

The Honorable Tiffany M. Cartwright

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

Marco CANTERO GARCIA, et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

Cammilla WAMSLEY, et al.,

Respondents.

Case No. 2:25-cv-2092-TMC

**PETITIONERS' REPLY IN
SUPPORT OF WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS**

Respondents' return confirms Petitioners' entitlement to relief as Bond Denial Class members under the declaratory judgment in *Rodriguez Vazquez v. Bostock*, No. 3:25-CV-05240-TMC, --- F. Supp. 3d ----, 2025 WL 2782499 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 30, 2025).

First, Respondents offer no argument in response to the request for "immediate release as to all Petitioners except for Mr. Munoz-Quiterio." Dkt. 1 ¶ 22. Longstanding caselaw establishes the four Petitioners' entitlement to unconditional release in light of Respondents' transparent and continued defiance of the summary judgment in *Rodriguez Vazquez*, see Dkt. 2 at 3–6—especially in the face of this Court's grant of two other petitions filed by individual class members, *Ortiz Martinez v. Wamsley*, No. 2:25-cv-01822-TMC, 2025 WL 2899116, at *4–5

(W.D. Wash. Oct. 10, 2025); Order at 3–4, *Garcia v. Wamsley*, No. 2:25-cv-01980-TMC (W.D. Wash. Oct. 29, 2025), Dkt. 11. Respondents are well aware of what the law requires, yet they continue to flout it. The Court should thus reject Respondents’ assertion that the Court may only grant a bond hearing or conditional release for Petitioners Cantero Garcia, Villalvozo-Benitez, Benitez Chavez, and Villalba Cordova. *See* Dkt. 9 at 4.

Second, as to Petitioner Munoz-Quiterio, Respondents do not rebut his class membership. *See* Dkt. 9 at 1 (acknowledging all Petitioners are members of the Bond Denial Class). Instead, they focus on contesting remedies that are not requested, arguing that “this Court should not order his release,” *id.* at 4, and that he must be required to “exhaust[] his administrative remedies,” *id.* at 5–8. Their arguments are inapposite, as Mr. Munoz-Quiterio seeks neither immediate release nor a bypass of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ review of the Immigration Judge’s (IJ’s) bond denial. Instead, he seeks only an order that requires Respondents to “consider him detained under § 1226(a)” and prohibits them from applying § 1225(b)(2) to dismiss his bond appeal. Dkt. 1 ¶ 24; *see also id.*, Prayer for Relief (d).

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioners respectfully request that the Court enforce the summary judgment in *Rodriguez Vazquez* by (1) ordering the immediate and unconditional release of Petitioners Cantero Garcia, Villalvozo-Benitez, Benitez Chavez, and Villalba Cordova; and (2) requiring Respondents to consider Petitioner Munoz-Quiterio to be detained under § 1226(a) and prohibiting them from applying § 1225(b)(2) to deny his bond appeal or affirm the IJ’s bond denial.

DATED this 5th day of November, 2025.

s/ Leila Kang

Leila Kang, WSBA No. 48048
leila@nwirp.org

I certify that this memorandum contains 390 words, in compliance with the Local Civil Rules.

1 s/ Matt Adams

Matt Adams, WSBA No. 28287

2 matt@nwirp.org

3 s/ Aaron Korthuis

Aaron Korthuis, WSBA No. 53974

4 aaron@nwirp.org

5 s/ Glenda M. Aldana Madrid

Glenda M. Aldana Madrid, WSBA No. 46987

6 glenda@nwirp.org

7 s/ Amanda Ng

Amanda Ng, WSBA No. 57181

8 amanda@nwirp.org

9 NORTHWEST IMMIGRANT RIGHTS PROJECT

615 Second Ave., Suite 400

10 Seattle, WA 98104

(206) 957-8611

11 *Counsel for Petitioners*