



U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

114

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



FILE:

Office: Texas Service Center

Date:

FEB 27 2001

IN RE: Applicant:



APPLICATION:

Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission into the United States after Deportation or Removal under § 212(a)(9)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(9)(A)(iii)

IN BEHALF OF APPLICANT: Self-represented

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.

Identification only deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Acting Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Honduras who applied for admission as a nonimmigrant visitor on December 15, 1998 by presenting a passport containing a fraudulent date stamp to conceal the fact that he had previously overstayed his period of admission as a nonimmigrant for approximately five years and had engaged in unauthorized employment. The applicant was found to be inadmissible under § 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having attempted to procure admission into the United States by fraud or misrepresentation. The applicant was removed from the United States on December 16, 1998 pursuant to § 235(b)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(1).

The applicant was present in the United States without a lawful admission or parole on June 18, 1999 and without permission to reapply for admission in violation of § 276 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1326 (a felony). The previous order of removal was reinstated on June 24, 1999 and he was removed from the United States on July 13, 1999. Therefore he is inadmissible under § 212(a)(9)(A)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(9)(A)(ii). The applicant seeks permission to reapply for admission into the United States under § 212(a)(9)(A)(iii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(9)(A)(iii), to join his wife and daughter.

The director determined that the applicant was statutorily ineligible for any relief pursuant to § 241(a)(5) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1231(a)(5), and denied the application accordingly.

Section 241(a) DETENTION, RELEASE, AND REMOVAL OF ALIENS ORDERED REMOVED.-

(5) REINSTATEMENT OF REMOVAL ORDERS AGAINST ALIENS ILLEGALLY REENTERING.-If the Attorney General finds that an alien has reentered the United States illegally after having been removed or having departed voluntarily, under an order of removal, the prior order of removal is reinstated from its original date and is not subject to being reopened or reviewed, the alien is not eligible and may not apply for any relief under this Act [chapter], and the alien shall be removed under the prior order at any time after reentry.

The Service holds that an alien whose prior order of removal has been reinstated is ineligible for any relief while he or she remains in the United States. However, after the alien departs from the United States § 241(a)(5) of the Act no longer applies. Since the alien in this matter has been removed from the United States, § 241(a)(5) no longer applies and the director's decision will be withdrawn. The application will be adjudicated *de novo*.

On appeal, the applicant's wife states that she and the applicant have been married for more than 27 years and they have 4 children. The applicant's wife states that she has lived in the United States

for at least 10 years and needs her husband to help support the family.

Section 212(a)(9) ALIENS PREVIOUSLY REMOVED.-

(A) CERTAIN ALIENS PREVIOUSLY REMOVED.-

(ii) OTHER ALIENS.-Any alien not described in clause (i) who-

(I) has been ordered removed under § 240 of the Act or any other provision of law, or

(II) departed the United States while an order of removal was outstanding,

and who seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal (or within 20 years of such date in the case of a second or subsequent removal or at any time in the case of an alien convicted of an aggravated felony) is inadmissible.

(iii) EXCEPTION.-Clauses (i) and (ii) shall not apply to an alien seeking admission within a period if, prior to the date of the alien's reembarkation at a place outside the United States or attempt to be admitted from foreign contiguous territory, the Attorney General has consented to the alien's reapplying for admission.

Section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii) of the Act provides that aliens who have been otherwise ordered removed, ordered deported under former §§ 242 or 217 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1252 or 1187, or ordered excluded under former § 236 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1226, and who have actually been removed (or departed after such an order) are inadmissible for 10 years.

Section 212(a)(6)(B) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(6)(B), was amended by the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA) and is now codified as § 212(a)(9)(A)(i) and (ii). According to the reasoning in Matter of Soriano, 21 I&N Dec. 516 (BIA 1996; A.G. 1997), the provisions of any legislation modifying the Act must normally be applied to waiver applications adjudicated on or after the enactment date of that legislation, unless other instructions are provided. IIRIRA became effective on September 30, 1996.

