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PART 1

I. PREFACE

2016 Edition

This toolkit is a compilation of information about INA § 240A(a), or Cancellation of Removal for lawful permanent residents (LPR). The toolkit is intended to serve as a resource for immigration attorneys representing LPR clients facing removal from the United States. In addition to describing the LPR Cancellation statute, the toolkit also provides information about aggravated felonies, the discretionary component of Cancellation, individuals who are ineligible for LPR Cancellation, options available to those who are ineligible for LPR Cancellation, applicable regulations, the Florence Immigrant and Refugee Rights Project Pro Se packet, sample documents from government entities, and immigration court citation guidelines.

This toolkit is an update of the 2010 edition. The 2016 edition provides the reader with updated case law and government forms, alternative remedies, information on obtaining client records, new evidence section, and additional suggested litigation strategies and briefs from practitioners. This toolkit was created by Laura Lopez Ledesma and Lauren Picciallo, second year law students of Penn State Law’s Center for Immigrants’ Rights Clinic (Center), under the supervision of Shoba Sivaprasad Wadhia, Samuel Weiss Faculty Scholar and professor of clinical law at Penn State Law-University Park. Invaluable feedback was provided by Matthew Lamberti, Esq., managing attorney at Pennsylvania Immigration Resource Center (PIRC). The Center is thankful to the following practitioner’s for their advice, briefs, and other supporting documents:

- George M. Baurkot, Esq., Baurkot & Baurkot (2016).
• Shelley Wittevrongel, Esq. (2009).
• Siobhan Waldron, Esq., formerly at Immigration Center for Women and Children (Los Angeles, CA), currently at Centro Legal de la Raza (Oakland, California) (2016).
• Susan Compernolle, Esq. (2009).
• Toni Maschler, Esq., Bromberg, Kohler Maya & Maschler, PLLC (2009).

**About the Center**

Penn State Law’s Center for Immigrants’ Rights Clinic is directed by Professor Shoba Sivaprasad Wadhia. At the Center, students produce white papers, practitioner toolkits, and primers of national impact for institutional clients. Students at the Center also engage in community outreach and education on immigration topics such as immigration enforcement and prosecutorial discretion. Finally, the Center provides legal support in individual cases of immigrants challenging deportation (removal) or seeking protection by the Department of Homeland Security and in the courts.

**About the Pennsylvania Immigration Resource Center**

The Pennsylvania Immigration Resource Center (PIRC) is located less than a mile from York County Prison and has become the leading source of legal services to immigrants detained by the Department of Homeland Security in Pennsylvania. PIRC offers pro bono representation to the most vulnerable immigrant detainees. In providing legal and educational resources to detained populations, PIRC seeks to empower unrepresented immigrants to evaluate and manifest their defenses against deportation from the U.S..

**About the Redacted Version (Available Upon Request)**

In creating the toolkit, we spoke to immigration ‘stakeholders’ and collected suggested litigation strategies and sample documents included the toolkit. Part 2 of the toolkit is available only upon request from the Center for Immigrants’ Rights at centerforimmigrantsr@pennstatelaw.psu.edu. Part 2 contains suggested litigation strategies and best practices and other sample documents. The sample documents include motions, memoranda, briefs, exhibit lists for supporting documents, certificates of service, and direct examination questions.

Throughout this toolkit, we will use the following acronyms to refer to specific terminology:

- AEDPA – Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996
- BIA – Board of Immigration Appeals
- DHS – Department of Homeland Security
- EOIR – Executive Office for Immigration Review
Methodology
This toolkit is an update of the 2010 edition. There are several additions and changes to the 2016 version of the toolkit. Below you will find the methodology and significant changes to the sections of the toolkit.

Statutory Section
The statutory section of the toolkit, Part 1, Roman Numeral III, describes each statutory element of LPR Cancellation of Removal. Each statutory element in LPR Cancellation of Removal is a subheading and contains a brief description of critical case law developments for that element. We have included hyperlinks to helpful practice advisories throughout the statutory section and hypotheticals addressing more complex issues of that element. While most of the case law is applicable to all circuits, this toolkit is specifically geared towards the Third Circuit. For example, Section 3, which covers the element “has not been convicted of any aggravated felony,” contains the entirety of §101(a)(43) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) in plain English. In addition to the statute, we have included case law specific to the Third Circuit that addresses issues applicable to the specific statutory subsection of 101(a)(43).

Case Law
The case law section of the toolkit, Part 1, Roman Numeral V, includes the case law that addresses the most critical components of the statutory elements. All case law in the 2016 edition was Shepardized and screened for additional developments.

Additionally, the case law section is arranged in two fashions: (1) arranged by court authority and (2) arranged by statutory element. In the case law section arranged by statutory element, we have further split each statutory element into sub-topics. For example, in the case law section which addresses the statutory element “has been an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence for not less than 5 years” the sub-topics include: (A) Conditional Lawful Permanent Residents, (B) Burden of Proof for Abandonment of Lawful Permanent Resident Status, and (C) Ability to Impute a Parent’s Lawful Permanent Resident Status. All case law we have included is precedent in the Board of Immigration Appeals or Third Circuit.
Practice Advisories
The Practice Advisory section of the toolkit, Part 1, Roman Numeral VI, includes “how to” instructions and additional helpful information on how to help get your client out of detention. This section has three subheadings. Section (a) includes information about how to prepare an LPR Cancellation of Removal application, supporting documents, required biometric and biographical information, fees, and serving and filing the application. Section (b) contains information about release from detention, which includes a brief description on bond and habeas corpus. Section (c) includes instruction on how to obtain client’s records from the federal government and the states of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware.

Advice from Practitioners
The Advice of Practitioners section, Part 2, Roman Numeral II, Section (a), includes suggested litigation strategies, best practices, and helpful tips in preparing the application and for court hearings. This section has been split up into subtopics that address different issues ranging from alternative remedies to the use of affidavits. Additionally, this section includes interviews from 2009 and 2016. Practitioners who were added to the section responded to our request for participation, which was sent to a variety of immigration listservs. The 2009 interviews have all been vetted to make sure each points are still relevant as of 2016.

Evidence
The Evidence section, Part 2, Roman Numeral I, Section (b), includes a consolidation of evidence that was suggested by different attorneys. Attorneys who participated were those who responded to our immigration listserv inquiries in 2016 and past attorneys who participated when the 2010 LPR Cancellation of Removal edition was developed.

Sample Legal Documents
The Sample Legal Documents Part 2, Roman Numeral I, Section (c), includes briefs and other documents submitted to the Immigration Court. At the beginning of the sample legal documents section is a brief description of each legal document contained. Briefs that were included were obtained from those who responded to the listserv inquiries. Additionally, all briefs were vetted for relevancy and accuracy.

Legal Disclaimer
This Toolkit is limited in its scope as it is primarily focused on Cancellation of Removal for Lawful Permanent Residents. Moreover, it is not a substitute for reading the primary sources of law that pertain to such remedy. This Toolkit is for informational purposes only and not for the purpose of providing legal advice. Although we have gone to great
lengths to make sure our information is accurate and useful, we recommend you conduct further research based on your client’s specific circumstances and circuit law governing your client’s case. Questions or corrections to this toolkit should be sent to centerforimmigrantsr@pennstatelaw.psu.edu.
II. INTRODUCTION

In 1996, Congress enacted two major pieces of legislation that modified the statutory requirements of relief from removal. The 1996 enactment of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) merged the former § 212(c) waiver-of-deportation and suspension-of-deportation methods of relief, and consolidated them into a statutory scheme called “Cancellation of Removal.”1 One form of relief is Cancellation of Removal for Lawful Permanent Residents (LPR) and another form of relief is Cancellation of Removal for Non-LPRs. The other major piece of legislation was the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA).2

Both IIRIRA and AEDPA greatly expanded the enumerated crimes falling under “aggravated felony,” thereby limiting relief for many noncitizens who would otherwise be eligible. IIRIRA applied special provisions and restrictions on noncitizens charged with aggravated felonies. For instance, an LPR charged with an “aggravated felony” after April 1, 1997 is ineligible for § 240A(a) Cancellation of Removal.3 Though Congress repealed § 212(c) relief, § 212(c) relief still can be invoked in some instances by noncitizens whose convictions were obtained through plea agreements and who, notwithstanding those convictions, would have been eligible for § 212(c) relief at the time of their plea.4

Under IIRIRA, two forms of Cancellation of Removal were devised, INA §§ 240A(a) and 240A(b). Cancellation of Removal for non-LPRs is available to “an alien who is inadmissible or deportable.”5 Unlike § 240A(a), which applies only to LPRs, § 240A(b) applies to all noncitizens who may qualify.6 However, the focus of this toolkit is limited to § 240A(a): LPR Cancellation of Removal. § 240A(a) reads as follows:


6 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(a) (2016); INA §240A(a); 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(b)(1) (2016); INA § 240A(b)(1).
The Attorney General may cancel removal in the case of an alien who is inadmissible or deportable from the United States if the alien—

(1) has been an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence for not less than 5 years,
(2) has resided in the United States continuously for 7 years after having been admitted in any status, and
(3) has not been convicted of any aggravated felony.\(^7\)

The relief of Cancellation of Removal under INA § 240A(a) applies to eligible noncitizens placed in removal proceedings on or after April 1, 1997.\(^8\) As with most forms of relief, Cancellation of Removal is granted or denied at the discretion of the Immigration Judge.

---

7 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(a) (2016); INA § 240A(a).
PART 1

III. STATUTE

III. STATUTE- LPR Cancellation of Removal: INA § 240A(a) & 8 U.S.C. § 1229b

“The Attorney General may cancel removal in the case of an alien who is inadmissible or deportable from the United States if the alien –

(1) Has been an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence for not less than 5 years,

(2) Has resided in the United States continuously for 7 years after having been admitted in any status, and

(3) Has not been convicted of any aggravated felony.”

Burden of Proof
While the government has the burden of proving removability by clear and convincing evidence,9 the applicant has the burden of proving that s/he qualifies for LPR Cancellation of Removal.10 For example, if charging that the noncitizen is removable for conviction of an aggravated felony, during the removal proceeding the government has to prove that the conviction is an aggravated felony. However, for purposes of establishing eligibility for relief, a noncitizen may have to show that the conviction is not an aggravated felony.


SECTION 1-
(1) Has Been an Alien Lawfully Admitted for Permanent Residence for Not Less Than 5 Years

The key terms under this provision are "lawfully admitted for permanent residence." "Lawfully admitted for permanent residence" means having been lawfully accorded the entry into the “United States after inspection and authorized by an immigration officer.” A person who obtains lawful permanent residence by fraud or mistake is deemed to have not been "lawfully admitted for permanent residence" and thus is ineligible for Cancellation of Removal. Attorneys should note that a child of an LPR may not impute the parent’s years of lawful permanent residency in order to achieve the five year requirement.

Hypothetical
• In January of 2000, a noncitizen was admitted into the U.S. as a Conditional Permanent Resident.
• In March of 2005, the noncitizen was convicted of theft.

Assessment
For purpose of LPR Cancellation of Removal, this noncitizen has been admitted as a Permanent Resident although the admission was on a conditional basis. Thus, this noncitizen has accrued 5 years and two months as a lawfully admitted permanent resident.

---

12 See Gallimore v. Attorney General, 619 F.3d 216, 223 (3rd Cir. 2010) (citing Matter of Koloamatangi, 23 I. & N. Dec. 548 (BIA 2003)); See also, Ijomah-Nwosa v. Holder, Civ. No. 14–2527 (WJM), 2015 WL 5097925 at *2 (D.N.J. 2015) (“Even though the Government mistakenly admitted and granted Petitioner lawful permanent resident status as the unmarried child of a U.S. citizen, such status is deemed void ab initio because it did not comply with the relevant substantive legal requirements that supported Petitioner’s eligibility”).
14 See generally, Gallimore v. Attorney General, 619 F.3d 216 (3d Cir. 2010).
SECTION 2-
(2) Has Resided in the United States Continuously for 7 Years After Having Been Admitted in Any Status

An "admission" is the lawful entry of a noncitizen into the United States after inspection and authorization by an immigration officer.\(^ {15} \) A noncitizen who is present in the U.S. without inspection has not made a lawful admission.\(^ {16} \) Likewise, a noncitizen who was paroled into the U.S. has not made a lawful admission.\(^ {17} \) Hence, a noncitizen's entry without inspection or by parole does not commence continuous residence.

