



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

H4




FILE: [Redacted] Office: SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA Date: AUG 24 2004

IN RE: Applicant: [Redacted]

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)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



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

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

DISCUSSION: The Form I-212, Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission into the United States after Deportation or Removal, was denied by the District Director, San Francisco, California, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained and the application approved.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who attempted to procure admission into the United States on September 30, 1995, at the Otay Mesa, California port of entry by presenting a Border Crossing Card that did not belong to her. The applicant was found inadmissible under section 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182 (a)(7)(A)(i)(I) for being an immigrant not in possession of a valid immigrant visa or lieu document. Consequently, on October 5, 1995, the applicant was expeditiously removed from the United States pursuant to section 235(b)(1) of the Act 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1). The record reflects that the applicant reentered the United States in December 1996 without a lawful admission or parole and without permission to reapply for admission in violation of section 276 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1326. The applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(A)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(i). She 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) in order to remain in the United States and reside with her U.S. citizen spouse and Lawful Permanent Resident (LPR) children.

The District Director determined that section 241(a)(5) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1231(a)(5) applies in this matter and the applicant is not eligible and may not apply for any relief and denied the Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission After Removal (Form I-212) accordingly. *See District Director's Decision* dated July 15, 2003.

The applicant reentered the United States prior to the April 1, 1997, enactment date of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, ("IIRIRA"), Pub. L. No. 104-208, § 303(b)(3), 110 Stat. 3009. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals held in *Castro-Cortez v. INS*, 239 F.3d 1037 (9th Cir. 2001) that section 241(a)(5) of the Act was not retroactive and did not apply to illegal reentries that occurred prior to its April 1, 1997, enactment. Since this case arises in the Ninth Circuit, *Castro-Cortez* is controlling and section 241(a)(5) of the Act is not applicable in this case. For this reason, the AAO finds that the District Director erred in his decision finding that section 241(a)(5) of the Act is applicable in this case.

The applicant is clearly inadmissible under section 212(a)(9) of the Act.

Section 212(a)(9). Aliens previously removed.-

(A) Certain alien previously removed.-

(i) Arriving aliens.- 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 five 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) Other aliens.- Any alien not described in clause (i) who-

(I) has been ordered removed under section 240 or any other provision

of law, or

- (II) departed the United States while an order of removal was outstanding, and 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 aliens 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 aliens' reembarkation at a place outside the United States or attempt to be admitted from foreign continuous territory, the Attorney General has consented to the aliens' reapplying for admission.

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 in most instances and to 20 years for others, (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.

In *Matter of Tin*, 14 I&N Dec. 371 (Reg. Comm. 1973), the Regional Commissioner listed the following factors to be considered in the adjudication of a Form I-212 Application for Permission to Reapply After Deportation:

The basis of deportation; the recency of the deportation; the length of legal residence in the U.S.; the applicant's moral character and his respect for law and order; evidence of reformation and rehabilitation; the applicant's family responsibilities; and hardship to the applicant's family if the applicant were not allowed to return to the U.S.

Matter of Lee, 17 I&N Dec. 275 (Comm. 1978) further held that a record of immigration violations, standing alone, did not conclusively support a finding of a lack of good moral character. *Matter of Lee* at 278. *Lee* additionally held that,

[T]he recency of deportation can only be considered when there is a finding of poor moral character based on moral turpitude in the conduct and attitude of a person which evinces a callous conscience [toward the violation of immigration laws] In all other instances when the cause of deportation has been removed and the person now appears eligible for issuance of a visa, the time factor should not be considered. *Id.*

In *Tin*, the Regional Commissioner noted that the applicant had gained an equity (job experience) while being unlawfully present in the U.S. The Regional Commissioner then stated that the alien had obtained an advantage over aliens seeking visa issuance abroad or who abide by the terms of their admission while in this country, and he concluded that approval of an application for permission to reapply for admission would be a

condonation of the alien's acts and could encourage others to enter without being admitted to work in the United States unlawfully. *Id.*

On appeal, filed on August 14, 2003, counsel requests thirty days to submit a brief and additional evidence to the AAO. As of this date, a year later, no additional documentation has been provided to the AAO. In the Notice of Appeal to the AAO (Form I-290B) counsel states that the applicant believed the she was granted voluntary departure, that she is a person of good moral character, she has been in the United States for almost seven years and that her U.S. citizen spouse and LPR children would suffer extreme hardship if she is not allowed to remain in the United States.

Unlike sections 212(g), (h), and (i) of the Act (which relate to waivers of inadmissibility for prospective immigrants), section 212(a)(9)(A)(iii) of the Act does not specify hardship threshold requirements which must be met. An applicant for permission to reapply for admission into the United States after deportation or removal need not establish that a particular level of hardship would result to a qualifying family member if the application were denied.

If extreme hardship is established, it is but one favorable factor to be considered in the determination of whether the Secretary should exercise discretion. *See Matter of Mendez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (BIA 1996).

The favorable factors in this matter are the applicant's family ties to her U.S. citizen spouse and LPR children, the approval of a petition for alien relative, the lack of a criminal record, the fact that she has filed tax returns, as required by law, and the prospect of general hardship to her family.

The unfavorable factors in this matter include the applicant's attempt to gain entry into the United States on September 30, 1995, and her re-entry without inspection subsequent to her removal.

While the applicant's attempt to enter the United States in 1995, and her subsequent entry without inspection are serious matters that cannot be condoned, the AAO finds that given all of the circumstances in the present case, the applicant has established that the favorable factors outweigh the unfavorable factors, and that a favorable exercise of the Secretary's discretion is warranted. Accordingly, the appeal will be sustained and the application approved.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained and the application approved.