

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy


U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

H4

PUBLIC COPY



FILE:



Office: BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

Date: AUG 21 2007


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) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A).

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 after removal was denied by the District Director, Baltimore, Maryland, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

On appeal, the applicant, through counsel, requested 30-days to submit a brief and/or evidence to the AAO. *Form I-290B*, filed February 1, 2005. The record contains no evidence that a brief or additional evidence was filed within 30-days. On July 13, 2007, the AAO sent counsel a facsimile requesting evidence of the brief and/or additional evidence, or a statement by counsel that neither a brief nor evidence was filed. On July 27, 2007, counsel responded that he did not file a brief as he considered the previously submitted evidence to be sufficient. Therefore, the record must be considered complete.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Trinidad and Tobago who entered the United States on a B2 nonimmigrant visa on February 27, 1989, with authorization to remain in the United States until August 26, 1989. On February 14, 1990, an immigration judge ordered the applicant deported. On October 16, 1992, the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) sustained the immigration judge's decision and granted the applicant voluntary departure. The applicant failed to depart the United States and a Warrant of Deportation (Form I-205) was issued on October 17, 1992. An additional Form I-205 was issued on March 28, 2002. On May 2, 2002, the applicant departed the United States. The applicant is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(ii). He now 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 reside with his wife.

The District Director determined that the applicant is inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I), for being ordered removed under section 240 or any other provision of law. The District Director denied the applicant's Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission After Deportation or Removal (Form I-212) accordingly. *District Director's Decision*, dated December 30, 2004.

Section 212(a)(9). Aliens previously removed.-

(A) Certain alien 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, or

(II) departed the United States while an order of removal was outstanding, and 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 aliens 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 aliens' reembarkation at a place outside the United States or attempt to be admitted from foreign continuous territory, the Attorney General [now, Secretary, Department of Homeland Security] has consented to the aliens' 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, the applicant, through counsel, asserts that the District Director's decision "is contrary to law and an abuse of discretion." *Form I-290B*, filed February 1, 2005. Counsel claims that the "applicant has no criminal record" and has submitted "voluminous documentation to verify his good moral character and equities in the United States." *Id.* The AAO notes that the applicant submitted various documents establishing that the applicant owns a home in Maryland, paid federal taxes, and has incurred significant debt. Counsel contends that the District Director's "suggestion that the applicant is in the United States is completely false and without foundation." *Id.* The AAO notes that the District Director determined that the applicant was in the United States based on a credit report which states the applicant is residing in Maryland with his sister. Counsel states that the applicant's marriage is *bona fide* and that the applicant's wife is suffering extreme hardship since the applicant departed the United States. *Id.*; see also letter from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] page 3, dated March 4, 2004. The applicant's wife claims she depends on the applicant for financial assistance; however, the applicant has not established that he could not provide financial assistance to his wife from Trinidad. The AAO notes that the applicant's wife is a college graduate and it has not been established that she could not obtain employment to help with the household expenses. Additionally, unlike sections 212(g), (h), and (i) of the Act (which relate to waivers of inadmissibility for prospective immigrants), section 212(a)(9)(A)(iii) of the Act does not specify hardship threshold requirements which must be met. An applicant for permission to reapply for admission into the United States after deportation or removal need not establish that a particular level of hardship would result to a qualifying family member if the application were denied. The AAO will consider the hardship to the applicant's spouse, but it will be just one of the determining factors.

The record of proceedings reveals that on February 14, 1990, an immigration judge ordered the applicant deported from the United States. On October 16, 1992, the BIA sustained the immigration judge's decision and granted the applicant voluntary departure. The applicant failed to depart the United States. A Form I-205 was issued on October 17, 1992, and March 28, 2002. On May 2, 2002, the applicant departed the United States. Based on the applicant's previous order of deportation, the applicant is clearly inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) of the Act.

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.*

Where an applicant is seeking discretionary relief from removal or deportation and the courts are required to weigh favorable equities or factors against unfavorable factors, many have repeatedly upheld the general principal that less weight is given to equities acquired by an alien after an order of deportation or removal has been issued. The AAO notes that the applicant's Form I-212 involves a similar weighing of equities or favorable factors against unfavorable factors in order to determine whether to grant discretionary relief.

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 (BIA) denial of an alien's request for discretionary voluntary departure relief. The Seventh Circuit found that the BIA's denial rested on discretionary grounds, and that the BIA 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 BIA 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.” *Id.*

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 BIA’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 hardship to a spouse and for purposes of assessing favorable equities in the exercise of discretion.

The favorable factors in this matter are the applicant’s family ties to United States citizens, his wife and son, general hardship they may experience, no criminal record, and the approval of a petition for alien relative. The AAO notes that the marriage to his wife occurred after his deportation and is an after-acquired equity. As an after-acquired equity this factor will be given less weight.

The AAO finds that the unfavorable factors in this case include the applicant’s failure to abide by an order of deportation, and periods of unauthorized presence and employment.

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 he 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.