

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

H4

PUBLIC COPY

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED]

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: **MAY 26 2006**

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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
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, Vermont 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 Portugal who was admitted to the United States as a C1 crewmember in October 1987. He remained in the United States illegally until August 1993 when he departed the United States. The applicant then attempted to re-enter the United States in September 1993 without a valid visa and was placed in removal proceedings. On December 12, 1993 the Board of Immigration Appeals ordered the applicant deported. The applicant was ordered deported a second time on March 9, 1995 and his BIA appeal was dismissed on November 8, 1995. On July 29, 1997 the Immigration Service sent the applicant a letter ordering him to appear on October 17, 1997 to be deported from the United States and he never appeared. The applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(A)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(i). 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 and child.

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 September 4, 2003.

On appeal, counsel states that the favorable facts outweigh the unfavorable factors in this case and the applicant warrants a favorable exercise of the Service's discretion.

Section 212(a)(9) 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 Secretary has consented to the alien's reapplying for admission.

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 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 favorable factors in this case are the applicant's U.S. citizen wife and child and the absence of any criminal record. The applicant also states that his son has a developmental disability. The applicant has an approved Alien Relative Petition (Form I-130) from his marriage to a U.S. citizen. His I-130 was approved on January 21, 1997 and the applicant's son was born on August 14, 2000. The AAO notes that these favorable factors were acquired after the applicant's deportation order by the BIA on December 12, 1993. The AAO finds that as after acquired equities, these factors will be given less weight.

Many legal decisions have repeatedly upheld the *general principal* that less weight is given to *equities* acquired by an alien after an order of deportation or removal order has been issued ("less weight principle").

In *Garcia-Lopez v. INS*, 923 F.2d 72 (7th Cir. 1991), for example, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals (Seventh Circuit) reviewed a Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) denial of an alien's request for discretionary voluntary departure relief. The Seventh Circuit found that the Board's denial rested on discretionary grounds, and that the Board had weighed all of the favorable and unfavorable factors and stated the reasons for its denial of relief. The Seventh Circuit affirmed the general principle that less weight may be accorded to equities acquired after an order of deportation is issued, and the Seventh Circuit concluded that the Board had not abused or exercised its discretion in an arbitrary or capricious manner.

In *Bothyo v. Moyer*, 772 F.2d 353, 357 (7th Cir. 1985), the Seventh Circuit reviewed a discretionary stay of deportation case that weighed and balanced favorable and unfavorable factors. The Seventh Circuit stated that an alien's marriage to a lawful permanent resident did not necessitate the granting of a stay of deportation because the marriage occurred after deportation proceedings had commenced and after an Order to Show Cause had been issued against the alien. The Seventh Circuit then affirmed the general principle that an "after-acquired equity" need not be accorded great weight by a district director in his or her consideration of discretionary weight.

In *Carnalla-Munoz v. INS*, 627 F.2d 1004, 1006 (9th Cir. 1980), the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit) reviewed a discretionary suspension of deportation case. The Ninth Circuit affirmed the principle that post-deportation equities are entitled to less weight in determining hardship. In doing so, the Ninth Circuit referred to the 1980 decision, *Wang v. INS*, 622 F.2d 1341, 1346 (9th Cir. 1980) (overruled on unrelated grounds). In *Wang*, the alien sought discretionary relief and a finding of extreme hardship through a motion to reopen deportation proceedings. The Ninth Circuit held in *Wang*, that, “[e]quities arising when the alien knows he is in this country illegally, e.g. after a deportation order is issued, are entitled to less weight than equities arising when the alien is legally in this country.”

In *Ghassan v. INS*, 972 F.2d 631, 634-35 (5th Cir. 1992), the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals (Fifth Circuit) reviewed a section 212(c), waiver of deportation, discretionary relief case that involved the balancing of favorable and unfavorable factors. The Fifth Circuit found no abuse of discretion in the Board’s weighing of equitable factors against unfavorable factors in the alien’s case, and the Fifth Circuit affirmed the principle that as an equity factor, it is not an abuse of discretion to accord diminished weight to hardship faced by a spouse who entered into a marriage with knowledge of the alien spouse’s possible deportation.

The AAO finds that the above-cited precedent legal decisions establish the general principle that “after-acquired equities” are accorded less weight for purposes of assessing favorable equities in the exercise of discretion.

The AAO finds that the unfavorable factors in this case include the applicant’s immigration violations, which include: overstaying his C1 crewmember visa, failing to appear for removal and years of unauthorized presence and employment. The AAO sympathizes with the applicant’s concerns surrounding his child’s disability, but his actions in this matter cannot be condoned. Thus, the AAO finds that the unfavorable factors in the applicant’s case outweigh the favorable factors.

Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361, provides that the burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that he is eligible for the benefit sought. After a careful review of the record, it is concluded that the applicant has not established that a favorable exercise of the Secretary’s discretion is warranted. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.