



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

[REDACTED]

H4

FILE:

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: OCT 25 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 El Salvador who entered the United States without a lawful admission or parole on or about November 30, 1994. On November 26, 1996, the applicant filed an Application for Asylum and for Withholding of Removal (Form I-589) with the Immigration and Naturalization Service (now Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS)). On January 6, 1997, the applicant was interviewed for asylum status. His application was referred to the immigration court and an Order to Show Cause (OSC) for a hearing before an immigration judge was served on him on January 21, 1997. On June 9, 1998, the applicant failed to appear for a deportation hearing and he was subsequently ordered deported *in absentia* by an immigration judge, pursuant to section 241(a)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) for having entered the United States without inspection. The applicant failed to surrender for removal or depart from the United States. On June 27, 1998, a Notice to Deportable Alien (Form I-166) was forwarded to the applicant requesting that he appear at the Los Angeles, California District Office in order to be removed from the United States. The Form I-166 was returned as unclaimed. The applicant is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130) filed by his U.S. spouse. The applicant is inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(ii). He 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 his U.S. citizen spouse.

The Director determined that the unfavorable factors in the applicant's case outweighed the favorable ones and denied the Form I-212 accordingly. See *Director's Decision* dated September 14, 2005.

Section 212(a)(9)(A) of the Act states in pertinent part:

(A) Certain aliens previously removed.-

(i) Other aliens. - Any alien not described in clause (i) who-

(I) has been ordered removed under section 240 or any other provision of law, or

(II) departed the United States while an order of removal was outstanding, and seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal (or within 20 years of such date 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 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 in 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 deterring aliens from overstaying their authorized period of stay and from being present in the United States without lawful admission or parole.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that he was unaware of the deportation order because he never received a notification to appear for a hearing. The applicant states that he found out about his deportation order after he appeared at the San Bernardino, California, CIS office to inquire about the status of his case. The applicant further states that he failed to appear for his hearing because he never received a notice for a court hearing and, therefore, he did not know that he had to depart the United States

The applicant's assertion is not persuasive. Although the applicant states that he never received any correspondence regarding his deportation hearing, the record indicates that he and/or his attorney was present at hearings on March 4, 1997, May 5, 1997, and August 4, 1997. At the August 4, 1997, hearing a new hearing was scheduled for June 9, 1998 to review the merits of his asylum claim. The applicant did not appear at that hearing and a final order was issued.

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 (7<sup>th</sup> 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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 (5<sup>th</sup> 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 his U.S. citizen spouse on August 19, 2000, over three and one half years after he was placed in deportation proceedings and over two years after he was ordered deported. 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 his being deported. He now seeks relief based on that after-acquired equity. Therefore, hardship to his 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, his 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 initial illegal entry into the United States, his failure to appear for deportation proceedings, his unauthorized employment and his 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. His equity, marriage to a U.S. citizen, gained after he was placed in deportation proceedings, 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.