Importantly, § 240A(a)(2) does not require a noncitizen to have resided in the U.S. in a lawful immigration status; rather it requires an admission in "any status."\(^ {18} \) Also, the continuous residence requirement does not apply to a noncitizen who has served 24 months in active-duty status in the U.S. armed forces, was in the U.S. at the time of enlistment or induction, and was honorably discharged.\(^ {19} \)

**Stop Time Rule**

Additionally, § 240(A)(d)(1), also known as the Stop Time Rule, sets forth that continuous residence stops at the earlier of one of the following: (1) the date of the commission of the crime which makes the noncitizen inadmissible or deportable or (2) the date the noncitizen received the most current Notice to Appear (NTA).\(^ {20} \) An attorney should be aware that service of an NTA in a previous proceeding does not serve to bar accrual of more time of continuous residence with concern to “an application for Cancellation of Removal filed in the current proceeding.”\(^ {21} \) Further, an attorney should be aware that children applying for LPR Cancellation of Removal must also meet the 7 year continuous residency requirement and may not impute their parents’ continuous residency to meet the requirement.\(^ {22} \)

\(^ {15} \) 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(13) (2016); INA § 101(a)(13).
\(^ {19} \) 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(d)(3) (2016); INA § 240A(d)(3).
Hypothetical

- On January 15, 1999, a noncitizen was admitted into the U.S. as a tourist.
- On January 15, 2000, the noncitizen married a U.S. citizen and adjusted to Lawful Permanent Residency.
- On January 30, 2006, the noncitizen was arrested for possession of cocaine.
- On January 31, 2006, the noncitizen pled guilty for possession of cocaine.
- On January 31, 2010, the noncitizen was served with a Notice to Appear.

Assessment

For purposes of LPR Cancellation of Removal, this noncitizen’s continued residence clock stopped on January 30, 2006, when the crime was committed.23 The stop-time rule was triggered 7 years and 15 days after the noncitizen was admitted as a tourist into the U.S.. Thus, this noncitizen has accrued the required 7 years of continuous residency after having been admitted into the U.S. in any status.

---

SECTION 3-
(3) Has Not Been Convicted of Any Aggravated Felony

A lawful permanent resident is deportable if convicted of an aggravated felony at any time after admission.\(^{24}\) Furthermore, under INA § 240A(a)(3), an LPR convicted of an aggravated felony is ineligible for Cancellation of Removal relief. The list of aggravated felonies under INA § 101(a)(43) expanded as a result of two pieces of legislation: the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA) and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA). As one scholar notes, “The definition of aggravated felony encompasses a range of offenses from very serious to relatively minor offenses and imposes harsh consequences for a noncitizen convicted of qualifying crimes.”\(^{25}\)

**Retroactivity**

An attorney representing an applicant for LPR Cancellation of Removal should be aware of the extensive list of aggravated felonies under INA § 101(a)(43). An attorney should also be aware that the aggravated felony definition applies retroactively, which means that a crime that did not constitute an aggravated felony at the time of an applicant’s conviction may be classified as such at the time of application for LPR Cancellation. When this retroactivity occurs, the previous crime will be considered an aggravated felony and will prevent the LPR from successfully obtaining Cancellation of Removal. Further, the attorney should be aware that some sections contain a term of imprisonment. A suspended sentence counts towards the one-year requirement for immigration purposes.\(^{26}\)

**Aggravated Felony Determination**

The attorney should be cognizant that not all state convictions will fall within the meaning of the comparable federal definition of aggravated felony under INA § 101(a)(43). That is, some state criminal statutes will not be a close enough comparison to the INA definition of aggravated felony for the applicant to be considered an aggravated felon for immigration purposes.\(^{27}\) To determine whether the state conviction falls within the meaning of the aggravated felony for immigration


\(^{27}\) See generally, Moncreiffe v. Holder, 133 S.Ct. 1678, 1684 (2013).
purposes, the attorney should apply the categorical approach and, when necessary, should apply the modified categorical approach.

**Categorical Approach**
Under the Categorical Approach\(^{28}\), the attorney should look to the state statute to see if the state statute’s elements fit within the “generic” federal definition of the corresponding aggravated felony.\(^{29}\) A state offense is a categorical match to a federal offense *only if* the state offense conviction “necessarily involved... facts” that would equate to the generic federal offense.\(^{30}\) Notably, the adjudicator will *not* consider the factual circumstances of the respondent’s case, and will only look to whether the statute’s elements are comparable.\(^{31}\) Additionally, the respondent must show that there was a *realistic probability*, not a theoretical possibility, that the state would apply its statute to conduct that falls outside of the generic definition of the applicable federal statute.\(^{32}\) In order to show a realistic probability, the attorney should provide the adjudicator with case law showing that circumstances exist in which the state statute would not be applied in the same manner in which the federal statute was applied.

An example of the application of the Categorical Approach appears in *Moncreiffe v. Holder*.\(^{33}\) There, the respondent pled guilty to possession with intent to distribute marijuana.\(^{34}\) However, the Supreme Court held that the state statute did not fit within the meaning of an aggravated felony because the state statute did not reveal whether the respondent obtained remuneration nor did the state statute reveal the amount of marijuana necessary for a conviction. Therefore, no way existed to determine whether every possible scenario of conviction under the state statute would necessarily fall within the bounds of the federal statute.\(^{35}\)

**Modified Categorical Approach**
The Modified Categorical Approach is a tool of the Categorical Approach and must be


\(^{30}\) Id. at 1680.


\(^{32}\) Id.


\(^{34}\) Id.

\(^{35}\) Id. at 1683.

\(^{36}\) Id. at 1680.
applied if the state statute is *divisible* into subsections, at least one of which contains elements that trigger a match with the generic definition. A state statute is divisible if the statute can be divided into more than one section so as to see whether an alternative portion of the statute would align with the federal statute.

A case example of the when the Court has applied the Modified Categorical Approach is *Descamps v. U.S.* There, the Supreme Court found that a California burglary statute was indivisible. The California statute would have allowed for lawful and unlawful entries to be considered burglary, unlike the federal statute that was only applicable to unlawful entries. Because the statute did not require that the jury decide which alternative, lawful or unlawful entry, satisfied a conviction, the Supreme Court found that the statute was indivisible. If the statute is determined to be divisible, then the court may consult a limited group of documents in the record of conviction to determine which of the multiple crimes covered by the divisible statute corresponds to the Respondent’s conviction.

For more information about the **Modified Categorical Approach** see the following:


---

37 Id.
38 Id.
39 Id.
40 Id.
41 Id.
42 Id.
List of Aggravated Felonies Under INA § 101(a)(43):43

(A) murder, rape, or sexual abuse of a minor;44

• In determining whether a crime involving sexual abuse of a minor falls within INA § 101(a)(43)(A), the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) finds it useful to look to 18 U.S.C. § 3509(a)(8), which defines sexual abuse as “the employment, use persuasion, inducement, enticement or coercion of a child to engage in, or assist another person to engage in, sexually explicit conduct or the rape, molestation, prostitution or other form of sexual exploitation of children, or incest with children.”45

(B) illicit trafficking in a controlled substance (see Controlled Substances Act, 21 U.S.C. 802), including a drug tracking crime (see 18 U.S.C. 924(c));46

(C) illicit trafficking in firearms or illicit trafficking in destructive devices (see Crimes and Criminal Procedure, 18 U.S.C. 921) or illicit trafficking in explosive

---

45 Matter of Rodriguez-Rodriguez, 22 I. & N. Dec. 991, 995 (1999); see also Stubbs v. Attorney General, 452 F.3d 251, 256 (3d Cir. 2006) (finding that in order for a crime to fall within INA § 101(a)(43)(A), the crime necessarily needs to involve a “past act with a child”).
materials (see Crimes and Criminal Procedure, 18 U.S.C. 841(c));

(D) an offense relating to laundering of monetary instruments (see 18 U.S.C. 1956) or relating to engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specific unlawful activity (see 18 U.S.C. 1957) if the amount of the funds exceeded $10,000;

(E) an offense described in the following:
  a. relating to explosive materials offenses.\(^{47}\)
    • It shall be unlawful for any person to receive, possess, transport, ship, conceal, store, barter, sell, dispose of, pledge or accept as security for a loan, any stolen explosive materials which are moving as, which are part of, which constitute, or which have been shipped or transported in, interstate or foreign commerce, either before or after such materials were stolen, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that the explosive materials were stolen. (see 18 U.S.C. 842(h)); unlawful for a person who is convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year; who is a fugitive from justice; who is an unlawful user of or addicted to any controlled substance; who has been adjudicated as a mental defective or who has been committed to a mental institution; an alien (unless admitted as an LPR (INA § 101(a)(20), a refugee (INA § 207), in asylum status (INA § 208)); and - is a foreign law enforcement officer of a friendly foreign government; or is a person having the power to direct or cause the direction of the management and policies of a corporation, partnership, or association licensed, and the shipping, transporting, possession, or receipt of explosive materials is in furtherance of such power. (see 18 U.S.C. 842(i));
    • Whoever transports or receives, or attempts to transport or receive, in interstate or foreign commerce any explosive with the knowledge or intent that it will be used to kill, injure, or intimidate any individual or unlawfully to damage or destroy any building, vehicle, or other real or personal property will be imprisoned or fined, or both; and if personal injury results to any person will be imprisoned or fined, or both; and if death results to any person will be imprisoned or fined, or both (see 18 U.S.C. 844(d));

• Whoever, through the use of the mail, telephone, telegraph, or other instrument of interstate or foreign commerce, or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, willfully makes any threat, or maliciously conveys false information knowing the same to be false, concerning an attempt or alleged attempt being made, or to be made, to kill, injure, or intimidate any individual or unlawfully to damage or destroy any building, vehicle, or other real or personal property by means of fire or an explosive shall be imprisoned or fined, or both. (see 18 U.S.C. 844(e));

• Whoever maliciously damages or destroys, or attempts to damage or destroy, by means of fire or an explosive, any building, vehicle, or other personal or real property in whole or in part owned or possessed by, or leased to, the U.S., or any department or agency thereof, or any institution or organization receiving Federal financial assistance, shall be imprisoned or fined or both; or directly or proximately causes personal injury or creates a substantial risk of injury to any person; or directly or proximately causes the death of any person (see 18 U.S.C. 844(f));

• Whoever possesses an explosive in an airport or building in whole or in part owned, possessed, or used by, or leased to, the U.S. or any department or agency, except with the written consent of the agency, imprisoned or fined, or both; see exceptions. (see 18 U.S.C. 844(g));

• Whoever- (1) uses fire or an explosive to commit any felony which may be prosecuted in a court of the U.S., or (2) carries an explosive during the commission of any felony which may be prosecuted in a court of the U.S. (see 18 U.S.C. 844(h));

• Whoever maliciously damages or destroys, or attempts to damage or destroy, by means of fire or an explosive, any building, vehicle, or other real or personal property used in interstate or foreign commerce or in any activity affecting interstate or foreign commerce shall be imprisoned or fined or both; and if personal injury or death results to any person, shall be imprisoned or fined or both (see 18 U.S.C. 844(i));

b. relating to firearms offenses:
It shall be unlawful for any person-
• who has been convicted in any court of, a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year. (see 18 U.S.C. 922(g)(1));
• who is a fugitive from justice (see 18 U.S.C. 922(g)(2));
• who is an unlawful user of or addicted to any controlled substance (as defined in (21 U.S.C. 802 § 102)) (see 18 U.S.C. 922(g)(3));
• who has been adjudicated as a mental defective or who has been committed to a mental institution (see 18 U.S.C. 922(g)(4));
• who, being an alien- is illegally or unlawfully in the U.S.; or except as provided in subsection (y)(2), has been admitted to the U.S. under a nonimmigrant visa. (see 18 U.S.C. 922(g)(5));

