

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: OCT 10

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:

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, 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, 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 December 29, 1996, at the San Ysidro, California, Port of Entry, applied for admission into the United States. The applicant presented a Border Crossing Card (Form I-586) that did not belong to her. The applicant was found to be inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (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. The applicant was placed in exclusion proceedings and on January 3, 1997, an immigration judge ordered the applicant excluded and deported from the United States. Consequently, on the same date the applicant was removed to Mexico. The record reflects that the applicant reentered the United States on or about June 4, 1998, 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 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 remain in the United States and reside with her U.S. citizen spouse and child.

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 October 6, 2005.

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.

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 in 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 deterring aliens from overstaying their authorized period of stay and from being present in the United States without lawful admission or parole.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief and documentation that was submitted with the filing of the Form I-212. In her brief, counsel states that the Director abused his discretion in finding that the applicant's positive equities did not outweigh the unfavorable factors and that the Director erred in not giving the applicant's positive equities the appropriate weight. Additionally counsel states that the Director erred in his interpretation of case law found in *Garcia-Lopes v. INS*, 923 F.2d 72 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991) in regard to weight given to equities acquired after a deportation order has been entered. Counsel further states that the applicant is remorseful about breaking the law, and that with the exception of her immigration violations, she does not have a criminal record. Furthermore, counsel states that the applicant is a wonderful mother and wife, an outstanding citizen in the community and a person of good moral character. Moreover, counsel states that if the applicant were removed from the United States she and her family would suffer extreme hardship. The applicant's spouse would have to decide if he would remain married to the applicant and relocate with her to Mexico or stay in the United States to support his family and be separated from his wife and child. Counsel refers to case law regarding extreme hardship. Finally, counsel states that the hardship the applicant and her family would suffer is extreme compared to the minor infraction she committed and asserts that the applicant is eligible for a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to the standards set in statute and in case law.

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 review the discretionary factors in this case, it must first determine whether the applicant is eligible to apply for the relief requested. As noted above, the applicant was excluded and deported from the United States on January 3, 1997. She reentered the United States after her deportation without a lawful admission or parole and without permission to reapply for admission. Because the applicant illegally reentered the United States after her deportation, the AAO finds that the applicant is inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(C)(i)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(C)(i)(II).

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-

(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)(II) 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)(i)(II) 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 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 eligibility 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.