identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
*Office of Administrative Appeals* MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

H4

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: FRESNO, CA Date: FEB 2 5 2010

RELATES)

IN RE: [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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of $585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Field Office Director, Fresno, California, denied the Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission into the United States after Deportation or Removal (Form I-212) and it 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 April 13, 1999, appeared at the San Ysidro, California, Port of Entry. The applicant presented a lawful permanent resident card, bearing the name [redacted]. The applicant was placed into secondary inspection. The applicant admitted that she was not the true owner of the document and that she did not have valid documentation to enter the United States. The applicant admitted that she was aware that the document she was presenting was fraudulent. The applicant failed to provide immigration officers with her true identity. The applicant was found inadmissible pursuant to sections 212(a)(6)(C)(i) and 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182 (a)(6)(C)(i) and 1182(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) for attempting to enter the United States by fraud and for being an immigrant without valid documentation. On April 13, 1999, the applicant was expeditiously removed from the United States pursuant to section 235(b)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1), under the name [redacted].

On November 16, 1999, the applicant filed an Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status (Form I-485) based on an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130) filed on her behalf by her then lawful permanent resident spouse. The Form I-485 indicated that the applicant last reentered the United States without inspection in July 1992. On July 31, 2002, the Form I-485 was denied. On April 29, 2007, the applicant filed a second Form I-485 based on the approved Form I-130. The Form I-485 indicates that the applicant reentered the United States without inspection in 1999. On the same day, the applicant filed an Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) and the Form I-212, indicating that she resided in the United States. On June 4, 2009, the Form I-485 and Form I-601 were denied. The applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(A)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(i). She 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 in the United States with her now naturalized U.S. citizen spouse and three lawful permanent resident children.

The field office director determined that the applicant is inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(C)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(C)(i), for illegally reentering the United States after having been removed. The field office director determined that the applicant was not eligible to apply for permission to reapply for admission because she had not remained outside the United States for the required ten years. The field office director denied the Form I-212 accordingly. *See Field Office Director's Decision,* dated June 4, 2009.

Counsel contends that the applicant detrimentally relied upon a U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services' (USCIS) memo and that USCIS should have adjudicated the Form I-212 concurrently with the Form I-485.[1] Counsel contends that the field office director erred in retroactively applying *Gonzales v. DHS* (*Gonzales II*), when the applicant, in filing the Form I-212, relied upon the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit) decision in *Perez-Gonzalez v. Ashcroft*, 379 F.3d 783 (9th

[1] Counsel's contentions are unpersuasive. The field office director did concurrently adjudicate the Form I-485 and Form I-212 and, as discussed below, correctly complied with an injunction issued by the Ninth Circuit when he held the Form I-212 and Form I-485 in abeyance of a decision in the *Gonzalez* case.

Cir. 2004). Counsel contends that it has been ten years since the applicant's last departure from the United States and she is eligible to apply for permission to reapply for admission. *See Counsel's Brief*, dated June 23, 2009.[2] In support of his contentions, counsel submits the referenced brief and a copy of the memorandum. The entire record was reviewed in rendering a decision in this case.

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.
> >
> > (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 who 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 on a 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 of Homeland Security] has consented to the alien's reapplying for admission.
>
> . . . .

[2] The AAO notes that counsel indicates that he is appealing the denial of the Form I-212 and Form I-485; however, counsel has only filed one Form I-290B and a Form I-290B is required for each application/petition from which an appeal or motion to reopen or reconsider is desired. As such, the AAO will treat the applicant's Form I-290B as an appeal of the Form I-212. Even though counsel is not appealing the denial of the Form I-601, he offers contentions in regard to the applicant's inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act. The AAO finds that the applicant is indeed inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act because, whether or not she was aware of what type of document she presented at the port of entry, the record reflects that she was fully aware that she was not the true owner of the document, that the document was fraudulent and that she was seeking to enter the United States by presenting a fraudulent document.

(C) Aliens unlawfully present after previous immigration violations.-

(i) In general.-Any alien who-

(I) has been unlawfully present in the United States for an aggregate period of more than 1 year, or

(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 of Homeland Security has consented to the alien's reapplying for admission.
(iii) Waiver

The Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the application of clause (i) in the case of an alien who is a VAWA self-petitioner if there is a connection between—

(I) the alien's battering or subjection to extreme cruelty; and

(II) the alien's removal, departure from the United States, reentry or reentries into the United States; or attempted reentry into the United States.

