



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

114

[Redacted]

FILE:

[Redacted]

Office: DENVER, COLORADO

Date:

SEP 09 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:

[Redacted]

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

PUBLIC COPY

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

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

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who entered the United States on or about June 1, 1998, without inspection. On October 10, 2001, an Immigration Judge granted the applicant voluntary departure in lieu of removal until February 7, 2002. The applicant failed to submit documentary evidence that he departed the United States on or prior to February 7, 2002. The applicant's failure to prove his departure on or prior to February 7, 2002, changed the voluntary departure order to an order of removal. The applicant is therefore inadmissible pursuant to 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 is the beneficiary of an approved petition for alien relative filed by his U.S. citizen spouse. 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 and reside with his U.S. citizen spouse.

The Interim 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 *Interim District Director's Decision* dated December 22, 2003.

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, filed on January 23, 2004, counsel requests thirty days to submit a brief and additional evidence to the AAO. As of this date, more than eight months 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 departed the United States on February 6, 2002.

The applicant has previously submitted a Notification of Departure-Bond Case (Form I-392) dated September 24, 2002. The Form I-392 states that on September 24, 2002, the applicant appeared in person at the Immigration and Naturalization Service office (now known as Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS)) at the American Consulate General in Ciudad Juarez, Mexico and stated that he departed the United States on February 6, 2002. However, aside from one sentence on Form I-290B and the applicant's own statement on Form I-392 the record contains no independent documentary evidence establishing that he departed on or before February 7, 2002, the date the voluntary departure order expired.

The record of proceedings reveals that on June 1, 1997, in Lafayette, Colorado the applicant was arrested, for failing to dim lights, driving while ability impaired, license for driver required and criminal impersonation. On December 18, 1998, the applicant was arrested for failure to appear on the above charges. In addition the applicant admitted that he obtained a driver's license by using fraudulent immigration documents

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 favorable factors in this matter are the applicant's family tie to a U.S. citizen, his spouse and the approval of a petition for alien relative filed on his behalf.

The unfavorable factors in this matter include the applicant's illegal entry into the United States on or about June 1, 1998, his overstay after he was granted voluntary departure, his failure to appear in court for traffic violations, his use of fraudulent documents in order to procure a drivers' license, his employment without authorization and his lengthy presence in the United States without a lawful admission or parole. 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. 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.