admission” into the United States, and § 1226 as the detention statute for noncitizens who are “already in the country.” 583 U.S. at 289. And although the *Jennings* Court characterizes § 1225(b)(2) as the “catchall” detention provision for noncitizens who are “seeking admission,” it identifies § 1226(a) as the “default rule” for the arrest, detention, and release of non-criminal aliens who are already present in the United States.

Id. at 303. The vast majority of courts confronting this precise issue have rejected Respondents’ interpretation, as well as the BIA’s interpretation in *Hurtado*, as contradictory to the plain text of § 1225.1 See, e.g., *Soto*, 2025 WL 2976572, at *7 (finding that § 1225(b)(2)(A) applies only to noncitizens who are actively, i.e., affirmatively, “seeking admission” to the United States and not petitioners who have been residing in the United States); *Belsai D.S. v. Bondi*, No. 25-cv-3682, 2025 WL 2802947 at * 6 (D.

Minn. Oct. 1, 2025) (noting that “the government’s proposed interpretation of § 1225(b) [is] at odds with the context and structure of the provisions governing detention of noncitizens who are arriving at the border and those who are already present in the country”); *Zumba*, 2025 WL 2753496 at * 3 (noting that “up until July 8 the predominant form of detention authority for petitioner and other noncitizens arrested in the interior of the United States was § 1226(a)”); *Salazar v. Dedos*, No. 25-cv-835, 2025 WL 2676729 (D.N.M.

Sept. 17, 2025); *Lepe v. Andrews*, No. 25-cv-01163, 2025 WL 2716910 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2025); *Roman v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-01684, 2025 WL 2710211 (D. Nev. Sept. 23, 2025); *Giron Reyes v. Lyons*, No. 25- cv-4048, 2025 WL 2712427 (N.D. Iowa Sept. 23, 2025); *Singh v. Lewis*, No. 25-cv-0096, 2025 WL 2699219 (W.D. Ky. Sept. 22, 2025); *Barrera v. Tindall*, No. 25-cv-541, 2025 WL 2690565 (W.D.

Ky. Sept. 19, 2025); *Hasan v. Crawford*, No. 25-cv-1408, 2025 WL 2682255 (E.D. Va. Sept. 19, 2025); *Vazquez v. Feeley*, No. 2:25-cv-01542, 2025 WL 2676082 (D. Nev. Sept. 17, 2025); [collecting additional cases]. *Id.* at *3–4. 1 This Court is not required to defer to the BIA’s interpretation of § 1225 because “[w]hen the meaning of a statute [is] at issue, the judicial role [is] to ‘interpret the act of Congress, in order to ascertain the rights of the parties.’” *Loper Bright Enters. v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369, 385 (2024) (quoting *Decatur v. Paulding*, 39 U.S. 497, 503 (1840)).

Based on this Court’s statutory interpretation in *Velasquez*, the Court finds the facts asserted in the Petition establish Petitioner’s detention is authorized only by 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), and not §

1225(b)(2). Accordingly IT IS, on this 8th day of January 2026, ORDERED that the Petition (ECF No. 1) is GRANTED; and it is further ORDERED that Respondents shall treat Petitioner as detained under 28 U.S.C. § 1226(a); and it is further ORDERED that, as soon as practicable but no later than 7 days from the date of this Order, Respondents shall provide Petitioner with an individualized bond hearing in accordance with 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) before an immigration judge who shall assess whether he presents a flight risk or a danger to the community; and it is further ORDERED that within three (3) days of that bond hearing, Respondents shall file a written notice of the outcome of that proceeding with the Court; and it is finally ORDERED the Clerk of Court shall serve a copy of this Order and the accompanying Opinion upon the parties electronically and CLOSE the case. _____ JULIEN XAVIER NEALS United States District Judge