

**Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



FILE:




Office: Nebraska Service Center

Date: **MAY 26 2010**


IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Inadmissibility pursuant to Section 245A of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a

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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for waiver of inadmissibility within the legalization program was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on certification. The decision will be affirmed.

It is noted that the applicant filed two waiver applications for the same benefit. The director's decision is deemed to relate to both applications.

The director denied the waiver application because the applicant was otherwise ineligible for temporary residence in the legalization program. The director reasoned that there would be no purpose in granting a waiver that could not assist the applicant in gaining temporary residence.

In response, counsel states that the filing of the waiver application was unnecessary. However, she did not withdraw it, and it shall be adjudicated. Earlier, the applicant pointed out that he has lived in the United States since 1976, and has U.S. citizen and lawful permanent resident children dependent upon him.

The applicant was deported to Mexico on October 3, 1986, according to the executed warrant of deportation, Form I - 205. Earlier in these proceedings, the applicant claimed that he did not actually leave the United States at that time. However, he did not explain how that could be true if the warrant were executed. Now, in rebuttal to the certified denial, counsel states the applicant does not remember if the October 3, 1986 date is correct. However, she also states that he remembers being released into Mexico. Therefore, in the absence of contradictory documentation, the executed warrant will be considered to be valid evidence of the deportation.

The applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II), which relates to aliens who were deported and reentered the United States without authorization. Pursuant to section 245A(d)(2)(B)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(d)(2)(B)(i), such inadmissibility may be waived in the case of individual aliens for humanitarian purposes, to assure family unity, or when it is otherwise in the public interest.

The applicant states that he has resided in the United States since 1976. The director nevertheless denied the waiver application because the applicant cannot otherwise qualify for legalization, as he fails to meet the "continuous residence" provision of the legalization program.

An applicant for temporary residence must establish entry into the United States before January 1, 1982, and continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through the date the application is filed. Section 245A(a)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(2). An alien shall not be considered to have resided continuously in the United States, if, during any period for which continuous residence is required, the alien was outside of the United States under an order of deportation. Section 245A(g)(2)(B)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255(g)(2)(b)(i).

Because he was deported, the applicant did not reside continuously in the United States for the requisite period. Therefore, he is statutorily ineligible for temporary residence.

Congress provided no relief in the legalization program for failure to maintain continuous residence due to a departure under an order of deportation. Relief is provided in the Act for absences based on factors other than deportation, namely absences due to emergencies and absences approved under the advance parole provisions. Clearly, with respect to maintenance of continuous residence, it was not congressional intent to provide relief for absences under an order of deportation.

The general grounds of inadmissibility are set forth in section 212(a) of the Act, and relate to any alien seeking a visa or admission into the United States, or adjustment of status. An applicant's inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II) for having been deported and having returned to the United States without authorization may be waived. However, an alien's inadmissibility under section 212(a) of the Act is an entirely separate issue from the continuous residence issue discussed above. Although the applicant's failure to maintain continuous residence, and his inadmissibility for having been deported and having returned without authorization, are both predicated on the deportation, a waiver is available only for the inadmissibility.

In support of his decision to deny the waiver application because the applicant was otherwise ineligible for legalization, the director cited *Matter of Martinez-Torres*, 10 I&N Dec. 776 (Reg. Comm. 1964) and *Matter of J-F-D-*, 10 I&N Dec. 694 (Reg. Comm. 1963). Those decisions relate to applications for permission to reapply for admission after deportation, and yet the decisions are on point and relevant to the current proceeding. In each case the Regional Commissioner concluded that no purpose would be served in waiving inadmissibility because the alien was ineligible for the overall benefit of lawful residence.

It is concluded that the director's decision to deny the waiver application because no purpose would be served in granting it was proper, logical and legally sound. Therefore, it shall remain undisturbed.

ORDER: The decision is affirmed, and the application remains denied.