

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



M₁

DATE:

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

FILE:



JUL 28 2011

IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION:

Application for Temporary Protected Status under Section 244 of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1254

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



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 Nebraska Service Center. 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 Nebraska Service Center 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 application was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center. A motion to reconsider was filed, which was granted by the director. The director subsequently affirmed her initial decision. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant claims to be a citizen of Haiti who is seeking Temporary Protected Status (TPS) under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1254.

The director denied the application because the applicant had previously filed a frivolous asylum application and, therefore, he is permanently ineligible for any benefit under section 244 of the Act.

On appeal, counsel argues that the director's decision contained no analysis of the applicant's arguments in his motion to reconsider or the precedent decisions (*Matter of Y-L*, 24 I&N Dec. 151(BIA 2007), *Matter of B-Y-*, 25 I&N Dec. 236 (BIA 2010)) he attached which warrant reconsideration.

Section 244(c) of the Act, and the related regulations in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2, provide that an applicant who is a national of a foreign state as designated by the Attorney General, now the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security (Secretary), is eligible for TPS only if such alien establishes that he or she:

- (a) Is a national of a state designated under section 244(b) of the Act;
- (b) Has been continuously physically present in the United States since the effective date of the most recent designation of that foreign state;
- (c) Has continuously resided in the United States since such date as the Secretary may designate;
- (d) Is admissible as an immigrant except as provided under section 244.3;
- (e) Is not ineligible under 8 C.F.R. § 244.4.

Section 208(d) of the Act states, in pertinent part:

- (4) Notice of privilege of counsel and consequences of frivolous application.
– At the time of filing an application for asylum, the Secretary shall –
 - (A) advise the alien of the privilege of being represented by counsel and of the consequences, under paragraph (6), of knowingly filing a frivolous application for asylum; and

- (B) provide the alien a list of persons (updated not less often than quarterly) who have indicated their availability to represent aliens in asylum proceedings on a pro bono basis.
- (6) Frivolous application – If the Secretary determines that an alien has knowingly made a frivolous application for asylum and the alien has received the notice under paragraph (4)(A), the alien shall be permanently ineligible for any benefits under this Act, effective as of the date of a final determination on such application.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 208.20 provides:

For applications filed on or after April 1, 1997, an applicant is subject to the provisions of section 208(d)(6) of the Act only if a final order by an immigration judge or the Board of Immigration Appeals specifically finds that the alien knowingly filed a frivolous asylum application. For purposes of this section, an asylum application is frivolous if any of its material elements is deliberately fabricated. Such finding shall only be made if the immigration judge or the Board is satisfied that the applicant, during the course of the proceedings, has had sufficient opportunity to account for any discrepancies or implausible aspects of the claim. For purposes of this section, a finding that an alien filed a frivolous asylum application shall not preclude the alien from seeking withholding of removal.

The record reflects that on September 6, 2000, a Form I-862, Notice to Appear, was issued and served on the applicant on September 7, 2000. The applicant's Form I-589, Application for Asylum and Withholding of Removal, was filed on February 23, 2001. The Form I-589 advised the applicant that if it is determined that he knowingly filed a frivolous application for asylum, he would be permanently ineligible for any benefits under the Act.

The transcript of hearing in the removal proceedings held on November 3, 2000,¹ indicates that the applicant was advised by the immigration judge of the consequences of knowingly filing a frivolous asylum application. The immigration judge advised the applicant that if he knowingly filed a frivolous application for asylum, he would be forever barred from receiving any benefits under the Act.

On April 3, 2002, a removal hearing was held and the applicant's asylum application was denied and he was ordered removed from the United States. The oral decision of the immigration judge (IJ) indicates, in pertinent part:

In addition and in light of the respondent's admission that the statement on his application is false with regard to his long time membership in the organization to which he earlier claimed a membership, the Espace de Concitation, that the

¹ The removal proceedings were subsequently continued.

respondent has knowingly submitted an application for asylum which contains statements or responses to questions that have been deliberately fabricated. Therefore, the Court also finds that the application for asylum submitted by the respondent is a frivolous application. This finding is also supported by the statement on the respondent's application he, in fact, was alone in the car at the time that the windows were purportedly broken and there was no indication that his grandfather was present in that car at the same time, contrary to his testimony.

The oral decision of IJ also indicates that the frivolous asylum warnings were read to the applicant and were given to the applicant in person. Thus, the applicant was permanently barred from receiving any benefits under the Act. Section 208(d)(6) of the Act. The applicant appealed the IJ's decision to the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). On September 30, 2003, the BIA affirmed, without opinion, the IJ's decision.

The director determined that the applicant was ineligible for TPS benefits and denied the application on June 7, 2010.

Counsel cannot collaterally attack the decisions of the IJ and the BIA before the AAO. The BIA and the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals are the appropriate forums for disputing the BIA's decision. The applicant had the opportunity on motion to dispute the BIA's findings, but failed to do so. Assuming, arguendo, the AAO had the authority to change the decisions of the IJ and the BIA, the fact remains that the transcript of hearing and the oral decision reflect that the frivolous asylum warnings was read to and given to the applicant in person, and the applicant, during his removal proceeding, admitted that the statements on his asylum application were false.

The AAO is bound by the clear language of the statute and lacks the authority to change the statute. There is no waiver available, even for humanitarian reasons, due to the applicant's ineligibility pursuant to section 208(d)(6) of the Act. Consequently, the director's decision to deny the TPS application on this ground will be affirmed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.