

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

HK

MAR 12 2007

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date:

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.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

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 entered the United States without a lawful admission or parole on or about March 29, 1990. The applicant departed the United States on an unknown date and on March 20, 1998, at the Fabens, Texas, Port of Entry applied for admission into the United States. The applicant presented a valid Mexican passport containing a valid nonimmigrant visa. The applicant was found inadmissible pursuant to 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 the same date 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 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), on an unknown date, but prior to July 27, 1999, the date she gave birth to a child. 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 children.

The Director determined that section 241(a)(5) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5), applies in this matter and the applicant is not eligible for any relief or benefit from the Act and denied the Form I-212 accordingly. *See Director's Decision* dated February 27, 2006.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief in which he states that based on the decision in *Perez-Gonzalez v. Ashcroft*, 379 F.3d 783 (9th Cir. 2004) the applicant is eligible to file a Form I-212 which must be adjudicated before a deportation or removal order can be reinstated. In addition, counsel states that based on *Perez-Gonzalez*, permission to reapply is available on a *nunc pro tunc* basis to an individual after he or she has already reentered the country. Additionally, counsel refers to *Morales-Izquierdo v. Ashcroft*, 388 F.3d 1299 (9th Cir. 2004) in which the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals decided that the Service does not have jurisdiction to reinstate removal orders, and only an immigration judge can reinstate a removal order. Counsel states that the Service Center should have dismissed the Form I-212 for lack of jurisdiction and issued a Notice to Appear for a hearing before an immigration judge. In the alternative, counsel requests that since no reinstatement proceedings have been initiated and the Director erroneously denied the Form I-212, the Director's decision should be vacated and the Form I-212 be adjudicated on its merits.

Section 241(a) detention, release, and removal of 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.

In its August 14, 2004, decision, *Perez-Gonzalez v. Ashcroft, supra*, 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 may nonetheless obtain adjustment of status if his Form I-212 is 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 states: "... if the alien has applied for permission to reapply in the context of an application to adjust status, the INS is required to consider whether to exercise its discretion in the alien's favor before it can proceed with reinstatement proceedings..."

Since this case arises in the Ninth Circuit, *Perez-Gonzalez* is controlling. The AAO agrees with counsel and finds that the Director erred in denying the Form I-212 based on section 241(a)(5) of the Act. As there is no order reinstating the applicant's prior order of removal the applicant is not subject to section 241(a)(5) of the Act and she is eligible to file a Form I-212.

The AAO conducts the final administrative review and enters the ultimate decision for CIS on all immigration matters that fall within its jurisdiction. The AAO reviews each case *de novo* as to all questions of law, fact, discretion, or any other issue that may arise in an appeal that falls under its jurisdiction. Because the AAO engages in *de novo* review, the AAO may deny an application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law, without remand, even if the district or service center director does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. See *Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003).

To recapitulate, on March 20, 1998, the applicant was expeditiously removed from the United States. Therefore, the applicant is clearly inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(A) of the Act, and must receive permission to reapply for admission.

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 the Secretary of 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; (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/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:

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 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 children, and an approved Form I-130.

The AAO finds that the unfavorable factors in this case include the applicant's initial illegal entry in March 1990, her attempt to reenter the United States to resume her illegal residence, her illegal reentry subsequent to her removal, a criminal record involving two convictions for theft, her periods of 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. 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.