

**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**

H4



FILE:



Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

**APR 12 2005**

IN RE:

Applicant:



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:



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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application for permission to reapply for admission after removal was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and 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 attempted to procure admission into the United States on February 21 1998, by fraud and willful misrepresentation of a material fact. The applicant presented an Alien Registration Card (Form I-551) that did not belong to her. She was found inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182 (a)(6)(C)(i) for having attempted to procure admission into the United States by fraud and section 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182 (a)(7)(A)(i)(I) for being an immigrant not in possession of a valid immigrant visa or lieu document. On February 23, 1998, 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). The applicant reentered the United States on an unknown date without a lawful admission or parole and without permission to reapply for admission in violation of section 276 the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1326 (a felony). She appeared at a Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) office for an interview regarding her application for adjustment of status. Her prior removal order was reinstated pursuant to section 241(a)(5) of the Act and she was removed to Mexico on June 26, 2002. On December 2, 2003, the applicant attempted to elude inspection in order to gain entry into the United States by being concealed in the trunk of a vehicle. She was paroled into the United States as a material witness, and on March 10, 2004, departed to Mexico after she was allowed to withdraw her application for admission to the United States. The applicant is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130) filed by her U.S. citizen spouse. She is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(A)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(i) and 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 travel to the United States to reside with her U.S. citizen spouse and child.

The Director determined that section 241(a)(5) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1231(a)(5) applies in this matter and denied the Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission After Removal (Form I-212) accordingly. *See Director Decision* dated September 8, 2004.

Section 241(a) detention, release, and removal or aliens ordered removed.-

(5) reinstatement of removal orders against aliens illegally reentering.- if the attorney General finds that an aliens has reentered the United States illegally after having been removed or having departed voluntarily, under an order of removal, the prior order of removal is reinstated from its original date and is not subject to being reopened or reviewed, the aliens is not eligible and may not apply for any relief under this Act [chapter], and the aliens shall be removed under the prior order at any time after reentry.

The AAO finds that the Director erred in finding that section 241(a)(5) of the Act applies in this case. The record of proceedings does not reflect that the applicant re-entered the United States after she was permitted to withdraw her application for admission into the United States. The electronic database of CIS reflects that the applicant departed the United States on March 10, 2004, and there is no documentary evidence to show otherwise. Although the applicant is not subject to section 212(a)(5) of the Act, she is clearly inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(A) of the Act.

Section 212(a)(9)(A) 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.

. . . . .

(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 Attorney General [now Secretary, Homeland Security, "Secretary"] has consented to the alien's reapplying for admission.

A review of the 1996 IIRIRA amendments to the Act and prior statutes and case law regarding permission to reapply for admission, reflects that Congress has (1) increased the bar to admissibility and the waiting period from 5 to 10 years in most instances and to 20 years for others, (2) has added a bar to admissibility for aliens who are unlawfully present in the United States, and (3) has imposed a permanent bar to admission for aliens who have been ordered removed and who subsequently enter or attempt to enter the United States without being lawfully admitted. It is concluded that Congress has placed a high priority on reducing and/or stopping aliens from overstaying their authorized period of stay and/or from being present in the United States without a lawful admission or parole.

On appeal, counsel states that CIS erred in denying the Form I-212. Counsel does not dispute the fact that the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, nor that she was removed twice from the United States. In his brief counsel states that the applicant is eligible for a waiver under section 212(i) of the Act and that the applicant's removal from the United States would result in an exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to her U.S. child. Counsel refers to case law that deals with extreme hardship regarding applications for waivers pursuant to sections 212(h) and 212(i) of the Act. The current proceeding is for permission to reapply for admission under section 212(a)(9)(A). Section 212(i) applies to waivers of inadmissibility. It is therefore not relevant to the current proceeding.

Unlike sections 212(g), (h), and (i) of the Act (which relate to waivers of inadmissibility for prospective immigrants), section 212(a)(9)(A)(iii) of the Act does not specify hardship threshold requirements which must be met. An applicant for permission to reapply for admission into the United States after deportation or removal need not establish that a particular level of hardship would result to a qualifying family member if the application were denied.

In *Matter of Tin*, 14 I&N Dec. 371 (Reg. Comm. 1973), the Regional Commissioner listed the following factors to be considered in the adjudication of a Form I-212 Application for Permission to Reapply After Deportation:

The basis of deportation; the recency of the deportation; the length of legal residence in the U.S.; the applicant's moral character and his respect for law and order; evidence of reformation and rehabilitation; the applicant's family responsibilities; and hardship to if the applicant were not allowed to return to the U.S.

*Matter of Lee*, 17 I&N Dec. 275 (Comm. 1978) further held that a record of immigration violations, standing alone, did not conclusively support a finding of a lack of good moral character. *Matter of Lee* at 278. *Lee* additionally held that,

[T]he recency of deportation can only be considered when there is a finding of poor moral character based on moral turpitude in the conduct and attitude of a person which evinces a callous conscience [toward the violation of immigration laws] . . . . In all other instances when the cause of deportation has been removed and the person now appears eligible for issuance of a visa, the time factor should not be considered. *Id.*

In *Tin*, the Regional Commissioner noted that the applicant had gained an equity (job experience) while being unlawfully present in the U.S. The Regional Commissioner then stated that the alien had obtained an advantage over aliens seeking visa issuance abroad or who abide by the terms of their admission while in this country, and he concluded that approval of an application for permission to reapply for admission would be a condonation of the alien's acts and could encourage others to enter without being admitted to work in the United States unlawfully. *Id.*

The AAO finds that the favorable factors in this case are the applicant's family ties in the United States, her U.S. citizen spouse and child, the approval of a Form I-130 and the absence of any criminal record.

The unfavorable factors in this matter include the applicant's entry into the United States without inspection or parole in November 1991, her attempt to gain entry into the United States by fraud, her illegal re-entry subsequent to her February 23, 1998, removal, her attempt to gain entry by being concealed in the trunk of a vehicle after her prior order of removal was reinstated and she was removed from the United States, and her lengthy presence in the United States without a lawful admission or parole. The Commissioner stated in *Matter of Lee*, *supra*, that residence in the United States could be considered a positive factor only where that residence is pursuant to a legal admission or adjustment of status as a permanent resident. To reward a person for remaining in the United States in violation of law would seriously threaten the structure of all laws pertaining to immigration.

The applicant's actions in this matter cannot be condoned. The applicant has not established by supporting evidence that the favorable factors outweigh the unfavorable ones.

Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361, provides that the burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that he is eligible for the benefit sought. After a careful review of the record, it is concluded that the applicant has failed to establish that a favorable exercise of the Secretary's discretion is warranted. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.