• It shall be unlawful for any person to receive, possess, conceal, store, barter, sell, or dispose of any stolen firearm or stolen ammunition, or pledge or accept as security for a loan any stolen firearm or stolen ammunition, which is moving as, which is a part of, which constitutes, or which has been shipped or transported in, interstate or foreign commerce, either before or after it was stolen, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that the firearm or ammunition was stolen (see 18 U.S.C. 922(j));

• It shall be unlawful for any person who is under indictment for a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year to ship or transport in interstate or foreign commerce any firearm or ammunition or receive any firearm or ammunition which has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce (see 18 U.S.C. 922(n));

• This subsection does not apply with respect to- a transfer to or by, or possession by or under the authority of, the U.S. or any department or agency thereof or a State, or a department, agency, or political subdivision thereof; or any lawful transfer or lawful possession of a machinegun that was lawfully possessed before the date this subsection takes effect. (see 18 U.S.C. 922(o))

• It shall be unlawful for any person to manufacture, import, sell, ship, deliver, possess, transfer, or receive any firearm- (1)(A) that, after removal of grips, stocks, and magazines, is not as detectable as the Security Exemplar, by walk-through metal detectors calibrated and operated to detect the Security Exemplar; or (B) any major component of which, when subjected to inspection by the types of x-ray machines commonly used at airports, does not generate an image that accurately depicts the shape of the component; (2) See for term definitions and exception. (see 18 U.S.C. 922(p));

• It shall be unlawful for any person to assemble from imported parts any semiautomatic rifle or any shotgun which is identical to any rifle or shotgun prohibited from importation under 18 U.S.C. 925(d)(3) (see 18 U.S.C. 922(r));

• Whoever, with intent to commit therewith an offense punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year, or with knowledge or reasonable cause to believe that an offense punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year is to be committed therewith, ships, transports, or receives a firearm or any ammunition in interstate or foreign commerce shall be imprisoned or fined or both (see 18 U.S.C. 924(b));

• Whoever knowingly transfers a firearm, knowing that such firearm will be
used to commit a crime of violence (as defined in subsection (c)(3)) or drug trafficking crime (as defined in subsection (c)(2)) shall be imprisoned or fined or both (see 18 U.S.C. 924(h)).


(F) a crime of violence (as defined in 18 U.S.C. 16 of Title 18, but not including a purely political offense) for which the term of imprisonment is at least one year.

- Under 18 U.S.C. § 16(a), “The term ‘crime of violence’ means an offense that has as an element the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against the person or property of another.”
- Under 18 U.S.C. § 16(b), “The term ‘crime of violence’ means any other offense that is a felony and that, by its nature, involves a substantial risk that physical force against the person or property of another may be used in the course of committing the offense.”
- Under 18 U.S.C. § 16(a), a crime of violence is a crime which require a mens rea that “suggests a higher degree of intent than negligent or merely accidental conduct.” In this regard, a crime of violence necessarily involves “violent force - that is, force capable of causing physical pain or injury to another person.”
- Although 18 U.S.C. § 16(b) sweeps more broadly than § 16(a), whether a reckless mens rea can amount to a crime of violence under § 16(b), depends on whether the statute encompasses “a person acting in disregard of the risk

---

50 Leocal v. Ashcroft, 543 U.S. 1, 1 (2004) (finding that Florida’s Driving while Under the Influence statute did not require a mens rea requirement other than negligence; therefore, the Florida Statute did not necessarily involve facts that would be a conviction under 18 U.S.C. § 16); See also, Aguilar v. AG, 663 F.3d 692, 700 (3rd Cir. 2011) (finding that a reckless crime could be a crime of violence under § 16(b) as both statute and case law focus on the risk of the intentional use of force, not merely on mens rea); But see, Jimenez-Gonzalez v. Mukasey, 548 F.3d 557, 560 (7th Cir. 2008) (finding that criminal recklessness was not a crime of violence under U.S.C. § 16(b)).
51 Johnson v. US, 559 U.S. 133, 140 (2010) (emphasis added); see also, Matter of Guzman-Polanco, 26 I. & N. Dec 713, 716-718 (BIA 2016) (Here, the Board affirmed the “violent force” language of Johnson v. US to hold that a statute which states that infliction of bodily injury by “any means or form” does not necessarily require the use of violent force and so is not a categorical match to § 16(a). However, the Board did not resolve the question of whether such a statute may be encompassed by § 16(b).).
that the physical force might be used against another in committing an offense.”

• However, a recent development concerning the constitutionality of 18 U.S.C. § 16, and particularly § 16(b) has arisen in the Federal Circuit Courts of Appeal.

(G) a theft offense (including receipt of stolen property) or burglary offense for which the term of imprisonment is at least one year.

• A misdemeanor of theft under the state law, may be deemed an aggravated felony for immigration purposes, so long as the term of imprisonment is at least one year.

(H) an offense relating to the demand for or receipt of ransom as described in the following sections: Interstate Communications (see 18 U.S.C. 875); Mailing threatening communications (see 18 U.S.C. 876); Mailing threatening communications from foreign country (see 18 U.S.C. 877); Ransom Money (see 18 U.S.C. 1202).

(I) an offense relating to child pornography: Sexual exploitation of children (see 18 U.S.C. 2251), Selling or buying of children (see 18 U.S.C. 2251A), or Certain activities relating to material involving the sexual exploitation of minors (see 18 U.S.C. 2252).

(J) an offense relating to racketeer influenced corrupt organizations (see 18 U.S.C. 1962), or if it is a second or subsequent offense (see 18 U.S.C. 1084); relating to gambling offenses (see 18 U.S.C. 1955), for which a sentence of one-year

52 Leocal v. Ashcroft, 543 U.S. at 10.
53 See, United States v. Gonzalez-Longoria, No. 15–40041, 2016 WL 537612 at *235 (5th Cir. 2016) (holding that 18 U.S.C. § 16 definition of “crime of violence” was unconstitutionally vague for sentencing enhancement purposes); United States v. Vivas-Cajas, 808 F.3d 719, 721 (7th Cir. 2015) (finding that 18 U.S.C. § 16(b) is unconstitutionally vague as the phrases “by its nature” and “substantial risk” provided no guidance to the courts); Dimaya v. Lynch, 803 F.3d 1110, 1120 (9th Cir. 2015) (finding that 18 U.S.C. § 16(b) is unconstitutionally vague, therefore INA § 101(a)(43)(F), which cites to 18 U.S.C. § 16 is unconstitutionally vague). For the standard for determining whether a residual clause is unconstitutionally vague, see Johnson v. U.S., 135 S.Ct. 2251 (2015).
54 See, e.g., Brooks v. Attorney General, 297 Fed. Appx. 205, 216 (3rd Cir. 2006) (holding that the noncitizen’s conviction under New York’s law for possession of stolen property in the fifth degree, a misdemeanor, was an aggravated felony for immigration purposes).
imprisonment or more may be imposed;

(K) an offense that –

(i) relates to the owning, controlling, managing, or supervising of a prostitution business;

(ii) is relating to transportation for the purpose of prostitution if committed for commercial advantage: Transportation generally (see 18 U.S.C. 2421); Coercion and enticement (see 18 U.S.C. 2422), or Transportation of minors (see 18 U.S.C. 2423); or


(L) an offense from the following:

(i) Gathering, transmitting or losing defense information (see 18 U.S.C. 793), Disclosure of classified information (see 18 U.S.C. 798), Destruction of war material, war premises, or war utilities (see 18 U.S.C. 2153), Treason (see 18 U.S.C. 2381), or Misprision of treason (see 18 U.S.C. 2382);

(ii) Protection of identities of certain U.S. undercover intelligence officers, agents, informants, and sources (National Security Act, see 50 U.S.C. 3121, formerly 50 U.S.C. 421); or

(iii) Currently 50 U.S.C. 3121, formerly at 50 U.S.C. 421)

(M) an offense that –

(i) involves fraud or deceit in which the loss to the victim or victims exceeds $10,000, or

(ii) is relating to tax evasion (see section 7201 of Title 26) in which the revenue loss to the Government exceeds $10,000.

55 Nijhawan v. Holder, 557 U.S. 29, 42-43 (2009) (Finding that the IJ was able to consider the applicant’s sentencing-related material to determine if the fraud amounted to $10,000 to fall within INA § 101(a)(43)(M)).
(N) an offense relating to bringing in and harboring certain aliens [see paragraph (1)(A) or (2) of section 8 U.S.C. 1324(a)], except in the case of a first offense for which the alien has affirmatively shown that the alien committed the offense for the purpose of assisting, abetting, or aiding only the alien's spouse, child, or parent (and no other individual) to violate a provision of this chapter;

(O) an offense of Improper Entry by Alien: Improper time or place; avoidance of examination or inspection, misrepresentation and concealment of acts (INA § 275(a); 8 U.S.C. 1325(a)) or of Reentry of Removed Aliens (INA § 276; 8 U.S.C. 1326) committed by an alien who was previously deported on the basis of a conviction for an offense described in another subparagraph of this paragraph;

(P) an offense (i) which either is falsely making, forging, counterfeiting, mutilating, or altering a passport or instrument in violation of Forgery of false use of passport (see 18 U.S.C. 1543), or Fraud and misuse of visas, permits, and other documents (see 18 U.S.C. 1546(a)) and (ii) for which the term of imprisonment is at least 12 months, except in the case of a first offense for which the alien has affirmatively shown that the alien committed the offense for the purpose of assisting, abetting, or aiding only the alien's spouse, child, or parent (and no other individual) to violate a provision of this Act;

(Q) an offense relating to a failure to appear by a defendant for service of sentence if the underlying offense is punishable by imprisonment for a term of 5 years or more;

(R) an offense relating to commercial bribery, counterfeiting, forgery, or trafficking in vehicles the identification numbers of which have been altered for which the term of imprisonment is at least one year;

(S) an offense relating to obstruction of justice, perjury or subornation of perjury, or bribery of a witness, for which the term of imprisonment is at least one year;

(T) an offense relating to a failure to appear before a court pursuant to a court order to answer to or dispose of a charge of a felony for which a sentence of 2 years' imprisonment or more may be imposed; and
(U) an **attempt or conspiracy**\(^\text{56}\) to commit an offense described in this paragraph.

The term applies to an offense described in this paragraph whether in violation of Federal or State law and applies to such an offense in violation of the law of a foreign country for which the term of imprisonment was completed within the previous 15 years. Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including any effective date), the term applies regardless of whether the conviction was entered before, on, or after the date of enactment of this paragraph.

---

\(^{56}\) In Matter of Richardson, 25 I. & N. Dec. 226, 226 (BIA 2010), the Board found that “conspiracy” is “not limited to conspiracies that require the commission of an overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy by one of the conspirators.” Further, the Board found that “[a]n alien who was only convicted of conspiracy to commit an aggravated felony is removable on the basis of the conviction section 101(a)(43)(U) of the Act may not also be found removable for the underlying substantive offense, even though the record of conviction shows that the conspirators actually committed the substantive offense.”
SECTION 4-
Discretionary Component of LPR Cancellation of Removal

In addition to satisfying the three statutory eligibility requirements under INA § 240A(a) which are that the applicant (1) has been an alien admitted for permanent residence for not less than 5 years, (2) has resided in the U.S. continuously for 7 years after having been admitted in any status, and (3) has not been convicted of any aggravated felony), an applicant for LPR Cancellation of Removal must establish that s/he warrants relief as a matter of discretion. An Immigration Judge (IJ) has discretion to determine whether a particular applicant should be granted Cancellation of Removal relief. An IJ must balance the adverse factors evidencing the individual's undesirability as a lawful permanent resident with the social and humane considerations presented on his or her behalf to determine whether the granting of relief appears to be in the best in interest of the United States.  

