



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

124

[Redacted]

FILE:

[Redacted]

Office: PHOENIX, ARIZONA

Date:

SEP 29 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.

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

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

IDENTIC COPY

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy
www.uscis.gov

DISCUSSION: The Form I-212, Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission into the United States after Deportation or Removal, was denied by the Acting District Director, Phoenix, Arizona, 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 August 2, 1992. An Order to Show Cause was served to the applicant on August 2, 1992, and he was released on a \$5,000 bond. On August 3, 1992, the applicant was convicted pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1325 for entering the United States without inspection. He was sentenced to 30 days imprisonment and on September 3, 1992, an Immigration Judge ordered the applicant deported pursuant to section 241(a)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act). On September 8, 1992, the applicant was removed from the United States at the San Diego Airport. The record reflects that the applicant reentered the United States in June 1995 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. The record further reflects that the applicant married a U.S. citizen on March 17, 1997, and he is the beneficiary of an approved petition for alien relative. The applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(ii). 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 remain in the United States.

The District Director determined that the unfavorable factors in the applicant's case outweighed the favorable factors, and denied the application accordingly. *See District Director's Decision* dated October 23, 2003.

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

(A) Certain alien 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 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.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief in which he states that the District Director abused her discretion in denying the Form I-212. Counsel states that the applicant is a person of good moral character and that he has been rehabilitated since his last unlawful activity in 1992. Additionally counsel states that the applicant's spouse would suffer severe hardship if the applicant were not permitted to remain in the United States because he is the primary economic and emotional support for her and her children. Furthermore counsel states that the applicant has resided in the United States for over eight years, has held steady employment since 1995 and his services are needed in the United States because there has always been a shortage of farm labor workers. Counsel submits several letter of recommendation from friends regarding the applicant's character.

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 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 without inspection on August 2, 1992, was removed from the United States, reentered illegally in June 1995 and married his U.S. citizen spouse on March 17, 1997. He now seeks relief based on that after-acquired equity.

The AAO finds that the favorable factors in this case are the applicant's family ties in the United States, his U.S. citizen spouse and stepchildren, an approved petition for alien relative, and the letters of recommendation.

The AAO finds that the unfavorable factors in this case include the applicant's illegal entry into the United States on August 2, 1992, his illegal reentry subsequent to his September 8, 1992, removal, 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. His equity, marriage to a U.S. citizen gained after his removal from the United States and his subsequent illegal reentry 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.