

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

Wilmer Antonio Ibarguen Rodriguez v. Kevin Raycraft et al.

Ibarguen Rodriguez v. Raycraft · No. 1:26-cv-435 · Decided February 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan grants Wilmer Antonio Ibarguen Rodriguez's petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The court holds that prudential exhaustion is not required, or alternatively should be waived, and concludes that the government failed to follow the statutory and regulatory requirements for terminating Rodriguez's parole before arresting and detaining him. The court also analyzes his Fifth Amendment due process challenge to the detention.

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	February 20, 2026
DOCKET	1:26-cv-435
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging his immigration detention and requesting release. After ordering Respondents to show cause, the court granted the petition, ordered release subject to the conditions of Petitioner's parole, enjoined re-detention absent a material change in circumstances and compliance with due process, and dismissed several respondents.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the § 2241 detention challenge and applied prudential-exhaustion principles, including whether exhaustion was required or should be waived. For the due-process claim, the court applied the three-factor balancing test from Mathews v. Eldridge.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion; nonprecedential

TOPICS

immigration detention

procedural due process

due process

removal proceedings

statutory interpretation

PRACTICE AREAS

immigration detention

habeas corpus

immigration

constitutional law

administrative law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether prudential administrative exhaustion should be required before adjudicating Petitioner's § 2241 challenge to his immigration detention.
2. Whether Respondents lawfully terminated Petitioner's parole under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A) and 8 C.F.R. § 212.5(e)(2)(i) before arresting and detaining him.
3. Whether Petitioner's detention violated the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause because he did not receive an individualized determination concerning revocation of his parole.
4. Which respondents were proper parties to Petitioner's habeas action under the immediate-custodian rule and its recognized exceptions.

HOLDINGS

1. Prudential administrative exhaustion was not required, and alternatively any exhaustion requirement should be waived, because the petition presented principally legal and constitutional questions, administrative review was unlikely to provide relief, and delay would impose hardship.
2. The government may not revoke or terminate Petitioner's parole, and then detain him on that basis, without satisfying the statutory and regulatory requirements governing termination of parole.
3. Petitioner's current detention violated the Fifth Amendment because due process required an individualized determination concerning revocation of his parole, and the Mathews factors weighed in his favor.
4. The court retained the Secretary of Homeland Security as a respondent because an exception to the immediate-custodian rule could apply if transfer authority were used to evade habeas review, but dismissed the Department of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, and the Executive Office for Immigration Review.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Upon consideration of these factors, this Court concludes that prudential exhaustion should not be required in Petitioner’s case.” (Section IV)

“The Court will order Respondents to release Petitioner from custody, subject to any conditions that existed under Petitioner’s § 1182(d)(5)(A) parole.” (Conclusion)

“The Court will also enjoin Respondents from re-detaining Petitioner absent a material change in circumstances unless the requirements of due process have been satisfied.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner, a Venezuelan citizen, applied for admission at a Texas port of entry in December 2024 and was charged as inadmissible for lacking valid entry documents. He was paroled into the United States under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A), with parole indicated as non-categorical parole and expiring December 7, 2026; he had work authorization, a pending asylum application, and no criminal history. ICE arrested and detained him on November 19, 2025, after encountering him during surveillance directed at another noncitizen. The record did not show that the government had terminated his parole in compliance with the governing statute and regulation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed a counseled § 2241 petition challenging the lawfulness of his detention. The court issued a show-cause order on February 10, 2026; Respondents responded on February 13, and Petitioner replied the same day. The court granted habeas relief and entered related release, injunction, reporting, and respondent-dismissal orders.