The AAO notes that a waiver to the section 212(a)(9)(C)(i) ground of inadmissibility is available to individuals classified as battered spouses under the cited sections of section 204 of the Act. *See also* 8 U.S.C. § 1154. There are no indications in the record that the applicant is or should be classified as such.

An alien who is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(C)(i) of the Act may not apply for consent to reapply unless he or she has *remained outside* the United States for more than 10 years 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); *Matter of Briones,* 24 I&N Dec. 355 (BIA 2007); and *Matter of Diaz and Lopez,* 25 I&N Dec. 188 (BIA 2010). Thus, to avoid inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act, it must be the case that the applicant's last departure was at least ten years ago, the applicant has remained outside the United States since that departure, *and* that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has consented to the applicant's reapplying for admission. While the applicant's last departure from the United States occurred on April 13, 1999, more than ten years ago, she has not remained outside the United States since that departure and she is currently present in the United

States.[3] The applicant is currently statutorily ineligible to apply for permission to reapply for admission.

On appeal, counsel contends that the applicant relied upon *Perez-Gonzalez* at the time she applied for permission to reapply for admission to the United States and that the application of *Gonzales II* to cases in which an applicant filed a Form I-212 in reliance upon *Perez-Gonzalez* is impermissibly retroactive and fundamentally unfair. Counsel contends that the applicant is eligible for permission to reapply for admission because it has been more than ten years since her last departure from the United States.

The applicant's Form I-212 was filed while an injunction restraining USCIS from applying agency policy as set forth in *Matter of Torres-Garcia* had been issued. The AAO finds, therefore, that in filing the Form I-212 under such circumstances, counsel's contention that the applicant reasonably relied upon the Ninth Circuit's *Perez-Gonzalez v. Ashcroft* decision is illogical.

The Ninth Circuit, in deferring to the BIA's decision in *Matter of Torres-Garcia,* found that the BIA's findings were reasonable and that the statute is unambiguous and unchanged since its promulgation. The Ninth Circuit found that the issue might have been resolved under the first step of *Chevron USA, Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council,* 467 U.S. 87, 104 S. Ct. 2778, 81 L. Ed. 2d 694 (1984), by examining the text of the relevant statutes and their legislative histories. The court found that it must defer to *Torres-Garcia* and that the statute itself is unambiguous. In *Matter of Torres-Garcia*, the BIA found that 8 C.F.R. § 212.2 was not promulgated to implement the current section 212(a)(9) of the Act and that the very concept of retroactive permission to reapply for admission, i.e., permission requested after unlawful reentry, contradicts the clear language of section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act, which in its own right makes unlawful reentry after removal a ground of inadmissibility that can only be waived by the passage of at least ten years. The BIA found that the *Perez-Gonzalez v. Ashcroft* decision contradicts the clear language of the statute and the legislative policy underlying the statute in general. Since the statute is unambiguous and has been in effect since April 1, 1997, counsel's contention that the correct application of the statute is fundamentally unfair and impermissibly retroactive is unfounded since the applicant's removal, unlawful reentry and filing of the Form I-212 occurred after the statute's enactment.

Finally, the statute clearly states that an alien who has been ordered removed and enters or attempts to reenter the United States without being admitted may seek an exception to permanent grounds of inadmissibility when seeking admission more than ten years after the date of the alien's last departure from the United States, ***if***, the applicant receives permission to reapply for admission prior to reentering the United States.[4] *See Matter of Torres-Garcia, Supra.; Matter of Briones, Supra.; and Matter of Diaz and Lopez, Supra.*

---

[3] The applicant will be required to submit evidence establishing that she is currently outside the United States and has remained outside the United States for period of ten years when she becomes eligible to apply for permission to reapply for admission.

[4] The AAO notes that the reentry after obtaining permission to reapply for admission must be a lawful admission to the United States; otherwise, the applicant has again illegally reentered the United States after having been removed and renewed his or her inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act.

Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361, provides that the burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that she is eligible for the benefit sought. The applicant in the instant case does not qualify for the waiver or an exception under section 212(a)(9)(C)(ii) and (iii) 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 as a matter of discretion.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.