

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

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

714

PUBLIC COPY

[REDACTED]

FILE:

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: AUG 16 2006

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:

[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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission into the United States after Deportation or Removal (Form I-212) 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 October 24, 1996, at the San Ysidro, California, Port of Entry, applied for admission into the United States. The applicant presented a temporary border crossing card that did not belong to her. The applicant was found to be inadmissible pursuant to 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 other valid entry document. The applicant was placed in exclusion proceedings and on October 28, 1996, an immigration judge ordered the applicant excluded and deported from the United States. Consequently, on the same date the applicant was removed to Mexico. The record reflects that the applicant reentered the United States shortly after her deportation, 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 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 remain in the United States and reside with her U.S. citizen spouse and child.

The Director determined that the unfavorable factors in the applicant's case outweighed the favorable factors, and denied the Form I-212 accordingly. *See Director's Decision* dated April 27, 2005.

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.

On the Notice of Appeal to the AAO (Form I-290B), counsel writes: "The service denied the I-212 application for several reasons. One such reason was the fact that no I-130 petition or other means of relief had been filed. This office tried to concurrently file the I-130 and I-485 application along with the I-212 at the local USCIS office at Chula Vista, California and it was not accepted. I was told to await decision then file."

The Director did not deny the Form I-212 solely on the fact that no petition or other means of relief had been filed on behalf of the applicant. The Director mentioned that as one of the unfavorable factors. The applicant

was eligible and was permitted to file a Form I-212 pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 212.2(g)(1) and the Director adjudicated the Form I-212 pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(A)(iii) of the Act.

On the Form I-290B, counsel states that he will be submitting a brief and/or evidence to the AAO within 30 days. On May 16, 2006, the AAO forwarded a fax to counsel informing him that this office had not received a brief or evidence related to this matter and unless counsel responded within five business days the appeal may be summarily dismissed. Counsel has not responded to the AAO's fax of May 16, 2006. The appeal was filed on May 31, 2005, and to this date more than 13 months later, no documentation has been received by the AAO. Therefore, the AAO will adjudicate the appeal based on the documentation within the record of proceedings.

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 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 be a condonation of the alien's acts and could encourage others to enter without being admitted and work in the United States 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 matter, married her U.S. citizen spouse on July 22, 2000, approximately four years after she was excluded and deported from the United States. The applicant's spouse should reasonably have been aware at the time of their marriage of the possibility of her being deported. She now seeks relief based on that after-acquired equity. Therefore, hardship to her spouse will not be accorded great weight.

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 and the absence of any criminal record.

The AAO finds that the unfavorable factors in this case include the applicant's attempt to enter the United States by fraud and willful misrepresentation of a material fact, her illegal reentry after she was deported, her unauthorized employment 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 she was excluded and deported and after she reentered without a lawful admission or parole, 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.