



PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Justice

A2

**Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

Immigration and Naturalization Service



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

FILE:



Office: Texas Service Center

Date:

DEC 17 2002

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:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that 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 that 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 that 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, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, who certified his decision to the Associate Commissioner, Examinations, for review. The director's decision will be withdrawn, and the application will be approved.

The applicant is a native of Cuba and citizen of Mexico who filed this application for adjustment of status to that of a lawful permanent resident under section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act (CAA) of November 2, 1966. This Act states, in pertinent part:

[T]he 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, may be adjusted by the Attorney General, in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien makes an application for such adjustment, and the alien is eligible to receive an immigrant visa and is admissible to the United States for permanent residence.

The director determined that the applicant was not eligible for adjustment of status, pursuant to section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act, because his claim of citizenship at the time of entry into the United States was Mexican. The director stated that the Board, in Matter of Ognibene, 18 I&N Dec. 425 (BIA 1983), came to the conclusion that although an alien may hold the phenomenon of dual nationality, an alien may only claim one citizenship at a time for purposes of immigration matters within the United States. The director concluded that the Service considers the applicant a national of Mexico for immigration matters; therefore, he is not able to adjust status under section 1 of the Act of November 2, 1966.

In response to the notice of certification, counsel asserts that in order to benefit under the terms of the Cuban Adjustment Act, one must only show that he or she is either a native or a citizen of Cuba. In this particular case, the applicant has provided a copy of his Cuban birth certificate which clearly establishes that he was born in Cuba. Counsel states that it is the applicant's contention that he has established a prima facie case of eligibility under the Cuban Adjustment Act because he is a native of Cuba.

The record reflects that the applicant was born in Cuba on January 22, 1959, to a Cuban mother and a Cuban father. It is not shown in the record when he departed from Cuba to reside in Mexico. The applicant entered the United States as a B-2 visitor on December 23, 1999, with a Mexican passport.

The applicant in this case is applying for adjustment of his status to permanent residence under section 1 of the CAA. To be eligible for adjustment of status under section 1 of the CAA, an alien must show only that he is a native or citizen of Cuba, he was inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States, he has been physically present in the United States for at least one year, and that he is admissible to the United States for permanent residence. See Matter of Masson, 12 I&N Dec. 699 (BIA 1968).

The applicant, in this case, was born in Cuba. He is, therefore, a native of Cuba, he was inspected and admitted into the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959, and he has been physically present in the United States for at least one year. He is, therefore, not precluded from adjustment of status under section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act of November 2, 1966. The director did not raise any other basis for denial, nor are there known grounds of inadmissibility.

Accordingly, the director's decision will be withdrawn, and the application will be approved.

ORDER: The director's decision is withdrawn. The application is approved.