


identifying data deleted to
prevent clear and unwarrranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

HA



FILE: 


Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: OCT 13 2006

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, 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 the Philippines who on March 29, 2002, at the Los Angeles International Airport applied for admission into the United States. The applicant presented a valid Philippines passport containing a non-immigrant visa. She 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. Consequently, on March 30, 2002, 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 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 travel to the United States and reside with her U.S. citizen spouse.

The Director determined that the unfavorable factors in the applicant's case outweighed the favorable ones and the Form I-212 accordingly. *See Director's Decision* dated November 10, 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 aliens' 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 appeal, counsel submits a brief and a letter from the applicant. In his brief, counsel states that the Director must evaluate the case on a balancing test and must review all factors presented. Counsel states that the Director overlooked some obvious elements. In addition, counsel asserts that as time passes from the date of removal, the need for strict or harsh interpretation of the facts gradually diminishes and the hardship to citizen relatives gradually increases, as the parties remain separated. In addition, counsel states that by the time the applicant's appeal is adjudicated well over eighty percent of the five-year period will have passed. Additionally, counsel states that the applicant married her U.S. citizen spouse on June 6, 2002, and although they were aware of her immigration problem the degree of hardship on the applicants' spouse increases the longer he and the applicant remain separated. In her letter, the applicant states that she understands that she made a mistake by working illegally in the United States but did so in order to support her family in the

Philippines and she had no intention to violate the laws of the United States. The applicant further states that her spouse traveled to the Philippines where they got married and he has visited her on numerous occasions. Finally the applicant states that she and her spouse need each other as they are not getting any younger and requests that the Form I-212 be granted.

Counsel did not specify the elements the Director overlooked nor did he refer to case law to support his statement that “as time passes from the date of removal, the need for strict or harsh interpretation of the facts gradually diminishes.”

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. The AAO will consider the hardship to the applicant’s spouse, but it will be just one of the determining factors.

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 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 matter married her U.S. citizen spouse on June 6, 2002, approximately three months after she was expeditiously removed from the United States. The applicant's spouse should reasonably have been aware at the time of their marriage of the applicant's immigration violations and the possibility of her being inadmissible. 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, an approved Form I-130, and the absence of any criminal record.

The AAO finds that the unfavorable factors in this case include the applicant's disregard for the immigration laws of this country shown by working without authorization, departing the United States and reentering in order to continue her employment without authorization.

The applicant's actions in this matter cannot be condoned. Her equity, marriage to a U.S. citizen, gained 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 eligibility 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.