Positive Factors
When exercising discretion in an LPR Cancellation of Removal case, an IJ may consider positive factors. The Board described the following positive factors in Matter of C-V-T, 22 I. & N. Dec. 7 (BIA 1998):

- Family ties within the U.S.;
- Residency of long duration in the U.S.;
- Evidence of hardship to the respondent and family if deportation occurs;
- Service in Armed Forces;
- History of employment;
- Existence of property or business ties;
- Existence of value and service to the community;
- Proof of genuine rehabilitation if a criminal record exists;
- Evidence attesting to a respondent's good character.

The existence of minor U.S. citizen children is a positive factor that an IJ may consider. It is important to note that equities that accrue after a final order or after knowledge of potential deportation are diminished. In addition, the Board may give less weight to a

---

record of employment, where employment was unauthorized, and long residence in the U.S., where status was undocumented.\textsuperscript{60}

**Negative Factors**

When exercising discretion in an LPR Cancellation of Removal case, an IJ may also consider negative factors such as:\textsuperscript{61}

- Nature and underlying circumstances of grounds of removal;
- Additional significant immigration violations;
- Existence of criminal record;
- Other evidence of bad character or undesirability

If an attorney has prepared documents in support of the positive factors relating to discretion, s/he may be able to refute any negative factors that an IJ considers. In addition to submitting supporting documents, an attorney should prepare his or her client to discuss negative factors in a hearing before the IJ, in case these factors are brought up. An applicant should be prepared to speak honestly about negative factors, to take responsibility for past actions, and to emphasize rehabilitation.\textsuperscript{62}

It is important to note that an IJ may consider all crimes that an applicant has committed, including crimes that are not aggravated felonies, for the purpose of determining whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. While considering such crimes, an IJ may inquire into circumstances surrounding the commission of the crimes. However, an IJ may not look to an applicant's criminal record in order to reassess his or her ultimate guilt or innocence.\textsuperscript{63}

For examples of evidence which support the discretionary component please request the redacted version of the LPR Cancellation of Removal Toolkit.

\textsuperscript{60} Varela-Blanco v. INS, 18 F.3d 584, 587-588 (8th Cir. 1994).


\textsuperscript{62} The Florence Immigrant and Refugee Rights Project, available at \url{http://www.firrp.org} (choose "Resources" and follow "How to Defend Your Case" hyperlink, scroll to “Cancellation of Removal for Legal Permanent Residents (green card holders) and select “English” hyperlink) (last visited May 12, 2016).

SECTION 5 -
Individuals Ineligible for LPR Cancellation Relief

INA § 240A(c) - Aliens ineligible for relief\(^{64}\):
The provisions of subsection (a) and (b)(1) shall not apply to any of the following aliens:

1. An alien who entered the United States as a crewman subsequent to June 30, 1964.

2. An alien who was admitted to the United States as a nonimmigrant exchange alien as defined in section 101(a)(15)(J) [8 U.S.C. § 1182(c)] of this title, or has acquired the status of such a nonimmigrant exchange alien after admission, in order to receive graduate medical education or training, regardless of whether or not the alien is subject to or has fulfilled the two-year foreign residence requirement of section 212(e) of this title.

3. An alien who--
   
   (A) was admitted to the United States as a nonimmigrant exchange alien as defined in section 101(a)(15)(J) [8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(J)], or has acquired the status of such a nonimmigrant exchange alien after admission other than to receive graduate medical education or training,

   (B) is subject to the two-year foreign residence requirement of section 212(e) [8 U.S.C. § 1182(e)], and

   (C) has not fulfilled that requirement or received a waiver thereof.


6. An alien whose removal has previously been canceled under this section or whose deportation was suspended under section 244(a) [8 U.S.C. § 1254(a)] or who has been granted relief under section 212(c) [8 U.S.C. § 1182(c)], as such sections were in effect before the date of the enactment of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 [September 30, 1996].

\(^{64}\) 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(c) (2016); INA § 240A(c).
Explanation of INA § 240A(c)
Noncitizens who are per se ineligible for LPR Cancellation of Removal include:

1. Crewmen who entered subsequent to June 30, 1964;
2. Persons admitted on J visas to receive graduate medical training regardless of whether they are subject to or have fulfilled the 2-year home residency requirement;
3. Persons admitted on a J visa or who acquired such status after admission with 2-year foreign residency requirement who never fulfilled the requirement or received a waiver;
4. Persons inadmissible or deportable for security or related reasons;
5. Persons determined to have persecuted others;
6. Persons previously granted suspension of deportation or Cancellation of Removal.
IV. REGULATIONS

8 C.F.R. § 1240.20: Cancellation of removal and adjustment of status under INA § 240A

(a) Jurisdiction. An application for the exercise of discretion under section 240A of the Act shall be submitted on Form EOIR–42, Application for Cancellation of Removal, to the Immigration Court having administrative control over the Record of Proceeding of the underlying removal proceeding under section 240 of the Act. The application must be accompanied by payment of the filing fee as set forth in § 103.7(b) of 8 C.F.R. Chapter I or a request for a fee waiver.

(b) Filing the application. The application may be filed only with the Immigration Court after jurisdiction has vested pursuant to § 1003.14 of this chapter.

8 C.F.R. § 1240.11(a): Creation of the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence

(1) In a removal proceeding, an alien may apply to the immigration judge for cancellation of removal under section 240A of the Act, adjustment of status under section 1 of the Act of November 2, 1966 (as modified by section 606 of Pub.L. 104–208), section 101 or 104 of the Act of October 28, 1977, section 202 of Pub.L. 105–100, or section 902 of Pub.L. 105–277, or for the creation of a record of lawful admission for permanent residence under section 249 of the Act. The application shall be subject to the requirements of § 1240.20, and 8 C.F.R. parts 1245 and 1249. The approval of any application made to the immigration judge under section 245 of the Act by an alien spouse (as defined in section 216(g)(1) of the Act) or by entrepreneur (as defined in section 216A(f)(1) of the Act) shall result in the alien's obtaining the status of lawful permanent resident on a conditional basis in accordance with the provisions of section 216 or 216A of the Act, whichever is applicable. However, the Petition to Remove the Conditions on Residence required by section 216(c) of the Act, or the Petition by Entrepreneur to Remove Conditions required by section 216A(c) of the Act shall be made to the director in accordance with 8 C.F.R. part 1216.

(2) In conjunction with any application for creation of status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence made to an immigration judge, if the alien is inadmissible under any provision of section 212(a) of the Act, and believes that s/he meets the eligibility requirements for a waiver of the ground of inadmissibility, s/he may
apply to the immigration judge for such waiver. The immigration judge shall inform the alien of his or her apparent eligibility to apply for any of the benefits enumerated in this chapter and shall afford the alien an opportunity to make application during the hearing, in accordance with the provisions of § 1240.8(d). In a relevant case, the immigration judge may adjudicate the sufficiency of an Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A (Form I–864), executed on behalf of an applicant for admission or for adjustment of status, in accordance with the provisions of section 213A of the Act and 8 C.F.R. part 213a.

(3) In exercising discretionary power when considering an application for status as a permanent resident under this chapter, the immigration judge may consider and base the decision on information not contained in the record and not made available for inspection by the alien, provided the Commissioner has determined that such information is relevant and is classified under the applicable Executive Order as requiring protection from unauthorized disclosure in the interest of national security. Whenever the immigration judge believes that s/he can do so while safeguarding both the information and its source, the immigration judge should inform the alien of the general nature of the information in order that the alien may have an opportunity to offer opposing evidence. A decision based in whole or in part on such classified information shall state that the information is material to the decision.
V. CASE LAW

Arranged by Court Authority
Page 38  Supreme Court of the United States
Page 42  United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit
Page 57  Board of Immigration Appeals

Arranged by Statutory Element
Page 67  (1) Has been an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence for not less than 5 years
Page 71  (2) Has resided in the U.S. continuously for 7 years after having been admitted in any status
Page 86  (3) Has not been convicted of any aggravated felony
Page 91  (4) Discretionary Component of LPR Cancellation of Removal
(a). Arranged by Court Authority

(1). Supreme Court of the United States

MELLOULI V. LYNCH, 135 S. Ct. 1980 (2015) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether a state drug-paraphernalia misdemeanor meets the categorical definition of controlled substance under the Controlled Substance Act when the state misdemeanor is silent as to the controlled substance?

HOLDING To be a categorical federal drug offense for immigration purposes, a state law violation for controlled substances must be an offense for a controlled substance as defined in the Controlled Substance Act.

- Respondent Moones Mellouli, a citizen of Tunisia, entered the U.S. on a student visa in 2004. In 2009, he became a conditional permanent resident and, in 2011, an LPR. In 2010, he pleaded guilty to a misdemeanor offense under Kansas law, the possession of drug paraphernalia to “store, contain, conceal, inject, ingest, inhale or otherwise introduce a controlled substance into the human body.” Kan. Stat. Ann. §21-5709(b)(2). Under the Kansas law, it was immaterial whether the substance was scheduled in the Controlled Substance Act, 21 U. S. C. §802. The State did not charge, or seek to prove, that Mellouli possessed a substance on the §802 schedules. The sole “paraphernalia” Mellouli was charged with possessing was a sock in which he had placed four orange tablets. The criminal charge and plea agreement did not identify the controlled substance involved, although Mellouli had acknowledged the tablets were Adderall. Mellouli was sentenced to a suspended term of 359 days and 12 months’ probation, after which DHS placed him in removal proceedings. The Board affirmed the immigration judge's decision and he was removed. The Eighth Circuit denied Mellouli’s petition for review. The Supreme Court then granted certiorari and applied the categorical approach. The Court held that since the record did not prove that Mellouli’s conviction was based on possession of a drug on the §802 schedule, the conviction could not be a categorical controlled substance conviction.

- This case is important because an offense for drug-paraphernalia possession must specify whether the controlled substance is scheduled in the Controlled Substance Act to meet the criteria for a controlled substance offense. Please note Mellouli was not found deportable of an aggravated felony, but rather deportable because Mellouli was found guilty of a crime involving controlled substance under INA §237(a)(2)(B). This case is included as an example of the application of the categorical
MONCRIEFFE V. HOLDER, 133 S. Ct. 1678 (2013) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether a conviction under a statute that criminalizes conduct described by the Controlled Substance Act’s (CSA) 21 U.S.C. §841’s felony provision and its misdemeanor provision, such as a statute that punishes all marijuana distribution without regard to the amount or remuneration, is a conviction for an offense punishable as a felony under the CSA?

HOLDING To be a categorical federal drug offense for immigration purposes, a state drug offense must necessarily correspond to an offense punishable as a felony under the Controlled Substance Act.

- Respondent Adrian Moncrieffe legally entered the U.S. in 1984. In 2007 he was stopped for a traffic violation and was found in possession of 1.3 grams of marijuana. He pleaded guilty under Georgia law to possession of marijuana with intent to distribute. He was placed in removal proceedings on the grounds that his conviction was an aggravated felony because possession of marijuana with intent to distribute is a Controlled Substance Act offense, 21 U.S.C. §841(a), punishable by up to five years’ imprisonment, §841(b)(1)(D). An IJ ordered his removal, and the Board affirmed. The Fifth Circuit denied Moncrieffe’s petition to review his argument that his conviction met CSA’s §841(b)(4), which makes marijuana distribution punishable as a misdemeanor if the offense involves a small amount for no remuneration. The U.S. Supreme Court granted certiorari to resolve whether the state conviction qualified as an aggravated felony when applying the categorical approach. A state drug offense must meet two conditions: 1) the offense must “necessarily” proscribe conduct that is an offense under the CSA, and 2) the CSA must “necessarily” prescribe felony punishment for that conduct. Unlike the federal statute, the Georgia statute is ambiguous as to whether the conduct proscribed involved remuneration or the amount of controlled substances needed to be a violation. Thus, because the conviction did not “necessarily” involve facts that correspond to an offense punishable as a felony under the CSA, the Court held the offense was not a categorical aggravated felony. The Court reversed and remanded the case.

