

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

Guadalupe Jara Dominguez v. Laura Hermosillo, et al.

Case No. 2:25-cv-02351-TMC · No. 2:25-cv-02351-TMC · Decided December 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Washington grants Guadalupe Jara Dominguez’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The court holds that his detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2) is unlawful, excuses exhaustion of administrative remedies, and orders Respondents to release him or provide a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within fourteen days of his request.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Tiffany M. Cartwright
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
DECIDED	December 4, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-02351-TMC
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging mandatory immigration detention and seeking release or a bond hearing.
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. The court also applied Article III ripeness principles and considered whether administrative exhaustion should be excused.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status is not specified in the opinion.
PARTIES	Guadalupe Jara Dominguez v. Laura Hermosillo, et al.

TOPICS

- immigration detention
- federal habeas corpus
- exhaustion of remedies
- statutory interpretation
- removal proceedings

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration detention

federal habeas corpus

administrative law

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the habeas petition was ripe even though petitioner had not yet received or requested a bond hearing.
2. Whether petitioner was required to exhaust administrative remedies before seeking habeas relief.
3. Whether a person who entered the United States without inspection, was not apprehended upon arrival, and later resided in the United States could be subjected to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), or instead was entitled to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).
4. Whether the appropriate habeas remedy was immediate release or an opportunity for a bond hearing.

HOLDINGS

1. The petition was ripe for review because petitioner was suffering a concrete and actual injury from ongoing detention under a mandatory-detention policy that the court had already determined violated the INA; the absence of a prior bond hearing did not make the controversy abstract or hypothetical.
2. Petitioner was not required to exhaust administrative remedies before seeking habeas relief because exhaustion was excused as futile.
3. Because petitioner entered the United States without inspection but was not apprehended upon arrival and had resided in the United States, he was not seeking admission and could not be subjected to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2). His detention was instead governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), which permits release on bond.
4. Immediate release was not required at that stage; a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) was sufficient relief to correct the unlawful detention.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“There is nothing abstract or hypothetical about this dispute. Jara Dominguez is suffering a concrete and actual injury—he is detained in federal immigration custody right now, based on a mandatory detention policy that this Court has already concluded violates the INA.” (Section III.A)

“Jara Dominguez need not go through a futile exercise of requesting a bond hearing while still subject to unlawful mandatory detention in order to seek habeas relief.” (Section III.A)

“Within fourteen days of receiving Petitioner Guadalupe Jara Dominguez’s request for a bond hearing, Respondents must either release him or provide him a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Guadalupe Jara Dominguez entered the United States in 1999 and resided in Washington before immigration officers apprehended him on November 6, 2025. He was detained at the Northwest Immigration and Customs Enforcement Processing Center on the charge that he was unlawfully present without admission or parole. He

had not received a custody redetermination or bond hearing, and respondents acknowledged that he was being detained under a policy treating persons who entered without inspection as subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Jara Dominguez filed a § 2241 habeas petition after being detained by immigration authorities without receiving a custody redetermination hearing. The court ordered the respondents to show cause; federal respondents filed a return, and petitioner filed a traverse. The court granted the petition and ordered respondents, within fourteen days after a request, either to release petitioner or provide a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Respondents must, within fourteen days after receiving petitioner's request for a bond hearing, either release petitioner or provide a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). If respondents fail to comply, petitioner may seek further relief from the court.

CASES CITED

- Davis v. Woodford, 384 F.3d 628, 638 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock, No. 3:25-CV-05240-TMC, 2025 WL 2782499 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 30, 2025)
- Flaxman v. Ferguson, 151 F.4th 1178, 1184–85 (9th Cir. 2025)
- Thomas v. Union Carbide Agricultural Products Co., 473 U.S. 568, 580 (1985)
- Twitter, Inc. v. Paxton, 56 F.4th 1170, 1173 (9th Cir. 2022)
- Leonardo v. Crawford, 646 F.3d 1157, 1160 (9th Cir. 2011)
- In re Yajure Hurtado, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025)
- Carafas v. LaVallee, 391 U.S. 234, 239 (1968)
- Cardozo v. Bostock, No. 2:25-CV-00871-TMC, 2025 WL 2592275, at *2 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 8, 2025)
- Harvest v. Castro, 531 F.3d 737, 741–42 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Doe v. Garland, 109 F.4th 1188, 1193 (9th Cir. 2024)
- Herrera v. Collins, 506 U.S. 390, 403 (1993)
- Rose v. Guyer, 961 F.3d 1238, 1246 (9th Cir. 2020)

OPINION

Hermosillo

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

7 GUADALUPE JARA DOMINGUEZ, Case No. 2:25-cv-02351-TMC 8 Petitioner, ORDER
GRANTING PETITION FOR 9
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

v. 10 LAURA HERMOSILLO, et al., 11 Respondents. 12 13

14 I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

15 Petitioner Guadalupe Jara Dominguez is an individual who is detained at the Northwest 16
Immigration and Customs Enforcement Processing Center (“NWIPC”) in Tacoma, Washington 17
on the charge that he is unlawfully present in the United States without admission or parole.

