A2

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identification data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

[redacted]

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

FILE: [redacted] Office: Miami Date: 04 MAR 2002

IN RE: Applicant: [redacted]

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:

[redacted]

Public Copy

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

Helen E. Crawford for

Robert P. Wiemann, 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 statute 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)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)(C). The district director, therefore, concluded that the applicant was ineligible for adjustment of status and denied the application.

The applicant has provided no statement or additional evidence on notice of certification.

Pursuant to section 212(a)(2)(C) of the Act, any alien who the consular officer or immigration officer knows or has reason to believe is or has been an illicit trafficker in any such controlled substance or is or has been a knowing assister, abettor, conspirator, or colluder with others in the illicit trafficking in any such controlled substance, is inadmissible to the United States.

The record reflects that on July 16, 1996, in Dade County Florida, Case No. [redacted], the applicant was arrested and charged with possession of a controlled substance with intent to sell (cocaine). No criminal complaint was filed with the court.

The arrest report was cited by the district director in his decision. Therefore, the report will not be repeated here.

Despite the fact that the applicant was not convicted of the charge, the district director, citing Matter of Rico, 16 I&N Dec. 181 (BIA 1977), and Matter of Tillighast, 27 F.2d 580 (1st Cir., 1928), determined that the applicant was inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(2)(C) of the Act because he had reason to believe the applicant is or has been an illicit trafficker in any such controlled substance or is or has been a knowing assister, abettor, conspirator, or colluder with others in the illicit trafficking in any such controlled substance.

The district director based his conclusion on the information or criminal complaint which reflects that the applicant participated in the sale of cocaine based on (1) the amount of pedestrian traffic going into and out of the apartment observed by the arresting officers, (2) the marked impress fund in the amount of $20 found in his possession, (3) on 16 off-white rocks weighing 1.4 grams found in a drain pipe near where the applicant was standing, (4) the packaging of the controlled substance, and (5) the large amount of money found in the possession of the applicant and the co-defendants.

Generally speaking, intent to distribute is established when the controlled substance is either found on the person of the accused, or in a vehicle or boat driven or occupied by the accused, or in a dwelling where the accused resided or visited frequently. It was held in United States v. Franklin, 728 F.2d 994 (8th Cir., 1984), that intent to distribute may be established by circumstantial evidence. Evidence the applicant possessed a controlled substance with the requisite intent to distribute is sufficient as a matter of law, where the controlled substance is packaged in a manner consistent with distribution and/or there is evidence of paraphernalia, amount of cash, weapons, or other indicia of narcotics distribution.

The circumstances surrounding the arrest, the fact that the controlled substance was found in a dwelling where the accused resided or visited, the controlled substance was packaged in a manner consistent with distribution, and the amount of cash found on the applicant and on the co-defendants, are sufficient factors to support the district director's conclusion that there was reason to believe the applicant is or has been an illicit trafficker in a controlled substance or is or has been a knowing assistor, abettor, conspirator, or colluder in the illicit trafficking in a controlled substance. The applicant is, therefore, inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(2)(C) of the Act, whether or not he was actually convicted. Matter of Rico, supra.

There is no waiver available to an alien found inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(C) of the Act based on trafficking in a controlled substance. Further, the applicant was offered an opportunity to submit evidence in opposition to the district director's finding of inadmissibility. No additional evidence has been entered into the record.

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 will be affirmed.

ORDER: The district director's decision is affirmed.