

The AAO finds that the District Director did not follow the proper procedures for rescinding lawful permanent resident status as described in 8 C.F.R. § 246.1. The applicant was given an appointment for a *de novo* interview regarding her application for adjustment of status. Based on the applicant's statement during her *de novo* interview the District Director concluded that the applicant was ineligible for adjustment of status pursuant to section 1 of the CAA of November 2, 1966.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 246.1 states:

If it appears to a district director that a person residing in his or her district was not in fact eligible for the adjustment of status made in his or her case, or it appears to an asylum office director that a person granted adjustment of status by an asylum officer pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 240.70 was not in fact eligible for adjustment of status, a proceeding shall be commenced by the personal service upon such person of a notice of intent to rescind, which shall inform him or her of the allegations upon which it is intended to rescind the adjustment of his or her status. In such a proceeding the person shall be known as the respondent. The notice shall also inform the respondent that he or she may submit, within thirty days from the date of service of the notice, an answer in writing under oath setting forth reasons why such rescission shall not be made, and that he or she may, within such period, request a hearing before an immigration judge in support of, or in lieu of, his or her written answer. The respondent shall further be informed that he or she may have the assistance of or be represented by counsel or representative of his or her choice qualified under part 292 of this chapter, at no expense to the Government, in the preparation of his or her answer or in connection with his or her hearing, and that he or she may present such evidence in his or her behalf as may be relevant to the rescission.

In rescission proceedings, the Government bears the burden of proving ineligibility for adjustment of status by clear, unequivocal, and convincing evidence. *Waziri v. INS*, 392 F.2d 55 (9th Cir. 1968); *Matter of Pereira*, 19 I&N Dec. 169 (BIA 1984).

The applicant in the present case was provided with a stamp granting her permanent resident status. That status has not been rescinded through proper procedures. The District Director's decision will be withdrawn and the record will be remanded to him in order to comply with the regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 246.1.

**ORDER:** The District Director's decision is withdrawn. The matter is remanded to him for further action consistent with the foregoing discussion.

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

[Redacted]

AZ

FILE: [Redacted]

Office: MIAMI, FLORIDA

Date: SEP 29 2005

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)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[Redacted]

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application was denied by the District Director, Miami, Florida, who certified his decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) 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 (CAA) of November 2, 1966. The CAA provides, in 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, (now the Secretary of Homeland Security, (Secretary)), 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 District Director found the applicant inadmissible to the United States because he falls within the purview of section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i). The applicant failed to show that he has a qualifying family member in order to be eligible to file for a waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(i) of the Act. The District Director, therefore, concluded that the applicant was ineligible for adjustment of status and denied the application accordingly. *See District Director's Decision* dated January 27, 2005.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act provides, in pertinent part, that:

(i) Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides that:

The Attorney General (now the Secretary of Homeland Security, [Secretary]) may, in the discretion of the Attorney General [Secretary], waive the application of clause (i) of subsection (a)(6)(C) in the case of an alien who is the spouse, son or daughter of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General [Secretary] that the refusal of admission to the United States of such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such an alien.

The record reflects that on May 31, 2002, at Miami, Florida, Florida, the applicant married [REDACTED] a native and citizen of Peru. The record further reflects that on June 12, 2002, the applicant and Ms. [REDACTED] filed applications for adjustment of status under section 1 of the CAA.

On June 24, 2004, the applicant and his spouse [REDACTED] appeared before Citizenship and Immigration Services, (CIS) for an interview regarding the applications for permanent residence. The applicant and [REDACTED] were each placed under oath and questioned separately regarding their domestic life and shared