



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

tl4

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Date:

JUL 06 2009

IN RE:

[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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required by 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

John F. Grissom
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Field Office Director, San Francisco, California, denied the Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission into the United States after Deportation or Removal (Form I-212) and it is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Columbia who, on November 26, 1999, was placed into immigration proceedings for entering the United States without inspection.¹ The applicant filed an Application for Asylum and for Withholding of Removal (Form I-589). On August 9, 2003, the applicant married his then lawful permanent resident spouse in New Rochelle, New York. On March 26, 2004, the immigration judge ordered the applicant removed *in absentia*. The applicant failed to surrender for removal or depart from the United States. On May 4, 2007, the applicant filed a motion to reopen and stay of removal. On June 15, 2007, the immigration judge denied the applicant's motion to reopen. On July 19, 2007, the applicant was removed from the United States and returned to Columbia.

On November 23, 2007, the applicant's spouse filed a Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130) on behalf of the applicant. On February 4, 2008, the applicant filed the Form I-212 indicating that he resided in Columbia. On November 21, 2008, the Form I-130 was approved. The applicant is inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(ii), for a period of ten years. 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 reside in the United States with his now naturalized U.S. citizen spouse.

The field office director determined that the applicant did not warrant a favorable exercise of discretion and denied the Form I-212 accordingly. *See Field Office Director's Decision*, dated April 8, 2008.

On appeal, counsel requests that a favorable exercise of discretion be granted in the applicant's case. *See Attachment to Appeal*, dated May 5, 2008. In support of his contentions, counsel submits the referenced attachment to appeal, an affidavit from the applicant's spouse, psychological documentation, a letter of recommendation and country condition reports. The entire record was reviewed in rendering a decision in this case.

Section 212(a)(9) 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.

¹ The AAO notes that there is a dispute as to when the applicant first entered the United States, but that it is agreed that the entry was without inspection.

- (ii) 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 who 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 on a 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 Secretary has consented to the alien's reapplying for admission.

....

(C) Aliens unlawfully present after previous immigration violations.-

(i) In general.-Any alien who-

(I) has been unlawfully present in the United States for an aggregate period of more than 1 year, or

(II) has been ordered removed under section 235(b)(1), section 240, or any other provision of law, and who enters or attempts to reenter the United States without being admitted is inadmissible.

(ii) Exception.- Clause (i) shall not apply to an alien seeking admission more than 10 years after the date of the alien's last departure from the United States if, prior to the alien's reembarkation at a place outside the United States or attempt to be readmitted from a foreign contiguous territory, the Secretary has consented to the alien's reapplying for admission. The Secretary, in the Secretary's discretion, may waive the provisions of section 212(a)(9)(C)(i) in the case of an alien to whom the Secretary has granted classification under clause (iii), (iv), or (v) of section 204(a)(1)(A), or classification under clause (ii), (iii), or (iv) of section 204(a)(1)(B), in any case in which there is a connection between—

(1) the alien's having been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty; and

(2) the alien's--

(A) removal;

- (B) departure from the United States;
- (C) reentry or reentries into the United States; or
- (D) attempted reentry into the United States.

Counsel and the applicant assert that the applicant has remained outside the United States and lived in Columbia since he was removed on July 19, 2007.²

The AAO notes that the applicant is inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), for being unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year, from at least November 24, 1999, the date on which the applicant claims to have entered the United States without inspection, and July 19, 2007, the date on which the applicant departed the United States, and is seeking admission within ten years of his last departure.³ To seek a waiver of this ground of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), an applicant must file an Application for Waiver of Ground of Inadmissibility (Form I-601).

As required by 8 C.F.R. § 212.2(d), an immigrant visa applicant who is outside the United States and requires both a waiver and permission to reapply for admission must simultaneously file the Form I-601 and the Form I-212 with the U.S. Consulate having jurisdiction over the applicant's place of residence. As the applicant has not complied with the regulatory requirements for filing the Form I-212, the application in this matter was improperly filed. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.

² The AAO notes that if it is later confirmed that the applicant illegally reentered the United States at any time after his 2007 removal, he is inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(C)(i) of the Act and is ineligible for permission to reapply for admission until he has remained outside the United States for a period of ten years. *See Matter of Torres-Garcia*, 23 I&N Dec. 866 (BIA 2006) and *Gonzales v. DHS (Gonzales II)*, 508 F.3d 1227 (9th Cir. 2007).

³ The AAO finds that, despite filing an asylum application, the applicant accrued unlawful presence since his entry without inspection and during the period of time the asylum application was pending before the immigration court, because, as reflected in a letter from [REDACTED], the applicant was employed in the United States by the Denali Group and was never issued employment authorization.