- This case is important because when there is ambiguity in the state conviction the facts may not “necessarily” correspond to an offense punishable as a felony under the CSA. A noncitizen’s conviction for a marijuana distribution offense can fail to qualify as an aggravated felony.
if the there is no remuneration or no more than a small amount of marijuana.

DESCAMPS V. U.S., 133 S.Ct. 2276 (2013) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether the modified categorical approach applies to statutes that contain a single, indivisible set of elements?

HOLDING The modified categorical approach does not apply to statutes that contain a single, indivisible set of elements.

- Respondent Michael Descamps was convicted of being “a felon in possession of a firearm” and the government sought an enhanced sentence “based on Descamps’ prior state convictions for burglary, robbery, and felony harassment.” To be subject to the enhanced sentencing, the statute requires that the person had been previously convicted of a 3 violent felonies or a serious drug offense. A “violent felony” is one which “has as an element the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against the person of another,” or that is a “burglary, arson or extortion, involves use of explosives or otherwise involves conduct that presents a serious potential risk of physical injury to another.” Descamps argued that his past conviction was not within the meaning of the “violent felony” and therefore he could not be subject to the enhanced sentencing. The prior California felony that Descamps had been convicted found guilty a “person who enters” certain locations “with intent to commit grand or petit larceny or any felony.” Unlike the federal statute, Descamps argues, the California statute did not require that a person enter into the location unlawfully; therefore, the California statute was not a categorical match. Both the District Court and the Ninth Circuit disagreed with Descamps, and applied the modified categorical approach to look to “certain documents, including the record of the plea colloquy, to discover whether Descamps had "admitted the elements of a generic burglary" when entering his plea.” The District Court and the Ninth Circuit concluded that Descamps’ crime was within the meaning of the federal statute of burglary but Descamps appealed. The Supreme Court concluded that the California statute was indivisible, and therefore, the lower courts erred in applying the modified categorical approach. The Court found that the purpose of the modified categorical approach was to help “effectuate the categorical analysis when a divisible statute, listing potential offense elements in the alternative, renders opaque which element played a part in the defendant’s conviction.” The Court illustrated that a statute may be indivisible, for example, when a statute of burglary includes both “entry into an automobile as well as a building.” In such a situation, entering an automobile would not be within
the generic federal definition; however, the alternative, “entry into... a building” would be within the generic federal definition. Because, in this hypothetical situation, the statute would not reveal which alternative the defendant was convicted, courts could look to the plea agreement, the colloquy between the judge and the defendant, or indictment so as to determine which alternative was used. On the other hand, where a statute is indivisible, courts should apply the categorical approach and may “only look to the statutory definitions,” of the defendant’s prior offenses, and not “to the particular facts underlying those convictions.” Here, the statute of Descamps prior conviction was not divisible, as the statute does not have a list of alternatives.

- This case is important because it shows an example of the application of the modified categorical approach and sets forth that the “sentencing courts may not consult additional documents when a defendant was convicted under an “indivisible” statutes.”

HOLDER V. MARTINEZ GUTIERREZ, 132 S. Ct. 2011 (2012) [Precedent]:

**ISSUE** Whether a parent’s lawful permanent resident status can be imputed to a child for purposes of calculating the 5 years of lawful permanent residence required to establish eligibility for Cancellation of Removal under § 240A(a)(1)?

**HOLDING** A child of an LPR may not impute the parent’s length of time as an LPR for purposes of 5 years of LPR and 7-year continuous residence requirement.

- This case decided two consolidated cases about imputation, one with regard to the 5-year LPR requirement and the other with regard to 7-year continuous residence requirement. Only Respondent Martinez Gutierrez involved imputation with regard to the five years of LPR requirement. Martinez Gutierrez illegally entered the U.S. with his family in 1989, when he was five years old. Respondent’s father obtained a LPR status two years later; however, respondent never adjusted his status until 2003. Two years later respondent was apprehended and admitted to smuggling undocumented people across the border. He then applied for Cancellation of Removal. The IJ determined he could qualify for LPR § 240A(a)(1) and (a)(2) on his own because of his father’s status, but the Board reversed. Respondent appealed to the Court of Appeals, which reversed and remanded the decision to the Board. On appeal from the Ninth Circuit, the Supreme Court concluded that the Board’s interpretation of §240A(a)(1) is “based on a permissible construction of the statute,” and reversed the Ninth Circuit’s decision.

- This case is important because the Supreme Court reaffirmed the Board’s
holding that a parent’s LPR status may not be imputed to their children to give the child the necessary 5 years of LPR status to qualify for cancellation or 7 years’ continuous residence.

**INS v. ENRICO ST. CYR, 533 U.S. 289 (2001) [Precedent]:**

**ISSUE** Whether the post-IIRIRA statutory restrictions on discretionary relief apply to noncitizens who plead guilty to a deportable crime prior to the enactment of IIRIRA?

**HOLDING** Post-IIRIRA statutory restrictions on discretionary relief do not apply to noncitizens who pled guilty to a deportable crime prior to the enactment of IIRIRA.

- Respondent Enrico St. Cyr was admitted as an LPR in 1986. A decade later in Connecticut, he pled guilty in a Connecticut state court to selling a controlled substance, $100 worth of cocaine, and thus became deportable. If the INS had taken custody of St. Cyr at the completion of his sentence, he would have been eligible for a waiver of deportation under INA § 212(c). Because the INS did not begin proceedings against St. Cyr until 1997, St. Cyr would be subject to the new laws passed in 1996, the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA) and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA), if the court found that the statutes were retrospective. Therefore, St. Cyr could no longer file a motion for § 212(c), even though he pled to the crime when the waiver was still being granted. Represented by the ACLU, St. Cyr sued the federal government on the grounds that he was lawfully eligible for the waiver. The case reached the U.S. Supreme Court in 2001. The Court ruled that Congress never intended for INS to apply its new rule retroactively in cases involving plea bargains made prior to the enactment of IIRIRA. That meant that St. Cyr, and other immigrants whose convictions were obtained through plea agreements, remain eligible for § 212(c) waiver if they would have been eligible for § 212(c) relief at the time of their plea.

- This case is important because it held that the effective date of the changes from INA § 212(c) to Cancellation of Removal for LPRs, April 1, 1997, does not bar § 212(c) relief for certain pre-IIRIRA convictions.

**(2). United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit**

**SINGH V. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 807 F.3d 547 (3d Cir. 2015) [Precedent]:**

**ISSUE** Whether a noncitizen convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude (CIMT) can use a re-entry to restart the clock to satisfy the seven-year continuous residency requirement?
**HOLDING** An LPR convicted of a CIMT cannot reenter as a method to restart the clock to accrue the requisite 7-year continuous residence.

- Respondent, Narinder Singh, was a native and citizen of India. He was granted asylum on July 1, 1993, and adjusted to LPR status on June 1, 1994. On September 14, 2000, he was convicted in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Florida of conspiracy to counterfeit passports, counterfeiting and using visas, and mail fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371. He was also convicted of unlawful possession of forged, counterfeited, altered, and falsely made nonimmigrant U.S. visas in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1546. Singh departed the U.S and re-entered on January 20, 2003. In October 2009, he applied for admission to the U.S. as an LPR. On January 10, 2010, Immigration and Customs Enforcement detained him. On January 19, 2010, he was served with a Notice to Appear charging him as inadmissible because he had a counterfeiting conviction, a crime involving moral turpitude. Singh applied for Cancellation of Removal but the IJ denied the petition and the Board dismissed his appeal based on a finding that he had not accrued seven years of continuous residence in the U.S. to be eligible for Cancellation of Removal pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(a) [240A(a)]. Singh then filed a petition for review arguing that his 2003 re-entry restarted the clock for purposes of the seven-year residence requirement. However, the Court held that when Singh committed the CIMT, the clock both stopped and permanently prevented the clock from restarting. The Third Circuit cited to its Okeke decision that where there is a re-entry, the clock starts “anew.” However, the Third Circuit court distinguishes Okeke from the present case because in the former, the basis for removal was that the noncitizen was a visa-overstay. Thus, the court relied instead on the Nelson case in which the noncitizen’s removal was based on a crime that terminated his continuous residence and his continuous presence. Because Singh’s conviction involved a CIMT, the CIMT terminated his continuous residence and continuous presence so his re-entry could not restart the clock.

- This case is important because it reaffirms that re-entry can re-start the clock after a “clock stopping event” (i.e., receipt of a NTA), except when the NTA states the “clock stopping event” as the cause for removal. Here, the Third Circuit distinguished in part and applied in part the holding in Okeke and thereby Cisneros-Gonzalez, to the context of LPR Cancellation of Removal.

**MATTER OF PAEK, 26 I. & N. 403 (BIA 2014), aff’d, 793 F.3d 330 (3d Cir. 2015)**

**ISSUE** Whether a noncitizen who was admitted to the U.S. as a conditional
permanent resident is considered a lawful permanent resident?

**HOLDING**  A noncitizen spouse lawfully admitted as a permanent resident on a conditional basis, is considered an LPR.

- Respondent Ka A. Paek was admitted into the U.S. in 1991. Respondent was convicted of theft in 2005 and robbery in 2006, and removal proceedings were initiated in July 2013. Respondent then applied for adjustment of status pursuant to his marriage to a U.S. citizen and applied for Section 212(h) waiver. However, the waiver states that “No waiver shall be granted under this subsection in the case of an alien who has previously been admitted to the United States as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if... since the date of his admission the alien has been convicted of an aggravated felony.” Therefore, if the Respondent was considered a “lawful” permanent resident at the time of his convictions, he would not be eligible for the waiver. The Board found that “notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, an alien spouse.... shall be considered, at the time of obtaining the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to have obtained such status on a conditional basis to the provisions of this section.”

- While this case deals with § 212(h) waivers, this case further indicates that a conditional permanent resident will be considered to have “lawfully” entered.

**GUZMAN V. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 770 F.3d 1077 (3d Cir. 2014) [Precedent]:**

**ISSUE**  Whether the stop-time rule can be applied retroactively to terminate the accrual of continuous residence for LPR Cancellation of Removal?

**HOLDING**  The stop-time rule can be applied retroactively to terminate accrual of time required to satisfy the requisite 7-year continuous physical presence.