An appeal must be decided according to the law as it exists on the date it is before the appellate body. See Bradley v. Richmond School Board, 416 U.S. 696, 710-1 (1974). In the absence of explicit statutory direction, an applicant's eligibility is determined under the statute in effect at the time his or her application is finally considered. If an amendment makes the statute more restrictive after the application is filed, the eligibility is determined under the terms of the amendment. Conversely, if the amendment makes the statute more generous, the application must be considered by more generous terms. Matter of

George, 11 I&N Dec. 419 (BIA 1965); Matter of Leveque, 12 I&N Dec. 633 (BIA 1968).

Prior to 1981, an alien who was arrested and deported from the United States was perpetually barred. In 1981 Congress amended former § 212(a)(17) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(17), eliminated the perpetual debarment and substituted a waiting period.

A review of the 1996 IIRIRA amendments to the Act and prior statutes and case law regarding permission to reapply for admission, reflects that Congress has (1) increased the bar to admissibility and the waiting period from 5 to 10 years, (2) has added a bar to admissibility for aliens who are unlawfully present in the United States, and (3) has imposed a permanent bar to admission for aliens who have been ordered removed and who subsequently enter or attempt to enter the United States without being lawfully admitted. It is concluded that Congress has placed a high priority on reducing and/or stopping aliens from overstaying their authorized period of stay and/or from being present in the United States without a lawful admission or parole.

Nothing could be clearer than Congress' desire in recent years to limit, rather than extend, the relief available to aliens who have violated immigration laws. Congress has almost unfettered power to decide which aliens may come to and remain in this country. This power has been recognized repeatedly by the Supreme Court. See Fiallo v. Bell, 430 U.S. 787 (1977); Reno v. Flores, 507 U.S. 292 (1993); Kleindienst v. Mandel, 408 U.S. 753, 766 (1972). See also Matter of Yeung, 21 I&N Dec. 610, 612 (BIA 1997).

The Service has held that an application for permission to reapply for admission to the United States may be approved when the applicant establishes he or she has equities within the United States or there are other favorable factors which offset the fact of deportation or removal at Government expense and any other adverse factors which may exist. Circumstances which are considered by the Service include, but are not limited to: the basis for removal; the recency of removal; the length of residence in the United States; the moral character of the applicant; the alien's respect for law and order; the evidence of reformation and rehabilitation; the existence of family responsibilities within the United States; any inadmissibility to the United States under other sections of the law; the hardship involved to the alien and to others; and the need for the applicant's services in the United States. Matter of Tin, 14 I&N Dec. 371 (Reg. Comm. 1973). An approval in this proceeding requires the applicant to establish that the favorable aspects outweigh the unfavorable ones.

It is appropriate to examine the basis of a removal as well as an applicant's general compliance with immigration and other laws. Evidence of serious disregard for law is viewed as an adverse factor. Matter of Lee, 17 I&N Dec. 275 (Comm. 1978). Family ties in the United States are an important consideration in deciding whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. Matter of Acosta, 14 I&N Dec. 361 (D.D. 1973). Family ties in the United States are an important consideration in deciding whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted.

The alien in Matter of Tin, supra, re-entered the United States after removal without being admitted and without permission to reapply for admission. The Regional Commissioner held that such an unlawful presence is evidence of disrespect for law.

The favorable factors in this matter are the applicant's family ties, the absence of a criminal record, the need for the applicant's presence and the prospect of general hardship to the family.

The unfavorable factors in this matter include the applicant's remaining longer than authorized, his fraudulent attempt to procure admission, his first removal, his felonious reentry without permission, his employment without Service authorization and his lengthy presence in the United States without a lawful admission or parole. The Commissioner stated in Matter of Lee, supra, that he could only relate a positive factor of residence in the United States where that residence is pursuant to a legal admission or adjustment of status as a permanent resident. To reward a person for remaining in the United States in violation of law, would seriously threaten the structure of all laws pertaining to immigration.

The applicant's actions in this matter cannot be condoned. The applicant has not established by supporting evidence that the favorable factors outweigh the unfavorable ones.

In discretionary matters, the applicant bears the full burden of proving eligibility in terms of equities in the United States which are not outweighed by adverse factors. See Matter of T-S-Y-, 7 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1957); Matter of Ducret, 15 I&N Dec. 620 (BIA 1976). After a careful review of the record, it is concluded that the applicant has failed to establish he warrants the favorable exercise of the Attorney General's discretion. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.