

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  
*Administrative Appeals Office* MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

MAY 22 2009

FILE:

[REDACTED]  
MSC 06 027 13042

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date:

IN RE:

Applicant: [REDACTED]

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:  
[REDACTED]

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. If your appeal was dismissed or rejected, all documents have been returned to the National Benefits Center. You no longer have a case pending before this office, and you are not entitled to file a motion to reopen or reconsider your case. If your appeal was sustained, or if your case was remanded for further action, you will be contacted.

John F. Grissom  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application for temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the settlement agreements reached in *Catholic Social Services, Inc., et al., v. Ridge, et al.*, CIV. NO. S-86-1343-LKK (E.D. Cal) January 23, 2004, and *Felicity Mary Newman, et al., v. United States Immigration and Citizenship Services, et al.*, CIV. NO. 87-4757-WDK (C.D. Cal) February 17, 2004 (CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements), was denied by the director, Los Angeles. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant submitted a Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident under Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), and a Form I-687 Supplement, CSS/Newman Class Membership Worksheet (together comprising the I-687 Application). The director denied the application for temporary residence because the applicant had been convicted of a felony narcotics offense in California. The director concluded that the applicant was not eligible to adjust to temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements.

The applicant is represented by counsel on appeal. In a brief submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal (Form I-694), counsel argues that a petition to expunge the felony conviction was filed with the California Superior Court on May 4, 2007 pursuant to section 1203.4 of the California Penal Code and “that the petition will be granted and returned in late June 2007.” Furthermore, counsel maintains that “the applicant is a first-time offender and therefore is entitled to waiver (sic) pursuant to section 212(a).” To date, no additional evidence has been filed.

An applicant for temporary resident status 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). The applicant must also establish that he or she has been continuously physically present in the United States since November 6, 1986. Section 245A(a)(3) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(3). The regulations clarify that the applicant must have been physically present in the United States from November 6, 1986 until the date of filing the application. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b)(1).

For purposes of establishing residence and physical presence under the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, the term “until the date of filing” in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b)(1) means until the date the applicant attempted to file a completed Form I-687 application and fee or was caused not to timely file during the original legalization application period of May 5, 1987 to May 4, 1988.

CSS Settlement Agreement, paragraph 11 at page 6; Newman Settlement Agreement, paragraph 11 at page 10.

The applicant has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she has resided in the United States for the requisite period, is admissible to the United States under the provisions of section 245A of the Act, and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status. The inference to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the extent of the documentation, its credibility and amenability to verification. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5).

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has furnished sufficient credible evidence to meet his burden of establishing continuous unlawful residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period, that he has no disqualifying criminal convictions and is thus otherwise admissible to the United States. Here, the applicant has failed to meet this burden because of his felony conviction.

For purposes of qualifying for certain immigration benefits, an alien who has been convicted of a felony or of three or more misdemeanors committed in the United States is ineligible for adjustment to Lawful Permanent Resident status. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.18(a)(1). "Felony" means a crime committed in the United States punishable by imprisonment for a term of more than one year, regardless of the term such alien actually served, if any, except when the offense is defined by the state as a misdemeanor, and the sentence actually imposed is one year or less, regardless of the term such alien actually served. Under this exception, for purposes of 8 C.F.R. Part 245a, the crime shall be treated as a misdemeanor. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.1(p).

"Misdemeanor" means a crime committed in the United States, either (1) punishable by imprisonment for a term of one year or less, regardless of the term such alien actually served, if any, or (2) a crime treated as a misdemeanor under 8 C.F.R. § 245a.1(p). For purposes of this definition, any crime punishable by imprisonment for a maximum term of five days or less shall not be considered a misdemeanor. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.1(o).

The term 'conviction' means, with respect to an alien, a formal judgment of guilt of the alien entered by a court or, if adjudication of guilt has been withheld, where - (i) a judge or jury has found the alien guilty or the alien has entered a plea of guilty or nolo contendere or has admitted sufficient facts to warrant a finding of guilt, and (ii) the judge has ordered some form of punishment, penalty, or restraint on the alien's liberty to be imposed.

Section 101(a)(48)(A) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act (Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(48)(A).

