



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

Identifying data deleted to
prevent identity misappropriation or
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY



AI

FILE:



Office: Nebraska Service Center

Date:

MAY 12 2005

IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION:

Application for Status as a Temporary Resident 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 decided and certified your case.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for temporary resident status (legalization) was denied by the Director, Western Regional Processing Facility. An appeal of that decision was dismissed.

The Director, Nebraska Service Center has now granted a motion to reopen that was filed by the applicant pursuant to a class action lawsuit entitled *Proyecto San Pablo v. INS*, No. Civ 89-456-TUC-WDB (D. Ariz.). The decision in that case allows an alien whose application was denied because he had been outside of the United States after January 1, 1982 under an order of deportation to have his application reopened. The Director, Nebraska Service Center then denied the application, and certified his decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The decision will be affirmed.

The applicant was deported on March 27, 1985, after having failed to avail himself of the opportunity to depart voluntarily. Both directors noted that the applicant was outside of the United States under an order of deportation after January 1, 1982, and therefore did not reside continuously in the United States since such date.

On rebuttal, counsel maintains that it is a violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution to deny temporary residence to aliens who were deported while granting temporary residence to other aliens who had disregarded orders of deportation. Counsel also requests that the applicant be granted a waiver of his inadmissibility for having been deported, and that he be granted consent to reapply for admission into the United States. Counsel opines that approval of these waivers would cure the lack of continuous residence stemming from the deportation.

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).

As a result of the deportation, the applicant did not reside continuously in the United States for the requisite period. He is therefore statutorily ineligible for temporary residence on that basis.

Counsel contends that it is unconstitutional to deny legalization to aliens who were deported, and at the same time legalize other aliens who received orders of deportation and yet disregarded them. No court ruling to that effect has been furnished by counsel. This office will continue to apply the law as written.

Counsel's assertion that a lack of continuous residence in such circumstances may be waived is unpersuasive. Congress set forth, at section 245A(d)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(d)(2), a provision to waive certain *grounds of inadmissibility* under section 212(a) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a). Section 245A(g)(2) of the Act, concerning *continuous residence*, is a separate section unrelated to the waiver provisions. 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. While 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 possible only for the inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II).

The question has arisen as to why, if the above interpretation is correct, the law would allow for a waiver of inadmissibility in the case of a deported alien and yet provide no waiver for a lack of continuous residence, also based on a deportation. It is noted that not all aliens who were deported in the past failed to meet the continuous residence requirement. For example, an alien who was deported in 1981 and reentered the United States before January 1, 1982 would be inadmissible because of the deportation and yet would not be ineligible for legalization on the continuous residence issue.

Counsel points out that the district court in *Proyecto San Pablo v. INS*, 784 F.Supp 738, 747 (D. Ariz. 1991) concluded that a waiver would cover both the inadmissibility and the continuous residence issue. However, in *Proyecto San Pablo v. INS*, 189 F.3d 1130 (9th Cir. 1999) the court of appeals held that the district court lacked jurisdiction to compel INS to change its interpretation of the statute.

In summary, the applicant was out of the United States after January 1, 1982 under an order of deportation, and cannot be granted temporary residence for two reasons. First and foremost, he failed to maintain continuous residence, and there is no waiver available. Therefore, he is ineligible for temporary residence. Secondly, he is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II) of the Act as an alien who was deported and returned without permission. That ground of inadmissibility may be waived. The applicant filed a waiver application in an effort to overcome such inadmissibility. That waiver application was denied by the director, and the decision was affirmed by the AAO in a separate decision. There is no other waiver provision, such as consent to reapply for admission into the United States after deportation, available to legalization applicants.

The applicant was deported on March 27, 1985, and therefore did not maintain continuous residence as required by section 245A(a)(2) of the Act. He remains ineligible for temporary residence.

ORDER: The director's decision is affirmed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.