

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
GEORGIA, COLUMBUS DIVISION

M.L.B. v. Warden, Stewart Detention Center, et al.

M.L.B. · No. 4:25-cv-438-CDL-AGH · Decided December 17, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia grants the petitioner’s habeas corpus motion to the extent that respondents must provide a bond hearing. The court determines that the petitioner is detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and is not subject to mandatory detention.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Columbus Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Clay D. Land
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Columbus Division
DECIDED	December 17, 2025
DOCKET	4:25-cv-438-CDL-AGH
DISPOSITION	writ_granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought habeas corpus relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 from immigration detention.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	M.L.B., Petitioner v. Warden, Stewart Detention Center, et al., Respondents

TOPICS

- immigration detention
- removal proceedings
- immigration
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- immigration detention
- habeas corpus
- immigration law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether Petitioner was subject to mandatory immigration detention.

2. Whether Petitioner was entitled to a bond hearing under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2) and the applicable regulations.

HOLDINGS

1. Petitioner was detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and was not subject to mandatory detention.
2. Petitioner was entitled to a bond hearing to determine whether release on bond was permissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2) and the applicable regulations.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Accordingly, Petitioner’s motion for habeas corpus relief is granted to the extent that Respondents shall provide Petitioner with a bond hearing to determine if Petitioner may be released on bond under § 1226(a)(2) and the applicable regulations.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The record showed that Petitioner was detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a). The court found that Petitioner was not subject to mandatory detention and therefore was eligible for a hearing to determine whether release on bond was appropriate.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

M.L.B. filed a § 2241 habeas petition challenging continued immigration detention. The district court determined that Petitioner was detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a), was not subject to mandatory detention, and granted relief to the extent of ordering Respondents to provide a bond hearing.

DISPOSITION

writ_granted

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Respondents shall provide Petitioner with a bond hearing to determine whether Petitioner may be released on bond under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2) and the applicable regulations.

CASES CITED

- J.A.M. v. Streeval, No. 4:25-CV-342-CDL, 2025 WL 3050094 (M.D. Ga. Nov. 1, 2025)
- P.R.S. v. Streeval, No. 4:25-CV-330-CDL, 2025 WL 3269947 (M.D. Ga. Nov. 24, 2025)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
COLUMBUS DIVISION M.L.B.,: Petitioner,: v.: Case No. 4:25-cv-438-CDL-AGH: 28 U.S.C. §
2241 Warden, STEWART DETENTION: CENTER, et al.,: Respondents.:
_____ ORDER Based on the present record, the Court finds

that Petitioner is currently detained under 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a) and that Petitioner is not subject to mandatory detention.

See *J.A.M. v. Streeval*, No. 4:25-CV-342-CDL, 2025 WL 3050094 (M.D. Ga. Nov. 1, 2025); *P.R.S. v. Streeval*, No. 4:25-CV-330-CDL, 2025 WL 3269947 (M.D. Ga. Nov. 24, 2025). Accordingly, Petitioner's motion for habeas corpus relief is granted to the extent that Respondents shall provide Petitioner with a bond hearing to determine if Petitioner may be released on bond under § 1226(a)(2) and the applicable regulations.

See 8 C.F.R. §§ 236.1 & 1236.1.1 IT IS SO ORDERED, this 17th day of December, 2025. s/Clay D. Land CLAY D. LAND U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
1 The brevity of this order is appropriate given that the issue presented is exactly the same as the issue previously decided on numerous occasions by the Court and yet Respondents insist upon denying the relief that the Court has found is required.