



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

H4

[REDACTED]

Date: **OCT 05 2012** Office: SANTA ANA, CA

FILE: [REDACTED]

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:

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 AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

*Elean L. Johnson*

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Field Office Director, Santa Ana, 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 record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who was ordered removed on May 13, 1999 and subsequently entered the United States without inspection in June 1999. 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). 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 U.S. Citizen children.

The Field Office Director determined that the applicant was also inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act and denied the Form I-212 accordingly. *See Field Office Director's Decision*, dated September 1, 2009.

On appeal counsel for the applicant contends that because the applicant's last departure occurred over 10 years ago she is eligible to request permission to reapply for admission after removal. Counsel additionally contends that the applicant can request permission to reapply for admission while in the United States.

The record contains a statement from the applicant's spouse, evidence of birth, marriage, residence, and citizenship, medical and educational documents, letters from community members, evidence of immigration proceedings, and other applications and petitions filed on behalf of the applicant. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

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 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.

The record reflects that on May 13, 1999 the applicant presented a border crossing card which did not belong to her to immigration officials in an attempt to procure admission into the United States.<sup>1</sup> The applicant was placed in expedited removal proceedings, and was removed from the United States on the same day. The record further reflects that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in June 1999, and has remained in the country ever since. The applicant is, therefore, inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii) of the Act and requires permission to reapply for admission into the United States under section 212(a)(9)(A)(iii) of the Act.

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.

---

<sup>1</sup> The AAO further affirms the Field Office Director's finding that the applicant is also inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act due to this misrepresentation or fraud. Consequently an I-601 waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(i) of the Act will be required in order to adjust status to that of a permanent resident or to obtain an immigrant visa.

(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 applicant was ordered removed on May 13, 1999, and entered the United States without inspection soon thereafter. She is therefore inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(C)(i)(II) of the Act. Counsel contends that the applicant is now eligible to apply for permission to reapply for admission after removal or deportation because her last departure occurred over 10 years ago. This is incorrect. An alien who is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act may not apply for consent to reapply unless the alien has been 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); *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 and CIS has consented to the applicant's reapplying for admission. In the present matter, the applicant is currently residing in the United States and therefore, has not remained outside the United States for 10 years since her last departure. She 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 she is eligible for the benefit sought. After a careful review of the record, it is concluded that the applicant has failed to establish that she is currently eligible to apply for permission to reapply for admission after removal. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.