

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

PUBLIC COPY




H 4

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: JUN 17 2005

IN RE: Applicant: [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:



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 on April 19, 1997, at the San Francisco International Airport applied for admission as a non-immigrant visitor for pleasure. The applicant was found inadmissible under section 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (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 other valid entry document. 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 record reflects that the applicant reentered the United States in December 1998 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). The applicant is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130) filed by her U.S. citizen spouse. 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 remain in the United States and reside with her U.S. citizen spouse and child.

The Director determined that the applicant was inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for a period of one year or more. In addition the Director determined that section 241(a)(5) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1231(a)(5) applied in this matter and the applicant was not eligible for any relief or benefit from her Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission After Deportation or Removal (Form I-212). The Director denied the Form I-212 accordingly. *See Director's Decision* dated September 2, 2004.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act provides, in pertinent part, that:

(B) Aliens Unlawfully Present.-

(i) In general.-Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who-

. . . .

(II) has been unlawfully present in the United States for one year or more, and who again seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal from the United States, is inadmissible.

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 alien 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 alien is not eligible and may not apply for any relief under this Act, and the alien shall be removed under the prior order at any time after the reentry.

On appeal counsel states that the decision erroneously states that the applicant is not eligible to be considered for permission to reapply. Counsel states that the applicant is presently living in Mexico and therefore the applicant is eligible to reapply for admission after removal. In addition counsel states that the applicant was expeditiously removed only 17 days after a new law allowing “summary exclusion” went into effect. Counsel asserts that under prior practice the applicant would have been allowed to withdraw her application for admission and if the applicant had been placed in an exclusion hearing she would have almost certainly been offered voluntary departure. Counsel further states that the Immigration and Naturalization Service (now Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS)) did not factually articulate the reason for the applicant’s inadmissibility. Finally counsel states that if the applicant is found to be inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act, this inadmissibility is not part of the Form I-212 and the applicant would be eligible to seek a waiver of her inadmissibility by filing an Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601).

The proceeding in the present case is for the application for permission to reapply for admission into the United States after deportation or removal and therefore the AAO will not discuss whether the Port Director erred in his decision to place the applicant in expedited removal, or whether the applicant would have been eligible for voluntary departure or allowed to withdraw her application for admission.

As noted above the record reflects that the applicant was expeditiously removed from the United States on April 19, 1997, reentered in December 1998 and remained in the United States without a lawful admission or parole.

In its August 14, 2004, decision, *Perez-Gonzalez v. Ashcroft*, 379 F.3d 783 (9th Cir. 2004), the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that a Mexican national who returned to the United States following a deportation and had his deportation order reinstated might nonetheless obtain adjustment of status if his Form I-212 was granted. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals stated in *Perez-Gonzalez* that: “Given the fact that Perez-Gonzalez applied for the waiver *before* his deportation order was reinstated, he was not yet subject to its terms and, therefore, was not barred from applying for relief.” The Court further states: “Prior administrative decisions of the Bureau of Immigration Appeals confirm the fact that permission to reapply is available on a *nunc pro tunc* basis, in which the petitioner receives permission to reapply for admission after he or she has already reentered the country.” Finally the Court found that: “. . . if permission to reapply is granted, the approval of Form I-212 is retroactive to the date on which the alien entered the country, and therefore, the alien is no longer subject to the grounds of inadmissibility in § 212(a)(9).”

The record of proceedings does not reveal that the applicant’s prior removal order was reinstated at the time she filed the Form I-212. Since this case arises in the Ninth Circuit, *Perez-Gonzalez* is controlling and the applicant is not subject to section 241(a)(5) of the Act. The applicant is eligible to file a Form I-212 and if approved she will not be inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act.

This office finds that although the applicant is not subject to section 241(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 aliens' reembarkation at a place outside the United States or attempt to be admitted from foreign continuous territory, the Attorney General has consented to the aliens' reapplying for admission.

A review of the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (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, with limited exceptions, 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.

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 or Removal:

The basis for deportation; recency of deportation; length of residence in the United States; applicant's moral character; his respect for law and order; evidence of reformation and rehabilitation; family responsibilities; any inadmissibility under other sections of law; hardship involved to himself and others; and the need for his services in the United States.

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 condone the alien's acts and could encourage others to enter the United States to work unlawfully. *Id.*

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.*

The court held in *Garcia-Lopes v. INS*, 923 F.2d 72 (7th Cir. 1991), that less weight is given to equities acquired after a deportation order has been entered. Further, the equity of a marriage and the weight given to any hardship to the spouse is diminished if the parties married after the commencement of deportation proceedings, with knowledge that the alien might be deported. It is also noted that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, in *Carnalla-Nunoz v. INS*, 627 F.2d 1004 (9th Cir. 1980), held that an after-acquired equity, referred to as an after-acquired family tie in *Matter of Tijam*, 22 I&N Dec. 408 (BIA 1998) need not be accorded great weight by the district director in considering discretionary weight. Moreover, in *Ghassan v. INS*, 972 F.2d 631, 634-35 (5th Cir. 1992), the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals held that giving diminished weight to hardship faced by a spouse who entered into a marriage with knowledge of the alien's possible deportation was proper.

The applicant in the present case married her U.S. citizen spouse on February 10, 1998, almost a year after her expedited removal from the United States. The applicant's spouse should reasonably have been aware of the applicant's immigration violations and the possibility of her being inadmissible at the time of their marriage. She now seeks relief based on that after-acquired equity.

The AAO finds that the favorable factors in this case are the applicant's family ties in the United States, her spouse and child, and the absence of any criminal record.

The unfavorable factors in this case include the applicant's stay and study in the United States without the proper nonimmigrant visa, her attempt to enter the United States as a nonimmigrant visitor for pleasure, her removal on April 19, 1997, her illegal reentry in December 1998 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. Her equity, marriage to a U.S. citizen, gained after her removal, can be given only minimal weight. 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 the applicant 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.