

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

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

**PUBLIC COPY**

[REDACTED]

H4

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: TUCSON, AZ

Date:

NOV 23 2010

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:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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 \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Field Office Director, Tucson, Arizona, denied the Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission into the United States after Deportation or Removal (Form I-212) 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, on November 20, 1999, appeared at the San Ysidro, California port of entry. The applicant presented a Mexican passport containing a U.S. nonimmigrant visa bearing the name '██████████'. The applicant was placed into secondary inspection. The applicant admitted that she was not the true owner of the document and that she did not have valid documentation to enter the United States. The applicant admitted that she knew that it was illegal to attempt to enter the United States with the document. The applicant failed to provide her true identity to immigration officers. 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 for being an immigrant without valid documentation. On November 21, 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) under the name '██████████'.

On July 30, 2007, the applicant filed an Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status (Form I-485), based on a Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130) filed on her behalf by her naturalized U.S. citizen spouse. The Form I-485 indicates that the applicant entered the United States without inspection on January 3, 2000. On July 30, 2007, the applicant filed an Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) and the Form I-212, indicating that she continued to reside in the United States. During an interview in regard to the Form I-485, the applicant testified that she had reentered the United States without inspection in 1999. On June 22, 2009, the Form I-485 was denied. On August 5, 2009, the Form I-601 was denied. 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 naturalized U.S. citizen spouse and two U.S. citizen children.

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 from the United States. 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 June 22, 2009.

On appeal, counsel contends that it would be impermissibly retroactive to apply *Gonzales v. DHS (Gonzales II)*, 508 F.3d 1227 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007), when the applicant, in filing the Form I-212, relied upon the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit) decision in *Perez-Gonzalez v. Ashcroft*, 379 F.3d 783 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004). Counsel also contends that section 245(i) of the Act should override the application of section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act under the principle of *lex posteriori derogate legi priori*. Counsel contends that the field office director should not have delayed the adjudication of the Form I-212.<sup>1</sup> *See Counsel's Brief*, dated August 11, 2009. In support of her contentions, counsel

---

<sup>1</sup> The applicant's Form I-212 was filed while an injunction restraining USCIS from applying agency policy as set forth in *Matter of Torres-Garcia* had been issued. As such, the field office director correctly complied with an injunction in the

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:

(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 of Homeland Security has consented to the alien's reapplying for admission.

(iii) Waiver

The Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the application of clause (i) in the case of an alien who is a VAWA self-petitioner if there is a connection between—

(I) the alien's battering or subsection to extreme cruelty; and

(II) the alien's removal, departure from the United States, reentry or reentries into the United States; or attempted reentry into the United States.<sup>2</sup>

The AAO takes note of the preliminary injunction that had been entered against the ability of DHS to follow *Matter of Torres-Garcia*, 23 I&N Dec. 866 (BIA 2006). *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 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007). In its opinion, the Ninth Circuit held that the Board's decision in *Matter of Torres-Garcia* was entitled to judicial

---

Ninth Circuit by delaying the adjudication of the applicant's Form I-212 until the injunction had expired and a decision had been rendered in *Gonzales II*.

<sup>2</sup> There are no indications in the record that the applicant is a VAWA self-petitioner.

deference. *Gonzales II*, 508 F.3d at 1241-42. The Ninth Circuit's mandate was issued on January 23, 2009 and 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, there was no judicial prohibition in force that precluded the director from applying the rule laid down in *Matter of Torres-Garcia* when denying the instant application regardless of when it was filed by the applicant.

Furthermore, in *Morales-Izquierdo v. Department of Homeland Security*, 600 F.3d 1076 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2010), the Ninth Circuit held that applicants, even those eligible for adjustment of status under section 245(i) of the Act, are bound by *Gonzales II*, that *Gonzales II* is not impermissibly retroactive, and that a Form I-212 waiver cannot cure inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act until an applicant, while residing outside the United States, applies for and receives advance permission, but only after ten years have elapsed since the applicant's last departure from the United States. *Morales-Izquierdo* at 1, 12.

As noted by the director, 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, Supra.*; *Matter of Briones*, 24 I&N Dec. 355 (BIA 2007); and *Matter of Diaz and Lopez*, 25 I&N Dec. 188 (BIA 2010). 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 U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has consented to the applicant's reapplying for admission. While the applicant's last departure from the United States occurred on November 21, 1999, more than ten years ago, she has not remained outside the United States since that departure and she is currently in the United States.<sup>3</sup> The applicant is currently statutorily ineligible to apply for permission to reapply for admission.

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 the exception or waiver under sections 212(a)(9)(C)(ii) and (iii) 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.

---

<sup>3</sup> The applicant will be required to submit evidence establishing that she is currently outside the United States and has remained outside the United States for a period of ten years when she becomes eligible to apply for permission to reapply for admission.