PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE
425 Eye Street N.W.
BCIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F
Washington, D.C. 20536

[redacted]

FILE [redacted] Office: Vermont Service Center Date: JUN 24 2003

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: Self-represented

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision 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 the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (Bureau) where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. *Id.*

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of $110 as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.7.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Guatemala who was present in the United States without a lawful admission or parole on July 28, 1991. On August 14, 1997, he was served with a Notice to Appear. On April 28, 1999, an immigration judge granted the applicant until August 28, 1999, to depart voluntarily from the United States in lieu of removal. The applicant failed to depart by that date, and he failed to surrender for removal. Therefore he is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(ii).

The applicant 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).

The director determined that the unfavorable factors outweighed the favorable ones and denied the application accordingly.

On appeal, the applicant states that it was never his intention to disregard or disrespect any immigration law. He states that it would be an extreme hardship to expose his daughter to the living conditions in Guatemala and he hopes to legalize his status. The applicant submits several letters of recommendation in support of his appeal.

Section 212(a)(9)(A) of the Act provides, in part, that:

> (i) 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 5 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) Any alien not described in clause (i) who-
>
> > (I) has been ordered removed under section 240 of the Act 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) 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 Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] has consented to the alien's reapplying for admission.

Section 212(a)(6)(B) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(B), was amended by the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA) and is now codified as section 212(a)(9)(A)(i) and (ii). In IIRIRA, Congress imposed restrictions on benefits for aliens, enhanced enforcement and penalties for certain violations, eliminated judicial review of certain judgements or decisions under certain sections of the Act, created a new expedited removal proceeding, and established major new grounds of inadmissibility. Nothing could be clearer than Congress's desire in recent years to limit, rather than to extend, the relief available to aliens who have violated immigration law. Congress has almost unfettered power to decide which aliens may come to and remain in this country. This power has been recognized repeatedly by the Supreme Court. *See Fiallo v. Bell*, 430 U.S. 787 (1977); *Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292 (1993); *Kleindienst v. Mandel*, 408 U.S. 753, 766 (1972). *See also Matter of Yeung*, 21 I&N Dec. 610, 612 (BIA 1997).

Although guidelines for considering permission to reapply for admission applications were promulgated in *Matter of Tin*, 14 I&N Dec. 371 (Reg. Comm. 1973), and in *Matter of Lee*, 17 I&N Dec. 275 (Comm. 1978), these holdings were rendered long before Congress amended the Act from 1981 through the present 1996 IIRIRA amendments and beyond. It is specifically noted that the Commissioner in *Matter of Lee*, referred to the intent of Congress in enacting former sections 212(a)(16) and (17) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(16) and (17), in the conclusions and recommendations of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in their report dated 1950. The Committee also reviewed section 3 of the 1917 Act in their study.

Even though the decisions in *Tin* and *Lee* have not been overruled, Congress and the courts following the 1981 amendments and onward have clearly shown in their intent, and in the legislation and in their decisions, that individuals who violate immigration law are viewed unfavorably. The later statutes and judicial decisions have effectively negated most precedent case law rendered prior to 1981. Such case law is still considered but less weight is given to favorable factors gained after the violation of immigration laws following statutory changes and judicial decisions.

Even the Regional Commissioner in *Tin* held that an alien's unlawful presence in the United States is evidence of disrespect for law. The Regional Commissioner noted also that the applicant gained an equity (job experience) while being unlawfully present subsequent to that return. The Regional Commissioner stated that the alien obtained an advantage over aliens seeking visa issuance abroad or who abide by the terms of their admission while in this country.

The Regional Commissioner then concluded that approval of an application for permission to reapply for admission would appear to be a condonation of the alien's acts and could encourage others to enter without being admitted to work in the United States unlawfully.

Congress has increased the bar to admissibility from 5 to 10 years. Congress has also added a bar to admissibility for aliens who are unlawfully present in the United States. In addition, Congress has imposed a permanent bar to admission for aliens who have been ordered removed and who subsequently enter or attempt to enter the United States without being lawfully admitted. In IIRIRA, Congress has added new and amended crimes, new grounds of inadmissibility, new grounds of deportability, and has enhanced enforcement authorities. It is concluded that Congress has placed a high priority on reducing and/or stopping aliens from overstaying their authorized period of stay and/or from being present in the United States without a lawful admission or parole.

It is appropriate to examine the basis of a removal as well as an applicant's general compliance with immigration and other laws. Evidence of serious disregard for law is viewed as an adverse factor. Family ties in the United States are an important consideration in deciding whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. *Matter of Acosta*, 14 I&N Dec. 361 (D.D. 1973).

The Bureau, following more recent judicial decisions and the Congressional amendments, has accorded less weight to an applicant's equities gained following the commencement of removal proceedings, if the equities were gained while the applicant was unlawfully present in the United States or after a violation of law. The statute provides in section 240 of the Act, 8 U.S.C § 1229, for the consideration of a certain amount of continuous physical presence in the United States for aliens seeking cancellation of removal. The present applicant is not seeking cancellation of removal.

The court held in *Garcia-Lopez v. INS*, 923 F.2d 72 (7th Cir. 1991), that less weight is given to equities acquired after a deportation order has been entered. Further, the equity of a marriage and the weight given to any hardship to the spouse is diminished if the parties married after the commencement of deportation proceedings, with knowledge that the alien might be deported. *Ghassan v. INS*, 972 F.2d 631 (5th Cir. 1992), *cert. denied*, 507 U.S. 971 (1993). It is also noted that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Carnalla-Muñoz v. INS*, 627 F.2d 1004 (9th Cir. 1980), held that after-acquired equities, referred to as "after-acquired family ties" in *Matter of Tijam*, 22 I&N Dec. 408 (BIA 1998), need not be accorded great weight by the district director in considering discretionary weight.

The applicant in the present matter entered the United States unlawfully in July 1991, was served with a Notice to Appear in

August 1997, was found removable and was granted voluntary departure until August 1999, he failed to depart, and became the father of a U.S. citizen daughter in October 1999. He now seeks relief based on that after-acquired equity.

The favorable factors in this matter are the applicant's family ties and the absence of a criminal record. The record fails to show, however, that the applicant lives with and/or supports either the child or the child's mother.

The unfavorable factors in this matter include the applicant's unlawful entry, his being found removable, his failure to depart voluntarily, his failure to surrender for removal, his employment without Bureau authorization during part of the time, and his lengthy presence in the United States without a lawful admission or parole. The Commissioner stated in *Matter of Lee, supra,* that residence in the United States could be considered a positive factor only where that residence is pursuant to a legal admission or adjustment of status as a permanent resident. To reward a person for remaining in the United States in violation of law would seriously threaten the structure of all laws pertaining to immigration.

The applicant's actions in this matter cannot be condoned. The applicant has not established by supporting evidence that the favorable factors outweigh the unfavorable ones.

Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361, provides that the burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that the applicant is eligible for the benefit sought. After a careful review of the record, it is concluded that the applicant has failed to establish that a favorable exercise of the Attorney General's discretion is warranted. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.