- Respondent, Cristian Guzman is a 38-year-old citizen of the Dominican Republic. He was admitted to the U.S. as an LPR on October 8, 1994 and had continually resided in the U.S. since that time. In 1995, Guzman was arrested in NY and charged with Criminal Possession of a Controlled Substance. On December 19, 1995, Guzman pled guilty to a lesser possession charge and was sentenced to 3 years’ probation. In 2005, he was again arrested and charged with Criminal Possession of a Controlled Substance and pled guilty. On December 1, 2005 he was sentenced to time served. On March 6, 2012, DHS served Guzman with an NTA and took him into custody based on the 2005 conviction pursuant to a controlled substance abuse (INA §237(a)(2)(B)(i)). He conceded removability, but applied for LPR Cancellation of Removal. The Government argued that Guzman was ineligible for the relief because the stop-time rule terminated
his continuous residence when he committed the 1995 drug offense. Guzman argued that he could have accrued 7 years of continuous residence. Specifically, Guzman argued that (1) the application of the stop-time rule was impermissibly retroactive because the rule became effective on April 1, 1997 through IIRIRA, after he committed his 1995 drug offense; (2) he should be able to apply for the 212(c) deportation waiver, which was available prior to IIRIRA, and he should be able to delay his deportation, which was a strategy available prior to IIRIRA to allow him to accrue the 7 years of continuous presence for the 212(c) waiver; and, (3) the retroactive application of the stop-time rule was arbitrary and capricious because only LPRs who committed crimes within 7 years of admission were punished by being subject to the rule. Therefore, Guzman moved to terminate his deportation to apply for naturalization. The IJ held the stop-time rule was not arbitrary; therefore, Guzman was ineligible for Cancellation of Removal and for 212(c) because he had only accrued 1 year of continuous residence by the time he committed the 1995 crime. Further, Guzman had not made affirmative communication with DHS regarding his prima facie eligibility for naturalization, which is required to terminate the deportation so that the Petitioner can seek naturalization (In re Acosta Hidalgo). The Board affirmed the IJ’s holding and found that Guzman could not apply simultaneously for 212(c) relief and LPR Cancellation of Removal because 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(c)(6) explicitly precludes applying for both. Additionally, even if he could obtain a 212(c) waiver notwithstanding his 1995 conviction, the conviction would still have ended his continuous residence for purposes of Cancellation of Removal because the 212(c) waiver does not serve to pardon, expunge, or eliminate all negative immigration consequences stemming from a noncitizen’s criminal conviction. The 3rd Circuit Court affirmed the Board’s decision that Guzman was ineligible to apply for the 212(c). The Court cited St. Cyr, wherein the noncitizen has accrued the required 7 years of continuous residence before IIRIRA became effective and removal proceedings commenced after IIRIRA became effective, thus, retroactive application of IIRIRA was held a “new disability” because the LPR already had a vested right to use 212(c) when he plead guilty. The 3rd Circuit Court also cited to Sinotes-Cruz, where the noncitizen committed a crime pre-IIRIRA that was later reclassified by IIRIRA as a deportable crime. Retroactive application was impermissible in that case because the LPR relied on the pre-IIRIRA law when he pled guilty. In the present case, the 3rd Circuit held that Guzman has no vested right in 212(c) because he did not have the requisite 7 years of continuous residence at the time he committed the
1995 crime, and the 1995 crime made him deportable. Thus, the stop-time rule was triggered and made him ineligible for LPR Cancellation of Removal.

- This case is important because the 3rd Circuit reinforced that an LPR may use 212(c) as relief only when the vested right to qualify under 212(c) existed at the time in which the crime was committed and that the stop-time rule does apply retroactively to terminate the accrual of continuous presence for purposes of LPR Cancellation of Removal\textsuperscript{65}. Additionally, the 3rd Circuit did not rule on whether the Board’s interpretation is correct when the Board held that an LPR cannot apply concurrently for 212(c) relief and LPR Cancellation of Removal.

VARGAS V. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 543 Fed. Appx. 162 (3d Cir. 2013)\textsuperscript{66} [Precedent]:

**ISSUE** Whether the Court of Appeals lacked jurisdiction to review a petitioner’s claim that the Board gave insufficient consideration to discretionary factors?

**HOLDING** The Court of Appeals lacks jurisdiction to review a petitioner’s claim, unless the Board engaged in “impermissible fact finding.”

- Respondent Emmanuel De La Cruz Vargas was found to be statutorily eligible for Cancellation of Removal; however, he was denied application on account of discretionary factors. Respondent argued that the IJ erred because the Judge did not meaningfully consider all discretionary factors. The government argues that the Courts of Appeal generally lack jurisdiction to review discretionary matters. The Third Circuit agreed with the government finding that the court lacked authority to review claims based on the IJ’s discretion; however, the Third Circuit found that the court can review for “impermissible fact finding.”

- This case is important because it holds that the Third Circuit will not look to whether the Board or IJ insufficiently weighed the equities, but will look at only those scenarios, which the Board engaged in “impermissible fact finding.”

\textsuperscript{65} See, Sinotes-Cruz v Gonzales, 468 F.3d 1190 (9th Cir. 2006) (holding that the stop-time rule may not be applied retroactively to prevent noncitizens from fulfilling the seven-year continuous residence requirement when the noncitizen pleads guilty under the expectation that his plea will not affect his immigration status based on the law in effect at the time the noncitizen pleads guilty).

\textsuperscript{66} See \textit{e.g.}, Padmore v. Holder, 609 F.3d 62, 70 (2d Cir. 2010) (finding the BIA “improperly found facts which it held to be “significant” and “important” to its decision denying him relief”).
LEE V. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 431 Fed. Appx. 184 (3d Cir. 2011) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether the IJ abused his discretion in denying Cancellation of Removal for a respondent who was statutorily eligible for relief?

HOLDING The IJ did not abuse his discretion.

- Respondent Mun Seok Lee conceded removability on account of his conviction of possession of a handgun without a permit and applied for Cancellation of Removal. Although Respondent was statutorily eligible, the IJ denied Cancellation of Removal on a discretionary basis. The IJ stated: “[Respondent] has not demonstrated that he is worthy of the Court’s favorable exercise of discretion based on [his] pattern of engaging in unlawful conduct relating to his alcohol intoxication as reported in conviction and/or arrest records occurring from 1993 to 2008.” The Board affirmed, finding that Respondent had not displayed that his “positive equities do not outweigh the adverse factors in this case.” The Board stated that Respondent’s positive equities included his lengthy stay in the U.S., the fact that he owns “several successful businesses that employ about 40 people, his history of paying taxes, and his active participation in his church and community.” The adverse factors included his criminal history, the “recency, the quantity of the [] alcohol-related arrests and convictions[,] and the serious nature of them poses a public risk,” the fact that his rehabilitation is not supported by the record, the fact that he only attended Alcoholics Anonymous that were mandated because of his criminal convictions, and the fact that “he was not forthcoming in his testimony about his use of alcohol in connection with his arrests, and that, by his own admission, he continued to drink alcohol.” The Third Circuit concluded that the Board correctly “weigh[ed] the favorable and adverse factors.”

- This case is important because the case provides an example of how the positive and adverse factors will be applied.

GALLIMORE V. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 619 F.3d 216 (3d Cir. 2010) [Precedent]:

ISSUE 1 Whether a noncitizen who had mistakenly responded falsely on an application for adjustment of status is considered to have been “lawfully admitted for permanent residence?”

ISSUE 2 Whether a noncitizen is considered to have been “lawfully” admitted for permanent residence when admitted on a conditional basis or when the conditions were removed?

HOLDING 1 A noncitizen who had mistakenly responded falsely on an application for adjustment of status is not considered to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

HOLDING 2 A noncitizen is considered to have been admitted as a lawful permanent
The Respondent, Earl Gallimore, entered the U.S. on August 7, 1993 pursuant to a nonimmigrant visa. On September 25, 1993, police found five pounds of marijuana in Respondent’s car on a car stop. On January 12, 1994, Respondent married a US citizen and applied for adjustment of status. On the application for adjustment of status, Respondent answered no to the following question: “Have you ever, in or outside the U.S. been arrested, cited, charged, indicted, fined, or imprisoned for breaking or violating any law or ordinance...?” On September 13, 1994, Respondent was arrested for the pending indictment for possession of marijuana and eventually pled guilty to the charge. On April 1, 1996, Respondent applied to have the conditions on his status removed. When Respondent applied for the removal of the conditions, his wife answered on a supporting document that Respondent had never been convicted of violating any law. On December 17, 2001, Gallimore applied for naturalization and was denied. Due to Respondent’s previous failure to disclose the indictment, he was found to have poor moral character. On April 3, 2006 he was served a Notice to Appear. Respondent explained to the IJ that he had not understood that he had been arrested during the car stop. The IJ found that Respondent had “willfully failed to disclose” his arrest on his application for adjustment, and that he had not been eligible for Cancellation of Removal because he had never been “lawfully admitted for permanent residence.” The Board agreed with the IJ’s conclusion, and the Third Circuit affirmed. The Third Circuit concluded that this was not the end of the inquiry as the date that Respondent could be considered to have obtained “lawful” permanent residence is January 12, 1994, the date in which Respondent had applied for conditional permanent residence. The Third Circuit found that the Board did not speak to this issue. While finding that the word “permanent” may connote a meaning that did not encompass noncitizens given a conditional status, the Third Circuit found this interpretation to be inconsistent with Section 1186(a), which concerns “conditional permanent residents’ eligibility for citizenship.” The statutes states: “For purposes of [naturalization] in the case of an alien who is in the United States as an LPR on a conditional basis under this section, the alien shall be considered to have been admitted as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence and to be in the United States as an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.” Further, Section 1186(a) is further corroborated by 8 C.F.R. §
216.1, which states that conditional residents are to be considered LPRs, as well. Therefore, the Third Circuit indicates that the court is not aware of any reason to conclude that a conditional permanent resident is not a “lawful” permanent resident. However, the Third Circuit leaves this decision to the Board to make an affirmative holding that a conditional permanent resident is considered a “lawful” permanent resident.

- This case is important for three reasons. The case affirms the Board’s holding that a noncitizen who fraudulently or mistakenly completed an application for lawful permanent residence will not be considered to have “lawfully” entered. The noncitizen will not be considered to have “lawfully” entered even if it is the agency that had erroneously conferred lawful permanent resident status. Further, this case indicates that a noncitizen who is a conditional permanent resident, is an LPR.


**ISSUE**

Whether INA § 240A(a) can be applied retroactively to crimes committed by an LPR in 1991, before INA §240 was enacted?

**HOLDING**

A noncitizen who committed crimes for which s/he was deportable under pre-Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act may be deportable under post-IIRIRA proceedings; the court left open the question as to whether Lawful Permanent Resident Cancellation of Removal can be applied retroactively to crimes committed before IIRIRA was enacted.

- Respondent, Jimmy Jurado-Delgado, a native and citizen of Ecuador, was admitted to the U.S. as an LPR in 1985. Jurado-Delgado conceded before an IJ that he was removable either under INA §237(a)(2)(A)(ii) for having been convicted of two crimes involving moral turpitude in 1997, or under INA §237(a)(3)(D), for having falsely represented himself to be a U.S. citizen, but he requested Cancellation of Removal under INA §240A(a). The court held that Jurado-Delgado's 1991 crimes stopped his accrual of time toward a period of seven years of continuous residence because they were crimes involving moral turpitude, which rendered him inadmissible under § 212(a)(2)(A)(i). Jurado-Delgado petitioned for review of a final order of the Board. He argued, among other things, that the Board's determination that he was ineligible for Cancellation of Removal is the result of an impermissible, retroactive application of that statute. In his view, the Board, when determining whether he was statutorily eligible for Cancellation Of removal, was not entitled to take into account crimes that he committed prior to Congress's creation of that remedy. Because the Board applied the law in effect at the time Jurado-Delgado committed the deportable offense,
no question of retroactivity was implicated. Here, the Third Circuit Court denied Jurado-Delgado's petition for review.

- This case is important because it suggests that INA § 240A(a) can be applied retroactively to crimes committed by an LPR before INA § 240A was enacted, such that the crimes can stop accrual of time toward a period of seven years of continuous residence.

AUGUSTIN v. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 520 F.3d 264 (3d Cir. 2008) [Precedent]:

**ISSUE** Whether a noncitizen who entered the U.S. as a minor can impute his parent's years of continuous residence in order to meet the seven-year requirement for Cancellation of Removal?

**HOLDING** A parent’s LPR residence may not be imputed to his or her child for purpose of the 7-year continuous residence requirement.

- Respondent, Luckson Augustin, was admitted to the U.S. as an LPR at the age of 13 to join his parents who had previously come to the U.S. Approximately five years after coming to the U.S., the noncitizen committed a crime involving moral turpitude. He was later charged with being removable based in part on that crime. The noncitizen admitted the allegations but argued that he was eligible for Cancellation of Removal based on his father's seven years of continuous residence in the U.S. prior to any of the crimes being committed. The Board rejected that argument, interpreting the statute as requiring that the noncitizen himself actually dwell in the U.S. for seven years before committing the crime. On review, the court held that the Board's denial of Cancellation of Removal and its refusal to impute the father's years of residence was permissible because it was a straightforward application of the statute's requirements.

- This case is important because it affirms, under Chevron deference, the view that a parent's residence may not be imputed to his or her minor child for purposes of the seven-year residence provision of Cancellation of Removal. This case affirms the Board’s reasoning in Matter of Ramirez Vargas, 24 I.& N. Dec. 599 (BIA 2008).