The AAO has reviewed all of the documents and evidence in the file in their entirety. Criminal record documents indicate that the applicant has a series of arrests and convictions, including:

- (1) an arrest by the Sheriff's Office of Norwalk, CA, on December 12, 1990 for two counts of unlawful possession of a controlled substance, and one count of possession of crack cocaine for sale. There is no court record of a final disposition for these charges;
- (2) an arrest on January 26, 1996 by the legacy INS border patrol for attempted illegal entry. The AAO notes that the file contains a Record of Exclusion and Deportation that indicates the applicant was deported from the United States on February 1, 1996 pursuant to the order of an immigration judge;
- (3) an arrest by the Sheriff's Office of Norwalk, CA, on March 15, 2001, for one count of possession of a narcotic controlled substance.

The AAO notes that the March 15, 2001 arrest is the subject of the applicant's petition before the Superior Court of California to dismiss the conviction pursuant to section 1203.4 of the California Penal Code. The petition lists the date of conviction as February 15, 2001 for a violation of section 11350(a) of the California Penal Code – *unlawful possession of a narcotic controlled substance*. Furthermore, the petition lists the offense as a felony.

There is no evidence in the record to indicate that the applicant's felony conviction has been dismissed for any reason, and a dismissal for anything other than constitutional reasons would have no effect on his immigration status. As this case arises within the jurisdiction of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, the law of that circuit is applicable. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has deferred to the Board of Immigration Appeals' (BIA) determination regarding the effect of post-conviction expungements pursuant to a state rehabilitative statute.<sup>2</sup> Section 1203.4 of the California Penal Code is a state rehabilitative statute. The provisions of section 1203.4 allow a criminal defendant to withdraw a plea of guilty or nolo contendere and enter a plea of not guilty subsequent to a successful completion of some form of rehabilitation or probation. It does not function to expunge a criminal conviction because of a procedural or constitutional defect in the underlying proceedings.

In this case, there is no evidence in the record to suggest that the applicant's petition was granted on account of an underlying procedural defect in the merits of the case, and the judgment remains valid for immigration purposes. *See Matter of Pickering*, 23 I&N Dec. 621 (BIA 2003); *Matter of Roldan*, 22 I. & N. Dec. 512 (BIA 1999)<sup>3</sup>. The AAO concludes that the applicant's felony conviction remains valid for immigration purposes.

---

<sup>2</sup> See *Murillo-Espinoza v. INS*, 261 F.3d 771, 774 (9th Cir. 2001) (expunged theft conviction still qualified as an aggravated felony); *Ramirez-Castro v. INS*, 287 F.3d 1172, 1174 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002) (expunged misdemeanor California conviction for carrying a concealed weapon did not eliminate the immigration consequences of the conviction); *see also de Jesus Melendez v. Gonzales*, 503 F.3d 1019, 1024 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007); *Cedano-Viera v. Ashcroft*, 324 F.3d 1062, 1067 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003) (expunged conviction for lewdness with a child qualified as an aggravated felony).

<sup>3</sup> Under the statutory definition of "conviction" provided at section 101(a)(48)(A) of the INA, no effect is to be given, in immigration proceedings, to a state action which purports to expunge,

The AAO notes that the applicant did not identify any arrests or convictions on his application for temporary residence (*See* No. 37, Form I-687). The applicant signed the Form I-687 under penalty of perjury that all of the information contained therein was true and correct (*Id.*, No. 43). The AAO finds that the applicant's false attestation regarding his criminal history is an act of perjury which serves to undermine his eligibility for temporary resident status under the terms of the settlement agreements.

The applicant stands convicted of a felony offense. He is therefore ineligible for temporary resident status pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1255a(4)(B); 8 C.F.R. § 245A.4(B). No waiver of such ineligibility is available. The applicant is, therefore, ineligible for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act on this basis. The decision of the director is affirmed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.

---

dismiss, cancel, vacate, discharge, or otherwise remove a guilty plea or other record of guilt or conviction. An alien remains convicted for immigration purposes notwithstanding a subsequent state action purporting to erase the original determination of guilt. State rehabilitative actions that do not vacate a conviction on the merits as a result of underlying procedural or constitutional defects are of no effect in determining whether an alien is considered convicted for immigration purposes. *Matter of Roldan, id.*