

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



H4

FILE:




Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

JUL 22 2005

IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION: Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission after Removal into the United States after Deportation 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 Director, California 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 on August 9, 2003, at the San Ysidro California Port of Entry represented herself to be a citizen of the United States in order to gain admission into the United States. The applicant was found to be inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(ii), as an alien who falsely represents herself to be a citizen of the United States for any purpose or benefit under the Act and section 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182 (a)(7)(A)(i)(I) for being an immigrant not in possession of a valid immigrant visa or other valid entry document. Consequently, on August 10, 2003, the applicant was expeditiously removed from the United States pursuant to section 235(b)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1). The applicant is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130) filed by her U.S. citizen spouse. She is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(A)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(i) and 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 her U.S. citizen spouse and children.

The Director determined that the unfavorable factors in the applicant's case outweighed the favorable factors, and denied the Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission After Deportation or Removal (Form I-212) accordingly. *See Director's Decision* dated October 7, 2004.

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

(A) Certain aliens 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.

.

(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.

On appeal, counsel submits proof that the applicant is residing in Mexico and has not reentered since her removal. In addition counsel states that the applicant was residing in the United States for a period of fifteen years prior to her removal, has no criminal record in the United States and her U.S. citizen children need to return to the United States with the applicant. Furthermore counsel states that the applicant's spouse would suffer hardship if the applicant is not permitted to enter the United States because he would be forced to either live alone or relocate with his family to Mexico where the standard of living would be much lower than in the

United States. Finally counsel states that the applicant's U.S. citizen children would be deprived of their right to attend school in the United States.

The AAO conducts the final administrative review and enters the ultimate decision for USCIS on all immigration matters that fall within its jurisdiction. The AAO reviews each case de novo as to all questions of law, fact, discretion, or any other issue that may arise in an appeal that falls under its jurisdiction. Because the AAO engages in de novo review, the AAO may deny an application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law, without remand, even if the district or service center director does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. See *Helvering v. Gowran*, 302 U.S. 238, 245-246 (1937); see also, *Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *affd.* 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003).

Based on the AAO's right of de novo review, the AAO finds that the applicant's application for permission to reapply for admission should be denied for reasons not noted in the Director's decision.

The record of proceedings clearly reflects that on August 9, 2003, the applicant was placed under oath and stated that on that date she presented a U.S. birth certificate that did not belong to her, to an Immigration Inspector in an attempt to gain admission into the United States. By submitting a U.S. birth certificate to an Immigration Inspector, when applying for admission to the United States, the applicant falsely represented herself to be a U.S. citizen. A false representation of U.S. citizenship may be either an oral representation or one supported by an authentic or fraudulent document. In the present case the applicant attempted to use a U.S. birth certificate in order to gain admission into the United States as a U.S. citizen. The applicant is clearly inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act provides, in pertinent part, that:

(ii) Falsely claiming citizenship-

(I) In General- Any alien who falsely represents, or has falsely represented, himself or herself to be a citizen of the United States for any purpose or benefit under this Act (including section 274A) or any other Federal or State law is inadmissible.

(II) Exception- In the case of an alien making a representation described in subclause (I), if each natural parent of the alien (or, in the case of an adopted alien, each adoptive parent of the alien) is or was a citizen (whether by birth or naturalization), the alien permanently resided in the United States prior to attaining the age of 16, and the alien reasonably believed at the time of making such representation that he or she was a citizen, the alien shall not be considered to be inadmissible under any provision of this subsection based on such representation.

The applicant in the instant case does not qualify for the exception under section 212(a)(6)(C)(ii)(II) of the Act, and there is no waiver available under section 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the 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.

The applicant is subject to the provisions of section 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act, which are very specific and applicable. No waiver of the ground of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act is available to an alien who made a false claim to United States citizenship. Therefore, 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.