



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**



H14

FILE:



Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: NOV 14 2005

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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 into the United States after Deportation or Removal (Form I-212) 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 a citizen of Guatemala who entered the United States without a lawful admission or parole on or about July 19, 1990. On September 8, 1995, the applicant applied for asylum with the Immigration and Naturalization Service (now Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS)). The applicant failed to appear for an interview for asylum status and an Order to Show Cause (OSC) for a hearing before an Immigration Judge was issued. On October 16, 1996, the applicant failed to appear for a removal hearing and he was subsequently ordered deported in absentia by an Immigration Judge pursuant to section 241(a)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act). The applicant failed to surrender for removal or depart from the United States and a Warrant of Deportation (Form I-205) was issued on October 28, 1996. The applicant filed a motion to reopen his deportation hearing, which was denied by an Immigration Judge on June 24, 1997. The applicant is inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(ii). 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 remain in the United States and reside with his family.

The Director determined that the unfavorable factors in the applicant's case outweighed the favorable factors and denied the Form I-212 accordingly. See *Director's Decision* dated September 22, 2004.

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 . . . [and who 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 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (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, with limited exceptions, 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 the applicant states that he entered the United States on July 7, 1970, in order to find work and help his family in Guatemala. In addition, he states that he contacted an individual who promised him he would get him an employment authorization card. The applicant states that it was not until April 2002, when he received copies of his immigration file, under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), that he found out that he had been ordered deported in absentia. Furthermore the applicant states that he needs a pardon in order to apply for relief under the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act (NACARA). Finally the applicant states that he needs to take care of his family, which includes a U.S. citizen child, that he has never had any problems with the law and that he is a very honest person.

The applicant's statement that he did not find out about his deportation order until April 2002 is not persuasive. According to the record of proceedings, on April 18, 1996, the applicant failed to appear for a hearing with an Immigration Judge. The applicant's attorney filed a motion to recalendar, which was granted, and a new deportation hearing was scheduled for October 16, 1996. Both the applicant and his attorney were informed of the new hearing date. If an individual defrauded the applicant, the fact remains that he signed and filed an asylum application and he failed to appear for a deportation hearing. The proceeding in the present case is limited to the issue of whether or not the applicant's inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii) of the Act may be waived.

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 for deportation; recency of deportation; length of residence in the United States; applicant's moral character; his respect for law and order; evidence of reformation and rehabilitation; family responsibilities; any inadmissibility under other sections of law; hardship involved to himself and others; and the need for his services in the United States.

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 condone the alien's acts and could encourage others to enter the United States to work in the United States unlawfully. *Id.*

*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.*

The AAO finds that the favorable factors in this case are the applicant's family tie to a U.S. citizen, his child, and the lack of any criminal record.

The unfavorable factors in this case include the applicant's initial illegal entry into the United States in 1990, his failure to attend his asylum interview, his failure to appear for removal proceedings, his failure to depart the United States after a final removal order was issued by an Immigration Judge, 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.