

Identifying data deleted
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

H4



FILE:




Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date: SEP 15 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:



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 Form I-212, Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission into the United States after Deportation or Removal, was denied by the Director, Nebraska 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 Mexico who was present in the United States without a lawful admission or parole on or about March 20, 1990. On April 13, 1990, the applicant was removed from the United States pursuant to section 241(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act). The record reflects that the applicant reentered the United States on an unknown date but prior to July 3, 1991, without a lawful admission or parole and without permission to reapply for admission in violation of section 276 of Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1326 (a felony). The applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(ii). She 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 remain in the United States and reside with her spouse and children.

The 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 Director's Decision* dated November 14, 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, 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 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, counsel states that the applicant has three U.S. citizen children for whom she is the primary care giver. In addition counsel states that if the applicant is removed from the United States her children would suffer immensely. Furthermore counsel states that the applicant is a person of excellent moral character, she has never been arrested, is involved in volunteer work and self-development, and has never engaged in any unauthorized employment.

In his decision the Director states that the applicant is inadmissible under section 241(a)(5) of the Act. Although the Director found the applicant inadmissible under section 241(a)(5) of the Act he continued to evaluate the favorable and unfavorable factors of the case. The AAO finds 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. The record of proceeding reflects that the applicant was deported to Mexico on April 13, 1990, and reentered illegally after her removal. She has never been granted permission to reapply for admission, therefore she is subject to the provision of section 241(a) (5) of the Act, and she is not eligible for any relief under this Act.

Section 241(a) detention, release, and removal or aliens ordered removed.-

(5) reinstatement of removal orders against aliens illegally reentering.- if the Attorney General finds that an alien has reentered the United States illegally after having been removed or having departed voluntarily, under an order of removal, the prior order of removal is reinstated from its original date and is not subject to being reopened or reviewed, the alien is not eligible and may not apply for any relief under this Act, and the alien shall be removed under the prior order at any time after reentry.

Notwithstanding the arguments on appeal, section 241(a)(5) of the Act is very specific and applicable. The applicant is subject to the provision of section 241(a)(5) of the Act, and she is not eligible for any relief under this Act.

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.