

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

H4

[REDACTED]

FILE:

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

MAR 26 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 or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).


John F. Grissom
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center denied the Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission into the United States after Deportation or Removal (Form I-212) and the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) dismissed the subsequent appeal. The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reconsider. The motion to reconsider will be granted, the order dismissing the appeal will be affirmed and the application will be denied.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who, on January 16, 1999, at the San Ysidro, California, Port of Entry, applied for admission into the United States. The applicant presented a counterfeit Arrival/Departure Record (Form I-94), with a stamp indicating that she had been granted permanent resident status. The applicant was found inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182 (a)(6)(C)(i) for having attempted to procure admission into the United States by fraud. Consequently, on January 16, 1999, 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, on an unknown date, but prior to January 19, 2000, the date on which she gave birth to her first child in Castro Valley, California. On September 27, 2005, the applicant filed the Form I-212, indicating that she continued to reside in the United States. 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 the applicant was inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(A) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A), for being an alien who entered the United States within 5 years after having entered the United States illegally and been removed from the United States. In addition, 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 her Form I-212. Finally, the director determined that the unfavorable factors in the applicant's case outweighed the favorable factors. The director then denied the Form I-212 accordingly. *See Director's Decision* dated January 5, 2005.

On March 23, 2006, the AAO dismissed the applicant's appeal because the applicant was inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(C)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(C)(i), the applicant had not remained outside the United States for the required ten years prior to seeking permission to reapply for admission, and no purpose would be served in the adjudication of the Form I-212. *Decision of AAO*, dated March 23, 2006.

In his motion to reopen or reconsider, counsel contends that the AAO erred in denying the applicant's Form I-212 in light of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit) decision in *Perez-Gonzalez v. Ashcroft*, 379 F.3d 783 (9th Cir. 2004). *See Counsel's Motion to Reopen or Reconsider*, dated April 18, 2006. In support of his contentions, counsel submits only the referenced motion. 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.

(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.

8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a) provides, in pertinent part:

(2) Requirements for motion to reopen.

A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be provided in the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. A motion to reopen an application or petition denied due to abandonment must be filed with evidence that the decision was in error because:

- a. The requested evidence was not material to the issue of eligibility;
- b. The required initial evidence was submitted with the application or petition, or the request for initial evidence or additional information or appearance was complied with during the allotted period; or
- c. The request for additional information or appearance was sent to an address other than that on the application, petition, or notice of representation, or that the applicant or petitioner advised the Service, in writing, of a change of address or change of representation subsequent to filing and before the Service's request was sent, and the request did not go to the new address.

(3) Requirements for motion to reconsider.

A motion to reconsider must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or Service policy. A motion to reconsider a decision on an application or petition must, when filed, also establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision.

Counsel did not submit evidence or provide information regarding new facts to be provided upon a reopening of the applicant's case. The AAO, therefore, finds that counsel has not met the requirements for a motion to reopen.

In support of his motion to reconsider, counsel contends that the AAO failed to properly apply Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit) case law, specifically *Perez-Gonzalez v. Ashcroft*, 379 F.3d 783 (9th Cir. 2004), in rendering its decision. The AAO takes note of the preliminary injunction that

had been entered against the ability of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to follow *Matter of Torres-Garcia*. *Gonzales v. DHS*, 239 F.R.D. 620 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The Ninth Circuit, however, reversed the district court, and ordered the vacating of that injunction. *Gonzales v. DHS* (*Gonzales II*), 508 F.3d 1227 (9th Cir. 2007). In its opinion, the Ninth Circuit held that the Board's decision in *Matter of Torres-Garcia* was entitled to judicial deference. *Gonzales II*, 508 F.3d at 1241-42. The Ninth Circuit's mandate was issued on January 23, 2009. On February 6, 2009, the district court denied the plaintiffs' motion for a new preliminary injunction. Order Denying Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Dkt # 59), *Gonzales v. DHS*, No. C06-1411-MJP (W.D. Wash. Filed February 6, 2006). Thus, as of the date of this decision, there is no judicial prohibition in force that precludes the AAO from applying the rule laid down in *Matter of Torres-Garcia*.

The AAO notes that an exception to the section 212(a)(9)(C)(i) ground of inadmissibility is available to individuals classified as battered spouses under the cited sections of section 204 of the Act. See also 8 U.S.C. § 1154. There are no indications in the record that the applicant is or should be classified as such.

An alien who is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(C)(i) of the Act may not apply for consent to reapply unless he or she has *remained outside* the United States for more than 10 years since the date of the alien's last departure from the United States. See *Matter of Torres-Garcia*, 23 I&N Dec. 866 (BIA 2006). Thus, to avoid inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act, it must be the case that the applicant's last departure was at least ten years ago, the applicant has remained outside the United States since that departure, *and* that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has consented to the applicant's reapplying for admission. In the present matter, while the applicant's last departure from the United States occurred on January 16, 1999, more than ten years ago, she has not remained outside the United States for the required ten years and she is currently present in the United States. The applicant is currently statutorily ineligible to apply for permission to reapply for admission. Additionally, the AAO finds that, in light of the applicant's repeated violations of the immigration laws, she would not warrant a favorable exercise of discretion.

Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361, provides that the burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that she is eligible for the benefit sought. The applicant in the instant case does not qualify for an exception under section 212(a)(9)(C)(ii) of the Act. Thus, as a matter of law, the applicant is not eligible for approval of a Form I-212. Accordingly, while the motion to reconsider will be granted, the order dismissing the appeal will be affirmed.

ORDER: The motion to reconsider is granted. The order dismissing the appeal will be affirmed.