




A2

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536



Public Copy


FILE:



Office: Miami

Date: MAR 13 2001

IN RE: Applicant:



APPLICATION: Application for Permanent Residence Pursuant to Section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act of November 2, 1966 (P.L. 89-732)

IN BEHALF OF APPLICANT: Self-represented

Identification data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Acting Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the District Director, Miami, Florida, who certified his decision to the Associate Commissioner, Examinations, for review. The district director's decision will be affirmed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Cuba who filed this application for adjustment of status to that of a lawful permanent resident under section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act of November 2, 1966. This Act provides for the adjustment of status of any alien who is a native or citizen of Cuba and who has been inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959, and has been physically present in the United States for at least one year, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien is eligible to receive an immigrant visa and is admissible to the United States for permanent residence.

The district director found the applicant inadmissible to the United States because he falls within the purview of section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)(II). The district director, therefore, concluded that the applicant was ineligible for adjustment of status and denied the application.

In response to the notice of certification, the applicant expresses remorse for his past behavior. He states that in the past eleven years he has been working very hard to raise his only son who was diagnosed with Juvenile Diabetes and is insulin dependent. He has bought a house, and he has also established a small business.

Section 212(a)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2), provides that aliens inadmissible and ineligible to receive visas and ineligible to be admitted to the United States include:

(A)(i) Any alien convicted of, or who admits having committed, or who admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of --

(II) a violation of (or a conspiracy or attempt to violate) any law or regulation of a State, the United States, or a foreign country relating to a controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act, 21 U.S.C. 802).

The record reflects the following:

1. On July 8, 1988, in the Circuit Court of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit, Dade County, Florida, Case No. [REDACTED], the applicant was indicted for possession of a controlled substance (cocaine). On July 11, 1988, the applicant was adjudged guilty of the crime, he was sentenced to imprisonment for a term of 3 days, and assessed a total of \$225 in costs.

2. On January 24, 1981, in Dade County, Florida, Case No. [REDACTED] the applicant was arrested and charged with possession of marijuana. On February 20, 1981, the applicant was convicted of the crime and assessed a total of \$125 in fines and costs.

3. On April 29, 1981, in Dade County, Florida, Case No. [REDACTED] the applicant was arrested and charged with Count 1, burglary of a conveyance (vehicle); Count 2, theft; and Count 3, loitering and prowling. On May 20, 1981, a "no information" was entered on the case.

4. On September 1, 1982, in Miami, Florida, Case No. [REDACTED] the applicant was arrested and charged with possession of a controlled substance (cocaine). On September 22, 1982, a "no information" was entered on the case.

5. On September 11, 1984, in Dade County, Florida, Case No. [REDACTED] the applicant was arrested and charged with strong armed robbery. On December 7, 1984, a "nolle pros" was entered on the case.

The applicant is inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(II) of the Act based on his convictions of possession of controlled substances (paragraphs 1 and 2 above). There is no waiver available to an alien found inadmissible under this section except for a single offense of simple possession of thirty grams or less of marijuana. The applicant does not qualify under this exception.

The applicant is ineligible for adjustment of status to permanent residence pursuant to section 1 of the Act of November 2, 1966. The decision of the district director to deny the application will be affirmed.

ORDER: The district director's decision is affirmed.