ATKINSON v. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 479 F.3d 222 (3d Cir. 2007) [Precedent]

**ISSUE** Whether the post-IIRIRA statutory restrictions on discretionary relief apply to noncitizens who were convicted of a deportable crime prior to the enactment of IIRIRA?

**HOLDING** Post-IIRIRA statutory restrictions on discretionary relief do not apply to noncitizens who were convicted of a deportable crime prior to the enactment of IIRIRA.

- Respondent Claudius Atkinson was convicted of state criminal offenses in
1991. He received a notice to appear in 1997, notifying him that he was removable based upon his convictions. The IJ denied the noncitizen's request for a waiver of deportation under former § 212(c) (repealed 1996), finding that he was ineligible for that relief. A month after the Board denied the noncitizen's appeal, the U.S. Supreme Court issued its decision in St. Cyr. The noncitizen filed his habeas petition after his reconsideration motion, based on St. Cyr, was denied. The District Court held that he was not entitled to relief because he failed to show that he had relied on § 212(c) when he was convicted in 1991. In conformity with the REAL ID Act, the court treated the habeas petition as a petition for review. The court held that the noncitizen was not precluded from applying for § 212(c) relief. IIRIRA did not apply retroactively to noncitizens who were convicted of aggravated felonies prior to IIRIRA's effective date, regardless of whether they pleaded guilty or were convicted by a jury.

This case is important because the Third Circuit held that § 212(c) is available to individuals who elected to go to trial and were convicted (as opposed to entering a plea agreement).

JOSEPH v. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 236 Fed. Appx. 787 (3d Cir. 2007) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether an LPR is eligible for Cancellation of Removal when he commits a controlled substance violation, triggering the statute's "stop-time" provision under § 240A(d)(1)?

HOLDING The stop-time rule only terminates the accrual of time for purposes of satisfying the requisite 7-year continuous residence; the stop-time rule does not apply to the 5-years of permanent residency requirement.

Respondent George Russel Joseph entered the U.S. in 1992 as a conditional resident and became an LPR in 1994. A NTA that was dated June 15, 2005 placed him in removal proceedings. He was charged with being removable because in August of 1997 he committed a controlled substance violation and an aggravated felony. He was convicted in January of 1998. The IJ found him removable for committing the controlled substance violation, but found that the Government had not met its burden of showing that any of his convictions were also aggravated felonies. Nevertheless, the IJ found Joseph ineligible for Cancellation of removal under INA § 240A(a). Joseph appealed to the Board, but the Board affirmed that Joseph was ineligible for LPR Cancellation of Removal because he did not have the required 5 years of permanent residence. The Board applied the stop-time rule to Joseph’s permanent residence status, and calculated that his status as a permanent resident began in 1994 and terminated in 1998 when he was convicted. Joseph then appealed to the
Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, which held that the Board impermissibly applied the stop-time rule to the requirement of 5 years of permanent residence, and the stop-time rule only applies to the 7 years of continuous residence. Joseph had met the permanent residency requirement. However, the Board still found him ineligible for LPR Cancellation of Removal because his conviction did trigger the stop-time rule for purposes of the 7 years of continuous residence requirement. To calculate Joseph’s continuous residence, the Board counted the time from when Joseph was admitted in 1992 to the date he committed the crime in 1997 and determined he did not have the 7 years of continuous residence. Thus, the court denied Joseph's petition for review.

- This case is important because it reaffirms that the stop-time rule applies only to the requirement of 7 years of continuous residence.

OKEKE v. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 407 F.3d 585 (3d Cir. 2005) [Precedent]:

**ISSUE**
Whether a noncitizen is entitled to a new period of continuous physical presence, commencing upon his lawful reentry into the U.S., so as to allow him to accrue the time required to establish eligibility for Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal?

**HOLDING**
A noncitizen who lawfully reenters the U.S. after overstaying a visa may start a new accrual of time for purposes of satisfying the requisite 10-year continuous physical presence when the noncitizen’s Notice to Appear exclusively charges the noncitizen with being a visa overstay.

- Respondent, Anderson Jude Okeke, a native and citizen of Nigeria, petitioned for review of two orders from the Board. Those orders affirmed the Immigration Judge's decision that Okeke could not demonstrate the requisite continuous physical presence in the U.S. in order to qualify for Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal. Essentially, the Board found that the 'stop-time' provision (INA § 240A(d)(l)), once triggered, precluded the accrual of a new period of continuous presence, which in this case commenced with Okeke's lawful reentry into the U.S. The lawful reentry, which was the critical fact on appeal, occurred after Okeke committed a controlled substance offense, which, pursuant to INA § 240A(d)(l), clearly ended any prior period of continuous physical residence. This court concluded that the clock restarted upon Okeke's reentry. Pursuant to the express terms of the NTA, it was the last reentry into the U.S. that should have been considered in calculating continuous physical presence.
- This case is important because a noncitizen is entitled to a new period of continuous physical presence under INA § 240A(d)(l), commencing upon his lawful reentry into the U.S., so as to allow him to accrue the time required to
establish eligibility for Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal. Here, the Third Circuit is applying the holding in Cisneros. Though this holding applies to Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal, the holding could also apply to LPR Cancellation of Removal as INA § 240A(d)(l) refers to both continuous physical presence under Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal and continuous residence under LPR Cancellation of Removal.

**DUDNEY v. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 129 Fed. Appx. 747 (3d Cir. 2005) [Precedent]:**

**ISSUE**  
Whether an LPR’s 1998 conviction stopped the clock for purposes of the continuous residence requirement of INA §240A(a)(2)?

**HOLDING** The stop-time rule may be triggered by a noncitizen when s/he commits a crime for which a noncitizen is deportable.

- Respondent Barrington Dudney was admitted to the U.S. as an immigrant in August 1992. In October 1998, he was convicted of possession and possession with the intent to deliver a controlled substance (92 packets of marijuana). On August 3, 1999, he was convicted of possession of a controlled substance, simple assault and for resisting arrest during an August 20, 1998 incident. Dudney also was convicted on August 31, 1999 of charges of simple assault, possession of an instrument of crime and recklessly endangering another person in an incident on February 19, 1999. In June 1999, the INS issued a NTA charging Dudney with removability based upon his October 1998 conviction. A removal order was entered after Dudney failed to appear for his hearing, but the IJ later terminated the proceedings due to insufficient evidence. In October 2001, the INS issued another NTA charging Dudney with removability for having committed an aggravated felony (drug trafficking), two crimes involving moral turpitude not arising out of a single scheme of criminal misconduct, and a violation of law relating to a controlled substance, other than a single offense involving possession for one’s own use of 30 grams or less of marijuana. These charges were based on the October 1998 and August 31, 1999 convictions. The NTA was then amended, and the August 3, 1999 convictions for drug possession and simple assault, and another aggravated felony charge were added. Through counsel, Dudney sought Cancellation of Removal as a permanent resident pursuant to INA § 240A(a). The IJ found Dudney removable for a violation of law relating to a controlled substance, other than a single offense involving possession for one’s own use of 30 grams or less of marijuana, based on his August 3, 1999 drug conviction. The Board also agreed with the IJ that Dudney was not eligible for Cancellation of Removal because he did not meet the requirement that he have continuous residence here for seven years. The Board explained that
even if Dudney could not be removed based upon his October 1998 conviction because the proceedings related to this conviction were terminated, the October 1998 conviction stopped the clock for purposes of the seven-year residence requirement. Alternatively, Dudney’s continuous residence stopped as early as August 20, 1998 when the crime was committed.

• This case is important because it affirms that an LPR must satisfy INA §240A(a)(2), the seven-year continuous residence requirement, in order to be eligible for LPR Cancellation of Removal, and furthermore that commission of the deportable crime or conviction for the deportable crime may stop the accrual of time.

**RODRIGUEZ-MUNOZ v. ATTORNEY GENERAL**, 419 F.3d 245 (3d Cir. 2005) [Precedent]:

**ISSUE**
Whether a noncitizen who has been convicted of an aggravated felony can seek simultaneous INA §212(c) and Cancellation of Removal relief?

**HOLDING**
A crime involving moral turpitude that may be waivable under §212(c) may nevertheless be an aggravated felony that renders a noncitizen ineligible for LPR Cancellation of Removal.

• Respondent Richard Jose Rodriguez-Munoz was admitted to the U.S. as an LPR in 1976. In 1992, he pled guilty to four drug offenses in New York state court, including third degree criminal sale of a controlled substance (crack cocaine). In 1994, the INS charged Rodriguez-Munoz with deportability as a noncitizen convicted of an aggravated felony and as being convicted of a violation relating to a controlled substance. While the immigration proceedings were pending, Rodriguez-Munoz pled guilty in New York to two additional offenses: fifth degree criminal possession of marijuana and seventh degree criminal possession of a controlled substance. The government acknowledged that there was no question that Rodriguez-Munoz was eligible to apply for an INA § 212(c), waiver of deportation concerning his 1992 conviction. Indeed, § 212(c) relief remained available for noncitizens whose convictions were obtained through plea agreements and who, notwithstanding those convictions, would have been eligible for § 212(c) relief at the time of their plea under the law then in effect. Rodriguez-Munoz apparently did not argue before the Board that his 1992 conviction was not an aggravated felony, nor did he raise such an argument on appeal. Although a waiver of deportation gave him a chance to stay in the U.S. despite his misdeed, it did not expunge his conviction. Thus, even if Rodriguez-Munoz’s deportation based on his 1992 conviction were waived under § 212(c), that conviction would nonetheless remain an aggravated felony for purposes of precluding his application for
Cancellation of Removal under INA § 240A. Thus, he was deportable.

This case is important because a noncitizen who has an aggravated felony conviction along with other crimes of moral turpitude cannot seek simultaneous INA § 212(c) and Cancellation of Removal relief, because the aggravated felony makes him or her ineligible for Cancellation of Removal.

**MURALI KRISHNA PONNAPULA v. ASHCROFT, 373 F.3d 480 (3d Cir. 2004) [Precedent]:**

**ISSUE** Whether the post-IIRAIRA statutory restrictions on discretionary relief apply to noncitizens who were convicted of a deportable crime prior to the enactment of IIRAIRA, but who turned down a misdemeanor plea deal?

**HOLDING** A noncitizen who turned down a misdemeanor plea deal, and was later convicted of an aggravated felony is not subject to the statutory restrictions of IIRAIRA.

- Respondent Murali Krishna Ponnapula was indicted for grand larceny and falsifying business records in violation of New York law after his brother submitted a loan application with the noncitizen's forged signature and without the noncitizen's knowledge. In reliance on counsel's advice, the noncitizen turned down a misdemeanor plea agreement, went to trial when former INA § 212(c) was still in effect, and was convicted. The court rejected the Government's contention that St. Cyr precluded the noncitizen from claiming an impermissible retroactive effect of the repeal of § 212(c). With respect to the noncitizen, who reasonably could have relied on the potential availability of § 212(c) relief, the court found the repeal of § 212(c) had an impermissible retroactive effect. Although the court concluded that actual reliance was not necessary, the court found that the noncitizen demonstrated clear and reasonable actual reliance on the former statutory scheme in making the decision to go to trial.

- This case is important because the noncitizen reasonably believed that even if he was convicted of a felony after trial he would still likely be eligible for hardship relief from deportation pursuant to former § 212(c). In reliance of this, the noncitizen decided to turn down the misdemeanor offer and proceeded to trial. The Third Circuit court utilized St. Cyr and allowed the noncitizen to avail himself of § 212(c) relief.

**SCHEIDEMANN v. INS, 83 F.3d 1517 (3d Cir. 1996) [Precedent]:**

**ISSUE** Whether an LPR who has served at least five years of imprisonment for a crime defined as an aggravated felony (under the original 1988 definition) is eligible to apply for a discretionary waiver of deportation under § 212(c).

