

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 MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

44



FILE:



Office: HOUSTON, TX

Date:

MAY 06 2009

IN RE:



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.

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 Field Office Director, Houston Texas, 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 Peru who, on June 7, 1998, appeared at the Houston International Airport. The applicant presented her Peruvian passport containing an altered U.S. nonimmigrant visa. The applicant was placed into secondary inspections. The applicant claimed that she was unaware that the visa was fraudulent and stated that she, herself, had obtained the nonimmigrant visa from the U.S. Embassy in Lima, Peru.¹ The nonimmigrant visa had been lifted and altered to reflect the applicant's photograph and biographical information. The applicant was found to be inadmissible pursuant to sections 212(a)(6)(C)(i) and 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182(a)(6)(C)(i) and 1182(a)(7)(A)(i)(I), for attempting to enter the United States by fraud and being an immigrant without valid documentation. On June 7, 1998, 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), under her maiden name.²

On April 9, 2007, the applicant filed the Form I-212, indicating that she resided in the United States. On April 19, 2007, a Notice of Intent/Decision to Reinstate Prior Order (Form I-871) was issued pursuant to section 241(a)(5) of Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5). The applicant had reentered the United States without a lawful admission or parole and without permission to reapply for admission on January 1, 2000. On April 19, 2007, the applicant was removed from the United States and returned to Peru. The applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(A)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(i), for a period of twenty years. 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 reside in the United States with her lawful permanent resident spouse and U.S. citizen child.

The field office director determined that the applicant is inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(C)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(C)(i), for illegally reentering the United States after having been removed. The field office director determined that the applicant was not eligible to apply for permission to reapply for admission because she had not remained outside the United States for the required ten years. The field office director denied the Form I-212 accordingly. *See Field Office Director's Decision*, dated August 28, 2007.

¹ Counsel contends that the applicant utilized the services of a travel agent in order to obtain the nonimmigrant visa; however, the record reflects that, at the port of entry, the applicant claimed to have applied for and picked up the nonimmigrant visa herself from the U.S. Embassy. At the time of apprehension at the port of entry, the applicant did not claim that she had utilized the services of a travel agent in applying for the nonimmigrant visa and was adamant that she herself had obtained the nonimmigrant visa from the U.S. Embassy.

² Counsel contends that the applicant was unaware that she was being removed from the United States and that she was not provided with documentation informing her of the removal and consequences of reentry into the United States; however, the record reflects that the applicant was personally served with a Determination of Inadmissibility (Form I-860) and a Notice to Alien Removed/Departure Verification (Form I-296). The Record of Sworn Statement in Proceedings under Section 235(b)(1) of the Act (Form I-867A) also reflects that the applicant was verbally informed that she had committed fraud in her attempt to enter the United States and that she had been ordered removed from the United States.

On appeal, counsel contends that the field office director erred in finding the applicant inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(C)(i) of the Act because she had not been properly ordered removed in 1998.³ Counsel contends that the applicant warrants a favorable exercise of discretion. *See Counsel's Brief*, dated October 29, 2007. In support of his contentions, counsel submits only the referenced brief. 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.
- (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. [Emphasis added]

....

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

- (i) In general.-Any alien who-

³ The AAO notes that the record reflects that the applicant had been properly ordered removed in 1998. Moreover, the AAO has no authority to review the decision to remove the applicant. The only issue before the AAO is whether the applicant, who was physically removed from the United States in 1998 and 2007, is eligible for permission to reapply for admission under section 212(a)(9)(A)(iii) of the Act.

(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.

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, the applicant's last

departure from the United States occurred on April 19, 2007, less than ten years ago.⁴ 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.

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*.

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, the appeal will be dismissed as a matter of discretion.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.

⁴ The AAO notes that the applicant will need to provide proof of her residence outside the United States for a period of ten years when she becomes eligible to apply for permission to reapply for admission.