


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

PUBLIC COPY



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services




HA

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: BANGKOK, THAILAND Date: NOV 18 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

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

The applicant is a native and citizen of Australia who entered the United States on May 9, 1998, as a non-immigrant visitor under the Visa Waiver Program. The applicant overstayed his authorized period of stay and on December 20, 2000, he was found removable under section 237(a)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1227(a)(1)(B) for having remained in the United States longer than permitted. On January 11, 2001, he was removed to Australia pursuant to section 237(a)(1)(C)(i) of the Act. The applicant is inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(A)(i) Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(i). He 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 to reside with his U.S. citizen spouse and stepchild.

The District Director determined that the unfavorable factors in the applicant's case outweighed the favorable factors, and denied the applicant's Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission After Removal (Form I-212) accordingly. *See District Director Decision* dated March 24, 2004.

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 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 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.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief, medical documentation regarding the applicant's stepchild and numerous letters of recommendation from relatives and friends regarding the applicant character. In his brief counsel states that the District Director erred in denying the Form I-212 because she erroneously considered the applicant's criminal record in Australia, the information he volunteered during an adjustment interview related to prostitution. In addition counsel states that the District Director failed to consider that the applicant demonstrated rehabilitation and failed to consider the hardship his spouse and stepchild would suffer if he is not permitted to travel and reside in the United States. Furthermore counsel submits documentation to show that the applicant's spouse and stepchild are not permitted to immigrate to Australia.

Counsel states that the applicant worked as a driver in order to help out a friend and was not aware that he was driving prostitutes to appointments. When he found this out, he stopped working as a driver immediately. Counsel further states that he was never arrested for any act related to prostitution and that he voluntarily provided this information during his adjustment interview.

Although the applicant was not arrested or convicted of any acts related to prostitution he admitted under oath that he was a driver for escorts for three months and therefore he is still inadmissible under section 212(a)(D)(ii) of the Act as an individual who indirectly received part of the proceeds of prostitution.

Counsel's assertion that the District Director erroneously considered the applicant's criminal record in Australia is unconvincing. In adjudicating a Form I-212 the District Director must weigh all favorable and unfavorable factors in the case and take into consideration the applicant's complete criminal history. The applicant was convicted in Australia for the offense of assault occasioning actual bodily harm and was arrested several other times although not convicted. In addition the applicant was convicted in the United States of harassment.

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.

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.*

The court held in *Garcia-Lopes v. INS*, 923 F.2d 72 (7th Cir. 1991), that less weight is given to equities acquired after a deportation order has been entered. Further, the equity of a marriage and the weight given to any hardship to the spouse is diminished if the parties married after the commencement of deportation proceedings, with knowledge that the alien might be deported. It is also noted that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, in *Carnalla-Nunoz v. INS*, 627 F.2d 1004 (9th Cir. 1980), held that an after-acquired equity, referred to as an after-acquired family tie in *Matter of Tijam*, 22 I&N Dec. 408 (BIA 1998) need not be accorded great weight by the district director in considering discretionary weight. Moreover, in *Ghassan v. INS*, 972 F.2d 631, 634-35 (5th Cir. 1992), the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals held that giving diminished weight to hardship faced by a spouse who entered into a marriage with knowledge of the alien's possible deportation was proper.

The applicant in the present matter entered the United States in 1998, fell out of lawful status, was ordered excluded and was removed from the United States on January 11, 2001. He married his U.S. citizen spouse on April 24, 2001, in Australia, after his removal from the United States. He now seeks relief based on that after-acquired equity.

The favorable factors in this matter are the applicant's family ties to U.S. citizens (spouse and stepchild), the approval of a petition for alien relative on his behalf and the prospective hardship to his family.

The unfavorable factors in this matter include the applicant's overstay after his initial lawful admission, his criminal history, his illegal stay and employment in the United States and his lengthy presence in the United States without authorization. The Commissioner stated in *Matter of Lee, supra*, that residence in the United States could be considered a positive factor only 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. His equity, marriage to a U.S. citizen, gained after his removal from the United States can be given only minimal weight. 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 Secretary's discretion is warranted. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.