





U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

HL

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy
PUBLIC COPY



FILE:




Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date **MAR 28 2006**

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.

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

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 citizen of Mexico who entered the United States without a lawful admission or parole on or about January 20, 1995. On March 26, 1996, the applicant filed an Application for Asylum and for Withholding of Removal (Form I-589) with the Immigration and Naturalization Service (now Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS)). On April 30, 1996, the applicant was interviewed for asylum status. His application was referred to the immigration court and an Order to Show Cause (OSC) for a hearing before an immigration judge was served on him on May 14, 1996. On July 2, 1996, an immigration judge found the applicant deportable and granted him voluntary departure until April 2, 1997, in lieu of deportation. The applicant failed to surrender for removal or depart from the United States. The applicant's failure to depart on or prior to April 2, 1997, changed the voluntary departure order to an order of deportation. On August 11, 1997, a Warrant of Removal/Deportation (Form I-205) was issued. On October 22, 2001, the applicant appeared at a CIS office in connection with an Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status (Form I-485). Based on the Form I-205, the applicant was apprehended and removed from the United States pursuant to section 241(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), for having entered the United States without inspection. The record reflects that the applicant reentered the United States shortly after his removal without a lawful admission or parole and without permission to reapply for admission, in violation of section 276 the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1326 (a felony). 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 U.S. citizen spouse.

The Director determined that the applicant was inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for a period of one year or more. In addition, the Director determined 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 for any relief or benefit from his Form I-212. Finally, the Director determined that the unfavorable factors in the applicant's case outweighed the favorable factors. The Director then denied the Form I-212 accordingly. *See Director's Decision* dated November 12, 2004.

The proceeding in the present case is for an application for permission to reapply for admission into the United States after deportation or removal and therefore the AAO will not discuss the applicant's potential grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act. These proceedings are limited to the issue of whether or not the applicant meets the requirements necessary for the ground of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(A)(i) of the Act to be waived.

Section 241(a) of the Act states in pertinent part:

(5) Reinstatement of removal orders against aliens illegally reentering. If the Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security, "Secretary"] 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 the reentry.

The AAO finds that the Director erred in finding that section 241(a)(5) of the Act applies in this case. In its August 14, 2004 decision, *Perez-Gonzalez v. Ashcroft*, 379 F.3d 783 (9th Cir. 2004), the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that a Mexican national who returned to the United States following a deportation and had his deportation order reinstated may nonetheless obtain adjustment of status if his Form I-212 is granted. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals stated in *Perez-Gonzalez* that: "Given the fact that Perez-Gonzalez applied for the waiver *before* his deportation order was reinstated, he was not yet subject to its terms and, therefore, was not barred from applying for relief." The Court further states: "Prior administrative decisions of the Bureau of Immigration Appeals confirm the fact that permission to reapply is available on a *nunc pro tunc* basis, in which the petitioner receives permission to reapply for admission after he or she has already reentered the country."

The record of proceedings does not reveal that the applicant's prior removal order was reinstated at the time he filed the Form I-212. Since this case arises in the Ninth Circuit, *Perez-Gonzalez* is controlling. The applicant is eligible to file a Form I-212.

On appeal, the applicant states that he has lived in the United States for many years, respecting the law and paying his taxes on time, and overall has been a good citizen to the community. In addition, the applicant states that he married his U.S. citizen spouse in good faith and he needs to be present in the United States in order to take care of his 82-year old spouse because she is not able to take care of herself on her own.

The AAO conducts the final administrative review and enters the ultimate decision for CIS 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), *aff'd*. 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003).

Before the AAO can weigh the discretionary factors in this case, it must first determine whether the applicant is eligible to apply for the relief requested. To recapitulate, the applicant was removed from the United States on October 22, 2001, and reentered after his removal without a lawful admission or parole and without permission to reapply for admission.

Because the applicant illegally reentered the United States after his removal, the AAO finds that although the applicant is not subject to section 241(a)(5) of the Act, he is clearly inadmissible under sections 212(a)(9)(A) and 212(a)(9)(C)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C § 1182(a)(9)(C)(i) and, therefore, must receive permission to reapply for admission.

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 Secretary has consented to the alien's reapplying for admission.

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

(C) Aliens unlawfully present after previous immigration violations.-

(i) In general.-Any alien who-

(I) has been unlawfully present in the United States for an aggregate period of more than 1 year, or

(II) has been ordered removed under section 235(b)(1), section 240, or any other provision of law, and who enters or attempts to reenter the United States without being admitted is inadmissible.

(ii) Exception.- Clause (i) shall not apply to an alien seeking admission more than 10 years after the date of the alien's last departure from the United States if, prior to the alien's reembarkation at a place outside the United States or attempt to be readmitted from a foreign contiguous territory, the Secretary has consented to the alien's reapplying for admission. The Secretary, in the Secretary's discretion, may waive the provisions of section 212(a)(9)(C)(i) in the case of an alien to whom the Secretary has granted classification under clause (iii), (iv), or (v) of section 204(a)(1)(A), or classification under clause (ii), (iii), or (iv) of section 204(a)(1)(B), in any case in which there is a connection between—

(1) the alien's having been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty; and

(2) the alien's--

(A) removal;

(B) departure from the United States;

(C) reentry or reentries into the United States; or

(D) attempted reentry into the United States.

An alien who is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(C)(i) of the Act may not apply for consent to reapply unless more than ten years have elapsed since the date of the alien's last departure from the United States. See *Matter of Torres-Garcia*, 23 I&N Dec. 866 (BIA 2006). Thus, to avoid inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act, it must be the case that the applicant's last departure was at least ten years ago *and* that CIS has consented to the applicant's reapplying for admission. In the present matter, the applicant's last departure from the United States occurred on October 22, 2001, less than ten years ago. The applicant is currently statutorily ineligible to apply for permission to reapply for admission.

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. The applicant in the instant case does not qualify for an exception under section 212(a)(9)(C)(ii) of the Act. Thus, as a matter of law, the applicant is not eligible for approval of a Form I-212. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.