




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)



DATE: **OCT 01 2014** OFFICE: NATIONAL BENEFITS CENTER FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: APPLICANT: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Status as Permanent Resident Pursuant to Section 13 of the Act of September 11, 1957, 8 U.S.C. § 1255b.

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the National Benefits Center Director. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of the Philippines who is seeking to adjust her status to that of lawful permanent resident under section 13 of the Act of 1957 ("Section 13"), Pub. L. No. 85-316, 71 Stat. 642, as modified, 95 Stat. 1611, 8 U.S.C. § 1255b, as an alien who performed diplomatic or semi-diplomatic duties under section 101(a)(15)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(A)(i).

The director denied the application for adjustment of status after determining that the applicant had failed to demonstrate that compelling reasons prevent her return to the Philippines. The director also noted that the Department of State issued its opinion on August 17, 2010, advising that it could not favorably recommend this case as the applicant had not established compelling reasons preventing her return to the Philippines.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that compelling reasons prevent her return to the Philippines. The applicant submits a statement in support of her appeal.

Section 13 of the Act of September 11, 1957, as amended on December 29, 1981, by Pub. L. 97-116, 95 Stat. 1161, provides, in pertinent part:

(a) Any alien admitted to the United States as a nonimmigrant under the provisions of either section 101(a)(15)(A)(i) or (ii) or 101(a)(15)(G)(i) or (ii) of the Act, who has failed to maintain a status under any of those provisions, may apply to the [Department of Homeland Security] for adjustment of her status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

(b) If, after consultation with the Secretary of State, it shall appear to the satisfaction of the [Department of Homeland Security] that the alien has shown compelling reasons demonstrating both that the alien is unable to return to the country represented by the government which accredited the alien or the member of the alien's immediate family and that adjustment of the alien's status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence would be in the national interest, that the alien is a person of good moral character, that she is admissible for permanent residence under the Immigration and Nationality Act, and that such action would not be contrary to the national welfare, safety, or security, the [Department of Homeland Security], in its discretion, may record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date [on which] the order of the [Department of Homeland Security] approving the application for adjustment of status is made. 8 U.S.C. § 1255b(b).

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245.3, eligibility for adjustment of status under Section 13 is limited to aliens who were admitted into the United States under section 101, paragraphs (a)(15)(A)(i), (a)(15)(A)(ii), (a)(15)(G)(i), or (a)(15)(G)(ii) of the Act who performed diplomatic or semi-

diplomatic duties and to their immediate families, and who establish that there are compelling reasons why the applicant or the member of the applicant's immediate family is unable to return to the country represented by the government that accredited the applicant, and that adjustment of the applicant's status to that of an alien lawfully admitted to permanent residence would be in the national interest.

The legislative history for Section 13 reveals that the provision was intended to provide adjustment of status for a "limited class of . . . worthy persons . . . left homeless and stateless" as a consequence of "Communist and other uprisings, aggression, or invasion" that have "in some cases . . . wiped out" their governments. Statement of Senator John F. Kennedy, *Analysis of Bill to Amend the Immigration and Nationality Act*, 85th Cong., 103 Cong. Rec. 14660 (August 14, 1957). The phrase "compelling reasons" was added to Section 13 in 1981 after Congress "considered 74 such cases and rejected all but 4 of them for failure to satisfy the criteria clearly established by the legislative history of the 1957 law." H. R. Rep. 97-264 at 33 (October 2, 1981).

A review of the record establishes the applicant's eligibility for consideration under section 13 of the 1957 Act. The applicant entered the United States in G-1 non-immigrant status on April 29, 1992 to work as a Staff Member and Liaison Officer at the [REDACTED]

The U.S. Department of State was notified of the termination of the applicant's G-1 nonimmigrant status on September 13, 1994. Per the requirements of section 13(a) of the 1957 statute, the applicant was admitted to the United States pursuant to 101(a)(15)(A)(i) of the Act but no longer held that status at the time she filed the application for adjustment on October 24, 1994.

Upon review of the applicant's sworn statement before a United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) officer on March 31, 1995, the applicant's statements, her assertions on appeal, as well as the current country conditions in the Philippines, we find that the applicant has not provided compelling reasons related to political changes in the Philippines that render her as a foreign representative "stateless or homeless" or at risk of harm following political upheavals in the country represented by the government which accredited her. The record does not include evidence showing that the applicant is at greater risk of harm because of her specific past government employment, political activities or other related reasons, including her employment at the [REDACTED]

The applicant stated at the March 31, 1995 interview that she "did not think that her family would be subject to persecution" if they were required to depart the United States because "the government right now its almost the same even though we have a new president." The applicant also stated that her children were very intelligent and she did not think that they "could afford to pay education in Manila." In addition, the applicant stated that they did not want to return because "her husband had a tremendous job in [REDACTED]" and that they "could not afford" to live in the Philippines. On appeal, counsel for the applicant stated that the applicant "will experience extreme hardship if she should be compelled to go back because of, among others, their personal health conditions and the living conditions, political and civil unrest, and the calamitous conditions now prevailing in the Philippines especially in light of super typhoon Yolanda and/or Haiyan as it recently passed through that country." Counsel asserts that "there is enough evidence on record that showed that [the applicant] and her family are unable to return because of the action and inaction on

the part of the government of the Philippines or other political entity there.” We find that the evidence of record does not support that claim.

As set forth in the director’s decision, the legislative history of Section 13 shows that Congress intended that “compelling reasons” related to political changes that render diplomats and foreign representatives “stateless or homeless” or at risk of harm following political upheavals in the country represented by the government which accredited them. Section 13 requires that an applicant for adjustment of status under this provision have “compelling reasons demonstrating that the alien is *unable* to return to the country represented by the government which accredited the applicant. (Emphasis added). The term “compelling” must be read in conjunction with the term “unable” to correctly interpret the meaning of the words in context. Thus, reasons that are compelling are those that render the applicant unable to return, rather than those that merely make return undesirable or not preferred from the applicant’s perspective. Voluntarily severing ties with the Philippines and establishing a life in the United States is not a compelling reason under Section 13. Similarly, the general hardship of relocating to another country is not a compelling reason under Section 13. The documentation provided does not present compelling reasons that prevent the applicant from returning to the Philippines. The social conditions in the Philippines the applicant describes, and the potential loss of opportunity for her children, though unfortunate, do not amount to compelling reasons under Section 13.

The applicant has failed to meet her burden of proof in this regard. As the applicant has not established that there are compelling reasons that prevent her return to the Philippines, the question of whether adjustment of status would be in the national interest need not be addressed.

For the reasons discussed above, we find that the applicant is not eligible for adjustment under Section 13. She has failed to establish that there are compelling reasons preventing her return to the Philippines. Pursuant to section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361, the burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that she is eligible for adjustment of status. The applicant has failed to meet that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The application remains denied.