18 Dkt. 1 ¶¶ 44–45. He entered the United States in 1999 and resided in Washington state before
19 being apprehended by immigration officers on November 6, 2025. Id. ¶¶ 43–44. To date, he has
20 not received a custody redetermination hearing before an Immigration Judge (“IJ”). Id. ¶¶ 16,
21 47–48; Dkt. 6 at 3. 22 On November 21, Jara Dominguez filed a petition for a writ of habeas
corpus requiring 23 Respondents to “release Petitioner or, in the alternative, provide Petitioner
with a bond hearing 24 pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) within seven days.” Dkt. 1. On November
25, the Court issued an 1 order to show cause directing Respondents to file a return to the habeas
petition. Dkt. 4. On

2 December 3, Federal Respondents filed a return, and Jara Dominguez filed a traverse the same
3 day. Dkt. 6; Dkt. 7. The habeas petition is now ripe for the Court’s review. For the reasons set 4
forth below, the Court GRANTS the petition for writ of habeas corpus.

5 II. LEGAL STANDARD

“Writs of habeas corpus may be granted by . . . the district courts . . . within their 6 respective
jurisdictions.” 28 U.S.C. § 2241(a). A habeas petitioner must prove by the 7 preponderance of the
evidence that he is “in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or 8 treaties of the United
States.” *Davis v. Woodford*, 384 F.3d 628, 638 (9th Cir. 2004); 28 U.S.C. 9 § 2241(c). 10 11

III. DISCUSSION

Jara Dominguez argues that Respondents have unlawfully subjected him to mandatory 12
detention consistent with their practice of treating every person who entered the United States 13
without inspection as an “applicant for admission” who is “seeking admission” under 8 U.S.C. 14
§ 1225(b)(2). Dkt. 1 ¶¶ 23–42, 49–51. In *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, this Court granted 15
summary judgment to members of a certified Bond Denial Class, holding that their detention 16
under § 1225(b)(2) was unlawful under the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”). --- F. 17
Supp. 3d ----, No. 3:25-CV-05240-TMC, 2025 WL 2782499, at *27 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 30, 18
2025). The Court defined the Bond Denial Class to include the following individuals: 19 All
noncitizens without lawful status detained at [NWIPC] who (1) have entered or 20 will enter the
United States without inspection, (2) are not apprehended upon arrival, (3) are not or will not be
subject to detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), 21 § 1225(b)(1), or § 1231 at the time the

noncitizen is scheduled for or requests a bond hearing. 22 Id. at *6. 23 24 1 Like members of the Bond Denial Class, Jara Dominguez, who resided in the United States for 2 years before his apprehension by immigration agents, is not “seeking admission” and thus cannot 3 be subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2). See id. at *16–*27. Instead, he is subject 4 to detention under § 1226(a), which permits release on bond. Id. 5 A. This case is ripe for the Court’s consideration, and Jara Dominguez is not required to exhaust administrative remedies before seeking habeas relief. 6 Federal Respondents argue that this matter is not yet ripe for the Court’s consideration 7 because an IJ has not yet made any determination regarding Jara Dominguez’s eligibility for 8 bond. Dkt. 6 at 3. In the alternative, they contend that even if the case is ripe, Jara Dominguez 9 has failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. Id. at 3–4. Notwithstanding those objections, 10 they do not oppose Jara Dominguez being considered a member of the Bond Denial Class for the 11 purposes of this habeas case. Id. at 4. 12 “Article III’s ripeness doctrine is designed to ‘prevent the courts, through premature 13 adjudication, from entangling themselves in abstract disagreements.’” *Flaxman v. Ferguson*, 151 14 F.4th 1178, 1184 (9th Cir. 2025) (quoting *Thomas v. Union Carbide Agric. Prods. Co.*, 473 U.S. 15 568, 580 (1985)). “Constitutional ripeness equates with Article III’s injury-in-fact requirement 16 for standing.” Id. at 1184–85. “The well-worn prerequisites are an invasion of a legally protected 17 interest that is (a) concrete and particularized, and (b) actual and imminent, not conjectural or 18 hypothetical.” Id. at 1185 (citation modified) (quoting *Twitter, Inc. v. Paxton*, 56 F.4th 1170, 19 1173 (9th Cir. 2022)). 20 The fact that Jara Dominguez has not yet had a bond hearing does not mean his habeas 21 petition is not ripe for review. There is nothing abstract or hypothetical about this dispute. Jara 22 Dominguez is suffering a concrete and actual injury—he is detained in federal immigration 23 custody right now, based on a mandatory detention policy that this Court has already concluded 24 1 violates the INA. Federal Respondents make clear in their response that Jara Dominguez is 2 detained pursuant to this policy: “While acknowledging the Court’s decision in *Rodriguez 3 Vazquez*, Federal Respondents continue to believe Petitioner is subject to mandatory detention 4 pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b).” Dkt. 6 at 1. 5 Similarly, although the portion of the *Rodriguez Vazquez* class definition that excludes 6 detainees subject to detention under other parts of the INA references “the time the noncitizen is 7 scheduled for or requests a bond hearing,” whether a detainee has requested a bond hearing does 8 not change the legality of their custody under § 1225(b)(2). The statutory analysis of *Rodriguez 9 Vazquez* applies with equal force to Jara Dominguez and others like him, whether they have yet 10 requested hearings or not. Where, as here, an individual “is in custody in violation of the . . . 11 laws . . . of the United States,” the Court is empowered to grant the petitioner’s writ of habeas 12 corpus. See 28 U.S.C. § 2241(a). This case is therefore ripe for the Court’s consideration. 13 Nor is Jara Dominguez required to exhaust administrative remedies before seeking 14 habeas relief from this Court. The Ninth Circuit has held that “[w]hen a petitioner does not 15 exhaust administrative remedies, a district court ordinarily should either dismiss the petition 16 without prejudice or stay the proceedings until the

