

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Orvin Rodolfo Fajardo-Aguilar v. Kristi Noem, et al.

Fajardo-Aguilar · No. CV-26-00579-PHX-MTL (ASB) · Decided March 23, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Arizona denied Orvin Rodolfo Fajardo-Aguilar's habeas petition challenging his immigration detention and seeking a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). The court held that mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A) applied because Petitioner was treated as an applicant for admission and had not been determined clearly and beyond a doubt to be entitled to admission. The court also rejected Petitioner's due process and Bautista class-membership arguments and dismissed the action.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael T. Liburdi
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
DECIDED	March 23, 2026
DOCKET	CV-26-00579-PHX-MTL (ASB)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought habeas relief challenging his immigration detention and requesting a bond determination hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). Respondents argued that he was subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the statutory, regulatory, and constitutional challenges to immigration detention in the context of a habeas corpus petition.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Orvin Rodolfo Fajardo-Aguilar v. Kristi Noem, et al.

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether petitioner was subject to mandatory detention without a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), rather than discretionary detention and a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a).
2. Whether mandatory detention under the applicable immigration statutes and procedures violated petitioner's due process rights.
3. Whether petitioner was entitled to relief based on his alleged membership in the Bautista class.

HOLDINGS

1. A person who entered the United States illegally, is present without having been admitted, and has not been determined clearly and beyond a doubt to be entitled to admission is subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).
2. Petitioner's due process challenge failed because the procedures provided by the Immigration and Nationality Act and the applicable congressional determination procedures constituted the process to which he was entitled.
3. Petitioner was not entitled to relief in this action based on his asserted membership in the Bautista class; any relief under the Bautista judgment had to be sought in the Central District of California.

KEY QUOTATIONS

*“For the reasons explained in Chavez v. Noem, — F. Supp. 3d —, 2026 WL 381618, at *1-2 (D. Ariz. Feb. 9, 2026), the Court finds that a person who entered the United States illegally and is clearly and beyond a doubt not entitled to admission, is subject to mandatory detention under § 1225(b)(2)(A).”* (at 1)

“These procedures represent the due process as provided by Congress in statute. Petitioner is entitled to nothing further under the Constitution.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner, a citizen of Honduras, had been present in the United States since 2006 and was arrested in December 2025. He challenged his immigration detention and sought a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), while the government maintained that he was subject to mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). The court found that he was present without having been admitted and that no immigration officer had determined that he was clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to admission.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in the District of Arizona after being arrested in December 2025 and detained in connection with removal proceedings. The court denied the petition, dismissed the action, denied pending motions as moot, and directed the Clerk to enter judgment.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Chavez v. Noem, — F. Supp. 3d —, 2026 WL 381618, at *1-2 (D. Ariz. Feb. 9, 2026)
- Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi, 166 F.4th 494 (5th Cir. 2026)
- Dep’t of Homeland Sec. v. Thuraissigiam, 591 U.S. 103, 140 (2020)
- Espinoza Lopez v. Noem, 26 Civ. 00345 (JHR), 2026 WL 266597, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 2, 2026)
- Calderon Lopez v. Lyons, — F. Supp. 3d —, 2025 WL 3683918, at *1 (N.D. Tex. Dec. 19, 2025)
- Bautista v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec., No. 26-1044 (9th Cir. Mar. 6, 2026)

OPINION

1 WO 2 3 4 5 6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF
ARIZONA 8 9 Orvin Rodolfo Fajardo-Aguilar, No. CV-26-00579-PHX-MTL (ASB) 10 Petitioner,
ORDER 11 v. 12 Kristi Noem, et al., 13 Respondents. 14 15 I. 16 Petitioner, a citizen of Honduras,
has been present in the United States since 2006. 17 (Doc. 1 ¶ 19.) Respondents arrested Petitioner
in December 2025.

(Id. ¶ 20.) Petitioner 18 filed this habeas corpus action challenging his immigration detention and
seeking a bond 19 determination hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). Respondents argue that
Petitioner is 20 subject to mandatory detention without bond under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).
(Doc. 7.) 21 II. 22 For the reasons explained in Chavez v. Noem, — F. Supp. 3d —, 2026 WL
381618, 23 at *1-2 (D.

Ariz. Feb. 9, 2026), the Court finds that a person who entered the United States 24 illegally and is
clearly and beyond a doubt not entitled to admission, is subject to mandatory 25 detention under §
1225(b)(2)(A). See also Buenrostro-Mendez v. Bondi, 166 F.4th 494 (5th 26 Cir. 2026). 27 Based
on this record, the Court finds that Petitioner is present without having been 28 admitted and is
therefore treated as an applicant for admission under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1).

1 The Court further finds that an immigration officer has not determined Petitioner clearly 2 and
beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted, and therefore mandatory detention under 8 3 U.S.C. §
1225(b)(2)(A) applies. Petitioner’s statutory and regulatory claims must be 4 denied. 5 As far as
Petitioner alleges that his detention violates his due process rights, he is 6 mistaken.

The government began removal proceedings against Petitioner under procedures 7 set forth in the
Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”). An alien unlawfully present in 8 the United States “has
only those rights regarding admission that Congress has provided 9 by statute.” Dep’t of
Homeland Sec. v. Thuraissigiam, 591 U.S. 103, 140 (2020); see also 10 Espinoza Lopez v. Noem,
26 Civ.

00345 (JHR), 2026 WL 266597, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 2, 11 2026). 12 In this case, Petitioner received due process in two respects. First, he was afforded 13 the procedural protection of the INA. Second, he was subject to the determination 14 procedures established by Congress in the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration 15 Responsibility Act where an immigration officer determined that he was not entitled to a 16 bond hearing.

These procedures represent the due process as provided by Congress in 17 statute. Petitioner is entitled to nothing further under the Constitution. 18 Finally, the Court also rejects Petitioner's argument that relief should be granted 19 here because he is a member of the Bautista class. See *Calderon Lopez v. Lyons*, — F. 20 Supp. 3d —, 2025 WL 3683918, at *1 (N.D.

Tex. Dec. 19, 2025). On March 6, 2026, the 21 Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals temporarily stayed the Bautista declaratory judgment, 22 pending a ruling on the Government's emergency motion for a stay pending appeal. See 23 *Bautista v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, No. 26-1044 (9th Cir. Mar. 6, 2026). If Petitioner 24 believes he is entitled to further relief under the judgment in Bautista, he must seek relief 25 in the Central District of California.

26.... 27.... 28.... 1 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus 2|| (Doc. 1) is DENIED. This action is dismissed, all pending motions are denied as moot, 3 || and the Clerk of Court must enter judgment accordingly. 4 Dated this 23rd day of March, 2026. 5 Michael T. Liburdi 8 United States District Judge 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 _3-