

PUBLIC COPY



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

**Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**



H4

FILE:



Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER, VT

Date: MAY 25 2004

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)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for permission to reapply for admission after removal was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Jamaica who on November 18, 1998, was convicted in the Superior Court of Rockville, Connecticut for the offense of "Possession of Hallucinogen > 4oz. Marijuana" in violation of Connecticut General Statutes Section 21a-276(b). On May 17, 2000, he was removed from the United States pursuant to section 237(a)(2)(B)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1227(a)(2)(B)(i), for having been convicted of a violation of any law or regulation of a State, the United States, or a foreign country relating to a controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802)), other than a single offense involving possession for one's own use of 30 grams or less of marijuana. The applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii) the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(ii) and he now 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 travel to the United States and reside with his US citizen parents and child.

The director determined that the unfavorable factors in the applicant's case outweighed the favorable factors, and denied the application accordingly. See *Director's Decision* dated February 27, 2003.

Section 212(a)(9)(A) of the Act states in pertinent part:

(A) Certain aliens previously removed.-

....

(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,

(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 [now Secretary, Homeland Security, "Secretary"] has consented to the alien's 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.

On appeal the applicant's mother states that the applicant lived in the United States for 13 years, he broke the law eight years ago and he has grown to be mature adult and father and he deserves a second chance. Additionally the applicant's mother states that she will be submitting a formal appeal within 30 days from the

date she filed the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal to the AAO. To this date, approximately one year after the filing of the Form I-290B, no additional documentation has been received by the AAO.

Before the AAO can weigh the favorable versus and unfavorable factors in this case, this office must first see if the applicant can benefit from a waiver of inadmissibility due to his conviction of a controlled substance. Based on this conviction the applicant is inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)(II).

Section 212(a)(2) of the Act states in pertinent part, that:

(A)(i) [A]ny alien convicted of, or who admits having committed, or who admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of-

.....

(II) a violation of (or a conspiracy or attempt to violate) any law or regulations of a State, the United States, or a foreign country relating to a controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802)), is inadmissible.

Section 212(h) of the Act provides, in pertinent part, that:

(h) The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security, "Secretary"] may, in his discretion, waive the application of subparagraphs (A)(i)(I), (B), (D) and (E) of subsection (a)(2) and subparagraph (A)(i)(II) of such subsection insofar as it relate to a single offense of simple possession of 30 grams or less of marijuana.-

As mentioned above the applicant was convicted for Possession of Hallucinogen more than 4 oz. Marijuana. No waiver of the ground of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(II) of the Act is available to an alien found inadmissible under this section except for a single offense of simple possession of thirty grams or less of marijuana. The applicant does not qualify under this exception.

Matter of Martinez-Torres, 10 I&N Dec. 776 (reg. Comm. 1964) held that an application for permission to reapply for admission is denied, in the exercise of discretion, to an alien who is mandatorily inadmissible to the United States under another section of the Act, and no purpose would be served in granting the application.

No purpose would be served in the favorable exercise of discretion in adjudicating the application to reapply for admission into the United States under section 212(a)(9)(A)(iii) of the Act. The applicant is not eligible for any relief under the Act and the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.