

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

Jesus Sanchez Romero v. Kevin Raycraft et al.

Sanchez Romero v. Raycraft · No. 1:25-cv-1567 · Decided January 13, 2026

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION _____ JESUS SANCHEZ ROMERO, Petitioner, Case No. 1:25-cv-1567 v. Honorable Jane M. Beckering KEVIN RAYCRAFT 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 November 11, 2025, by filing a counseled petition for 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 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 either ordering Respondents to release Petitioner or ordering Respondents to conduct a bond hearing to satisfy the requirements of due process.

(Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.25-26.) 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 1, 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. 11.) Respondents filed their response on December 4, 2025 (ECF No. 12), and Petitioner filed his reply on December 9, 2025 (ECF No. 13). II. Factual Background Petitioner is a native and citizen of Mexico. (Notice to Appear (NTA), ECF No. 12-1, PageID.38.) Petitioner entered the United States as a child in 1998 (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.7–9) at an unknown location without being “admitted or paroled.” (NTA, ECF No. 4-1, PageID.38.)

On April 12, 2010, Petitioner was stopped by ICE on his way to work and was taken to the Detroit Field Office, where he was processed and issued an NTA. (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.8.) Once in custody, ICE determined that Petitioner was neither a danger to the community nor a flight risk and authorized a \$3,000 bond for his release. (Id.)

The bond was paid and Petitioner was released on August 20, 2010. (Id.; Immigration Bond, ECF No. 1-2, PageID.29–31.) On November 17, 2010, Petitioner filed an application for cancellation of removal with the Detroit Immigration Court. (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.8.) Petitioner was in active removal proceedings and attended multiple hearings until March 1, 2016, at which time the immigration judge administratively closed his case based on a motion by DHS stating it was in their “best interest that [Petitioner’s] removal proceedings be administratively closed.” (Id., PageID.8–9; Mot.

To Adm. Close Proc., ECF No. 1-3, PageID.33–34.) On July 16, 2025, Petitioner’s case was re-calendared. (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.9.) In August of 2025, Petitioner was stopped by ICE agents a few blocks from his home. (Id.) Petitioner was fingerprinted and taken into custody. (Id.) Plaintiff has lived in the United States for 27 years and prior to Petitioner’s present detention, he resided in Lincoln Park, Michigan, with his three United States citizen children ages 16, 14, and 10.

(Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.8–9.) Petitioner has owned a home for 10 years and is involved with his church and community. (Id.) Petitioner is currently detained without an opportunity to post bond or be released on other conditions. (Id., PageID.1) 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 less than three months.

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.

The Court will dismiss the United States Department of Homeland Security, the Attorney General for the United States, and the Executive Office for Immigration Review 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.¹ 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. Further, the Court will dismiss the United States Department of Homeland Security, the Attorney General for the United States, and the Executive Office for Immigration Review as Respondents.

Dated: January 13, 2026 /s/ Jane M. Beckering Jane M. Beckering United States District Judge 1
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.