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

CASES CITED

- Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, 542 U.S. 507, 525, 529 (2004)
- Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678, 687, 690 (2001)
- A. A. R. P. v. Trump, 145 S. Ct. 1364, 1367 (2025)
- Shearson v. Holder, 725 F.3d 588, 593-94 (6th Cir. 2013)
- McCarthy v. Madigan, 503 U.S. 140, 144 (1992)
- Island Creek Coal Co. v. Bryan, 937 F.3d 738, 746 (6th Cir. 2019)
- Pizarro Reyes v. Raycraft, No. 25-cv-12546, 2025 WL 2609425, at *3 (E.D. Mich. Sep. 9, 2025)
- Hernandez Torrealba v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec., No. 1:25-cv-1621, 2025 WL 2444114, at *8 (N.D. Ohio Aug. 25, 2025)
- Lopez-Campos v. Raycraft, No. 2:25-cv-12486, 2025 WL 2496379, at *4-5, *9 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2025)
- United States v. California Care Corp., 709 F.2d 1241, 1248 (9th Cir. 1983)
- McGee v. United States, 402 U.S. 479, 484 (1971)
- McKart v. United States, 395 U.S. 185, 193-95 (1969)
- Shweika v. Dep't of Homeland Sec., No. 1:06-cv-11781, 2015 WL 6541689, at *12 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 29, 2015)
- Loper Bright Enters. v. Raimondo, 144 S. Ct. 2244, 2273 (2024)
- Sterkaj v. Gonzales, 439 F.3d 273, 279 (6th Cir. 2006)
- Shalala v. Ill. Council on Long Term Care, Inc., 529 U.S. 1, 13 (2000)
- Jennings v. Rodriguez, 583 U.S. 281, 288 (2018)
- Y-Z-L-H v. Bostock, 792 F. Supp. 3d 1123, 1132-33, 1137-47 (D. Or. 2025)

- Mata Velasquez v. Kurzdorfer, 794 F. Supp. 3d 128, 145-46, 153 (W.D.N.Y. 2025)
- Loaiza Arias v. LaRose, No. 3:25-cv-02595-BTM-MMP, 2025 WL 3295385, at *2-4 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2025)
- Coal. for Humane Immigrant Rts. v. Noem, No. 25-cv-872 (JMC), 2025 WL 2192986, at *2 (D.D.C. Aug. 1, 2025)
- Salgado Bustos v. Raycraft, No. 25-13202, 2025 WL 3022294, at *5-7 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 29, 2025)
- E.V. v. Raycraft, No. 4:25-cv-2069, 2025 WL 2938594, at *10 (N.D. Ohio Oct. 16, 2025)
- Doe v. Noem, 152 F.4th 272, 278-79, 285 (1st Cir. 2025)
- Corley v. United States, 556 U.S. 303, 314 (2009)
- Norfolk S. Ry. Co. v. U.S. Dep't of Lab., No. 21-3369, 2022 WL 17369438, at *6 (6th Cir. Dec. 2, 2022)
- Wilson v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., 378 F.3d 541, 545 (6th Cir. 2004)
- Sameena, Inc. v. U.S. Air Force, 147 F.3d 1148, 1153 (9th Cir. 1998)
- United States v. Silvestre-Gregorio, 983 F.3d 848, 852-56 (6th Cir. 2020)
- Günaydin v. Trump, 784 F. Supp. 3d 1175, 1187 (D. Minn. 2025)
- Hernandez-Lara v. Lyons, 10 F.4th 19, 28 (1st Cir. 2021)
- Velasco Lopez v. Decker, 978 F.3d 842, 851 (2d Cir. 2020)
- Sampiao v. Hyde, No. 1:25-cv-11981-JEK, 2025 WL 2607924, at *12 (D. Mass. Sep. 9, 2025)
- Braden v. 30th Jud. Cir. Ct. of Ky., 410 U.S. 484, 494-95 (1973)
- Roman v. Ashcroft, 340 F.3d 314, 322, 325-26 (6th Cir. 2003)
- Chavez-Rivas v. Olsen, 194 F. Supp. 2d 368, 374 (D.N.J. 2002)
- Lee v. Ashcroft, 216 F. Supp. 2d 51, 55 (E.D.N.Y. 2002)
- Arias-Agramonte v. Comm'r, No. 00 CIV. 2412 (RWS), 2000 WL 1617999, at *8 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 30, 2000)