petitioner has exhausted remedies, unless exhaustion is excused.” *Leonardo v. Crawford*, 646 F.3d 1157, 1160 (9th Cir. 2011) (emphasis added). The Court finds that exhaustion is excused here. The Board of Immigration Appeals has already adopted Federal Respondents’ position that the IJs lack jurisdiction to grant bond to any detainee who is charged with entering the United States without admission or parole, and the Court has already held that this position is inconsistent with the INA. See *In re Yajure Hurtado*, 29 I. & N. Dec. 216 (BIA 2025); *Rodriguez Vazquez*, No. 3:25-CV-05240-TMC, 2025 WL 23 2782499, at *27. Federal Respondents do not dispute that Jara Dominguez is currently subject to mandatory detention without the possibility of bond under § 1225(b)(2), consistent with agency-wide practice. Dkt. 6 at 1–3. Jara Dominguez need not go through a futile exercise of requesting a bond hearing while still subject to unlawful mandatory detention in order to seek habeas relief. See *Carafas v. LaVallee*, 391 U.S. 234, 239 (1968) (explaining that under the federal habeas statute, “(t)he court shall [. . .] dispose of the matter as law and justice require” (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 2243)). The Court declines to order the immediate release of Jara Dominguez. Federal Respondents argue that if the Court grants Jara Dominguez’s habeas petition, the appropriate relief is to order that he be provided a bond hearing under § 1226(a). Dkt. 6 at 4. Jara Dominguez argues that he is entitled to immediate release because Respondents have not identified a “specific interest” in maintaining his detention. Dkt. 7 at 5–6; see Dkt. 1. The Court concludes that a bond hearing is the appropriate relief at this time. “In modern habeas practice, courts often ‘employ a conditional order of release,’ which orders the government to release the petitioner unless it ‘takes some remedial action’ that corrects” the government’s violation of the law. *Cardozo v. Bostock*, No. 2:25-CV-00871-TMC, 2025 WL 2592275, at *2 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 8, 2025) (quoting *Harvest v. Castro*, 531 F.3d 737, 741–42 (9th Cir. 2008)). A conditional writ is the “typical relief granted” in a federal habeas case. *Doe v. Garland*, 109 F.4th 1188, 1193 (9th Cir. 2024) (quoting *Herrera v. Collins*, 506 U.S. 390, 403 (1993)). After issuing a conditional writ, a district court retains jurisdiction to ensure compliance with the writ and may order unconditional release if the government fails to comply with the initial habeas order. *Rose v. Guyer*, 961 F.3d 1238, 1246 (9th Cir. 2020). The Court concludes that Jara Dominguez’s request for release is premature. Section 1226 requires only consideration of release on bond, and a bond hearing is therefore sufficient to correct Respondents’ ongoing violation of the INA as to Jara Dominguez. See 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). If Respondents fail to comply with this order, Jara Dominguez may seek further relief from the Court at that time.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons explained above, the Court ORDERS as follows: 1. The petition for writ of habeas corpus (Dkt. 1) is GRANTED. 2. Within fourteen days of receiving Petitioner Guadalupe Jara Dominguez’s request for a bond hearing, Respondents must either release him or provide him a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). Any fee petition should be filed within the deadlines set by the Equal Access to Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2412. Dated this 4th day of

December, 2025. 14 Tiffany. Cartwright United States District Judge 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23
24

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-western-district-of-was/2025/guadalupe-jara-dominguez-v-laura-hermosillo-et-al-usluzge0>