



PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Justice

Identifying documents used to
prevent clearing of names wanted
invasion of personal privacy

Immigration and Naturalization Service

HAKH

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



FILE  Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: JAN 29 2003

IN RE: Applicant: 

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

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, Vermont 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 Italy who was lawfully admitted for permanent residence on January 5, 1974. On April 7, 1989, the applicant was sentenced to 5 years probation and 6 months incarceration after having been convicted of the violations of Bail Jumping 2 and Burglary 3. The applicant was also sentenced to 6 months incarceration for having been convicted of two counts of Attempted Burglary 3. These violations are crimes involving moral turpitude which rendered the applicant inadmissible to the United States. The applicant left the United States in the year 2000 to visit his mother in Italy.

On February 7, 2000, the applicant applied for admission to the United States as an intending immigrant. He was served with a Notice to Appear on April 18, 2000, and charged with being inadmissible under section 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(7)(A)(i)(I). On July 28, 2000, he was ordered removed by an immigration judge. The applicant indicates that he left the United States on August 29, 2000. Therefore he is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(ii).

The applicant has been married to a U.S. citizen since December 1985 and seeks permission to reapply for admission into the United States under section 212(a)(9)(A)(iii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(iii).

The director determined that the unfavorable factors outweighed the favorable ones and denied the application accordingly.

On appeal, counsel states that the Service Center is denying the application based on crimes that the applicant committed more than 12 years ago. Counsel asserts that the applicant was not deported because of his crimes but because he was attempting to enter without a valid visa, and he voluntarily deported himself without knowing the effects and burden that it would cause his family. Counsel states that the applicant did not fight the deportation order because he was going through many health problems. His wife and son accompanied him to Italy. Counsel states that they cannot speak the language. Counsel further states that the applicant has reformed his character since 1989 and that the applicant was unjustifiably deported as the crimes were committed prior to the law changing.

The record reflects that the applicant was convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude. This act rendered the applicant inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I), notwithstanding the fact that the Notice to Appear only charged him with being an immigrant without a valid visa. As an alien convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, he needed a waiver of that ground of

inadmissibility, which he did not have at the time he applied for admission.

Section 212(a)(9)(A) of the Act provides, in part, that:

(i) Any alien who has been ordered removed under section 235(b)(1) or at the end of proceedings under section 240 initiated upon the alien's arrival in the United States and who again seeks admission within 5 years of the date of such removal (or within 20 years 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.

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

(I) has been ordered removed under section 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) 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)(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 section 212(a)(9)(A)(i) and (ii).

In IIRIRA, Congress imposed restrictions on benefits for aliens, enhanced enforcement and penalties for certain violations, eliminated judicial review of certain judgments or decisions under certain sections of the Act, created a new expedited removal proceeding, and established major new grounds of inadmissibility. Nothing could be clearer than Congress's desire in recent years to limit, rather than to extend, the relief available to aliens who have violated immigration law. 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).

Although guidelines for considering permission to reapply for admission applications were promulgated in Matter of Tin, 14 I&N Dec. 371 (Reg. Comm. 1973), and in Matter of Lee, 17 I&N Dec. 275 (Comm. 1978), these holdings were rendered long before Congress amended the Act from 1981 through the present 1996 IIRIRA amendments and beyond. It is specifically noted that the Commissioner in Matter of Lee, referred to the intent of Congress in enacting former sections 212(a)(16) and (17) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(16) and (17), in the conclusions and recommendations of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in their report dated 1950. The Committee also reviewed section 3 of the 1917 Act in their study.

Even though the decisions in Tin and Lee have not been overruled, Congress and the courts following the 1981 amendments and onward have clearly shown in their intent, and in the legislation and in their decisions, that individuals who violate immigration law are viewed unfavorably. The later statutes and judicial decisions have effectively negated most precedent case law rendered prior to 1981. Such case law is still considered but less weight is given to favorable factors gained after the violation of immigration laws following statutory changes and judicial decisions.

Congress has increased the bar to admissibility from 5 to 10 years. Congress has also added a bar to admissibility for aliens who are unlawfully present in the United States. In addition, Congress 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. In IIRIRA, Congress has added new and amended crimes, new grounds of inadmissibility, new grounds of deportability, and has enhanced enforcement authorities. 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.

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. 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). In Acosta, the alien's wife was a lawful permanent resident and his children were U.S. citizens. Family ties were a consideration in that matter.

Letters from family members in the United States and his wife in Italy stress the factors of hardship due to separation.

The favorable factors in this matter are the applicant's family ties, consideration of the applicant's health problems, and the prospect of general hardship to the family based on separation.

The unfavorable factors in this matter include the applicant's conviction of crimes involving moral turpitude and his being ordered deported.

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

Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361, provides that the burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that the applicant is eligible for the benefit sought. After a careful review of the record, it is concluded that the applicant has failed to establish that a favorable exercise of the Attorney General's discretion is warranted. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.