**HOLDING** A noncitizen who has been convicted of an aggravated felony with a 5-year sentence is ineligible for relief under INA 212(c).
Respondent James Scheidemann was an LPR since 1959. Scheidemann sought review of an order of the Board, which dismissed his appeal to overturn a deportation order. Scheidemann faced deportation on account of a 1987 drug trafficking conviction for which he had served over five years in prison. Scheidemann did not contest his deportability. Rather, he argued that he was eligible to apply for a discretionary waiver of deportation under INA § 212(c). The court held that Congress intended § 212(c) to restrict the Attorney General's power to exercise discretionary relief, immediately after the amendment to the aggravated felony statute, with respect to noncitizens who had served at least five years imprisonment for crimes defined as aggravated felonies under the original 1988 definition, regardless of the conviction date. Accordingly, Scheidemann's petition for review was denied.

This case is important because an LPR who has served at least five years of imprisonment for a crime defined as an aggravated felony (under the original 1988 definition) will not be eligible to apply for a discretionary waiver of deportation under the former § 212(c).

MATTER OF HUANG, 19 I. & N. Dec. 749 (BIA 1988) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Who has the burden of establishing abandonment of lawful permanent resident status?

HOLDING The DHS has the burden of establishing abandonment of lawful permanent residence status.

The noncitizen family members were natives and citizens of Taiwan and included an adult female and her two minor children. They were initially admitted to the US as LPRs on June 5, 1982. The noncitizen's husband was admitted as an LPR one week earlier. The noncitizen's husband, after receiving his Alien Registration Receipt Card, returned to Japan to continue studying and working at a university's medical school as a medical doctor. Soon after, the noncitizen wife and the children returned to Japan. The noncitizen and her two children last sought to reenter the U.S. on May 10, 1986, at which time they were placed in exclusion proceedings and ordered removed. She appealed. The INS contended on appeal that the noncitizens had abandoned their LPR statuses. The Board noted that the INS has the burden of proving that a noncitizen is ineligible for admission as a returning permanent resident. In determining whether the DHS has met its burden of proof, the IJ should look to whether the LPR has an unrelinquished residence after a temporary visit abroad. A temporary visit abroad may be an extended period of absence, “if the end of the period of absence can be fixed by some early event.” The noncitizen’s professed
intent to return is not sufficient to support a finding that the visit was “temporary.” The Board found that the INS had met the burden and the Board ordered the noncitizen and her children removed from the U.S.

- This case is important because the Board held that the DHS bears the ultimate burden of showing abandonment of LPR status.

(3). Board of Immigration Appeals

MATTER OF NELSON, 25 I. & N. Dec. 410 (BIA 2011) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether a noncitizen is entitled to a new period of continuous residence, commencing upon his reentry into the U.S., so as to allow him to accrue the time required to establish eligibility for LPR Cancellation of Removal?

HOLDING “Once an alien has been convicted of an offense that stops the accrual of the 7-year period of continuous residence required for cancellation of removal...section 240A(d)(1) of the Act does not permit such residence to restart simply because the alien has departed from, and returned to the United States.”

- Respondent, Michael Alexander Nelson, a native and citizen of Jamaica, was admitted as a LPR on November 3, 1994. On February 20, 1999, Respondent was convicted of a New York offense for possession of marijuana. In August 2000, Respondent visited Canada and thereafter returned to the U.S.. On November 26, 2008, Nelson was served with an NTA because of his criminal offense of possession of marijuana. The IJ found that Nelson was removable based on his 1999 convictions and that Nelson failed to show eligibility for Cancellation of Removal because he had not accrued continuous residence for 7 years. Specifically, the IJ found that Nelson could not re-start the clock when he re-entered after his trip to Canada. Thus, according to the IJ, the clock stopped for purposes of accruing continuous residence time on February 20, 1999, at which point Nelson had not resided in the U.S. for 7-years. On appeal, Nelson argued that he was eligible for Cancellation of Removal because his reentry into the U.S. after his trip to Canada, restarted the clock. Thus, the date that the stopped the time for accrual of residence was November 2008, rather than February 1999. The Board affirmed the IJ’s decision. In so holding, the Board found that the facts in Okeke v. Attorney General differ. In Okeke, the respondent had been removed for possession of marijuana, and thereafter returned to the U.S. lawfully on a student visa. The respondent in Okeke, was then placed into removal proceedings for failing to maintain a student status. Here, the Board found that the fact that the new removal proceedings were related to the clock stopping event distinguished the Nelson’s case from that of Okeke. Unlike the respondent in
Okeke, here Nelson’s removal proceedings are on account of his conviction. Therefore, the Board concluded that Okeke, was not “binding” in this case. However, the Board did suggest that it may have come to a different result should Nelson have received a waiver prior to his reentry into the U.S. This case is important because the holding provides that lawful reentry into the U.S. after a clock-stopping event will not re-start the clock for purposes of 7-years continuous residence when the clock-stopping event was the basis for removal. Further, this distinguishes the holding in Okeke v. Attorney General, providing a further wrinkle in that the clock cannot restart after lawful re-entry, if the basis for removal is the prior clock stopping event.

MATTER OF CAMARILLO, 25 I. & N. Dec. 644 (BIA 2011) [Precedent]:

**ISSUE** Whether an NTA that does not include the date and time of the initial hearing can stop the clock for purposes of Cancellation of Removal?

**HOLDING** In-person service of an NTA that does not indicate a date or time of hearing is nevertheless sufficient to terminate the continuous residence of an LPR.

Respondent, Judith Camarillo, was a native and citizen of Guatemala who became a LPR in 2000. On August 29, 2005, she was served in person with a Notice to Appear, which included the phrase “To be set” in the space provided for the date and time of the hearing. The NTA was later filed with the Harlingen Immigration Court, which issued a notice of hearing on November 9, 2007. She was charged with alien smuggling and the IJ found her removable. But the IJ granted her petition for Cancellation of Removal on the grounds that Camarillo had accrued the required seven-years of continuous residence by the time the Court issued the notice that contained the hearing date. The IJ interpreted the terms in 239(a)(1) of 8 U.S.C. §1229(a)(1)(G), “[t]he time and place at which the proceedings will be held,” as requirements for an NTA so that the stop-time rule takes effect. DHS appealed, arguing that section § 1229(a)(1) specifies that an NTA must be served, and the terms in §1229(a)(1)(G) help identify what an NTA is. The Board agreed with the DHS that the key phrase was “served a notice to appear” and the Congress intended the phrase “under section 239(a)” after “notice to appear” to specify the document the DHS must serve to trigger the “stop-time” rule. Additionally, the court highlighted that removal proceedings commence when the NTA is filed with the Immigration Court. 8 C.F.R. § 1239.1(a) (2011). Since the commencement of proceedings is a separate issue from the service of the NTA, what mattered was the NTA that Camarillo was served in person. Thus,
Camarillo was not eligible for Cancellation of Removal because she had not accrued seven-years at the time she was served in 2005. The court sustained the appeal by DHS.

- This case is important because the holding found that the NTA will suffice to end continuous residence, regardless if there is a date or time for the hearing on the NTA at the time the noncitizen is served. The court also distinguished that the date that mattered for purposes of terminating continuous residence is the date that the NTA was served and not the date on which removal proceedings commence nor the date that the NTA is filed. Peculiarly, the Board never makes any conclusions regarding Camarillo’s criminal conviction for smuggling aliens into the U.S., which could have been a reason to stop time for purposes of the 7 years of continuous residence.

**MATTER OF RAMIREZ-VARGAS, 24 I. & N. Dec. 599 (BIA 2008) [Precedent]:**

**ISSUE** Whether a parent's lawful permanent resident status can be imputed to a child for purposes of calculating the 5 years of lawful permanent residence required to establish for Cancellation of Removal under § 240A(a)(1)?

**HOLDING** A parent's LPR residence may not be imputed to his or her child for purpose of the 7-year continuous residence requirement.

- Respondent, Ramirez-Vargas, a native and citizen of Mexico and an LPR of the U.S., was found removable as a noncitizen convicted of a controlled substance violation but granted his application for Cancellation of Removal. The DHS appealed, arguing that the IJ erred in finding the respondent statutorily eligible for that relief because the lawful permanent residence of the noncitizen's father could not be imputed to the noncitizen. The Board sustained the appeal by DHS. The Board held that a parent's period of residence in the U.S. cannot be imputed to a child for purposes of calculating the 7 years of continuous residence required to establish eligibility for Cancellation of Removal under INA § 240A(a)(2).

- This case is important because it rejected the 9th Circuit Court’s holding that imputation of a parent’s LPR status to a child was permissible. Matter Of Escobar, 24 I. & N. Dec. 231 (BIA 2007). Matter of Escobar was vacated in 2009 and currently all Circuit Courts hold that imputation of a parent’s continuance residence is impermissible.

**MATTER OF JURADO, 24 I. & N. Dec. 29 (BIA 2006) [Precedent]:**

**ISSUE** Whether a noncitizen needs to be charged with a crime and found inadmissible or removable in order for the criminal conduct in question to
terminate continuous residence?

**HOLDING** A noncitizen who committed crimes for which s/he was deportable under pre-IIRIRA may be deportable under post-IIRIRA proceedings; the Board left open the question as to whether LPR Cancellation of Removal can be applied retroactively to crimes committed before IIRIRA was enacted.

- Respondent Jimmy Roberto Jurado, was admitted to the U.S. as an LPR on September 15, 1985. He was convicted in 1991 of retail theft in violation of Pennsylvania law. In 1992 he was also convicted of unsworn falsification to authorities. In addition, the noncitizen was convicted in 1997 of two crimes involving moral turpitude that were the basis of the charge of removability in his NTA. In proceedings before the IJ, the noncitizen conceded that he was removable, both on the initial charge and on a lodged charge that he falsely represented himself to be a U.S. citizen. He applied for Cancellation of Removal under section 240A(a) of the Act, which the IJ granted. On appeal, the DHS contended that the noncitizen failed to demonstrate the requisite period of continuous residence to establish his eligibility for Cancellation of Removal. The Board agreed and found that the IJ erred in concluding that the noncitizen was eligible for Cancellation of Removal.

- This case is important because the Board concluded that the time period of a crime is measured from the commission of the crime, not the conviction.

**MATTER OF CISNEROS-GONZALEZ, 23 I. & N. Dec. 668 (BIA 2004) [Precedent]:**

**ISSUE** Whether a noncitizen who departed the U.S. after being served with a valid charging document can seek relief in a subsequent removal proceeding, based on a new period of continuous physical presence measured from the date of his return?

**HOLDING** For purposes of applying for Cancellation of Removal, a noncitizen’s period of continuous physical presence ends when s/he is served with the charging document on which the current removal proceeding is based (8 U.S.C. § 1229b(d)(1)); the stop-time rule does not refer to charging documents served in prior proceedings.

- Respondent Ignacio Cisneros-Gonzalez’s first removal proceeding was in December 28, 1990. He was served with an Order to Show Cause, Notice of Hearing, and Warrant for Arrest of Alien (Form I-221S), charging him with deportability for having entered without inspection (former 8 U.S.C. §1251(a)(2)). On January 10, 1991 he was deported. On January 11, 1991 he returned to the U.S. without being admitted or paroled. On January 5, 2001, he applied for Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal, which requires continuous
physical presence for 10 years. The IJ cited to Matter of Mendoza-Sandino as authority to apply the stop-time rule to Cisneros-Gonzalez’s first deportation proceeding from 1990, which would have made him ineligible for the relief. However, the Board’s legislative history analysis determined that Congress did not intend for the stop-time rule under INA §240A(d)(1) to ban noncitizens from seeking Cancellation of Removal relief. The “stop-time” rule was not intended to extend to charging documents issued in earlier proceedings. Thus, the Board sustained Cisneros-Gonzalez’s appeal and remanded the case.

This case is important because the Board distinguishes this case from Matter of Mendoza-Sandino, 22 I. & N. Dec. 1236 (BIA 2000). There, the noncitizen applied for suspension of deportation based on a single order to show cause. Here, however, multiple charging documents existed. When the DHS does not or cannot reinstate a prior order of removal against a previously deported noncitizen and instead issues a new order of removal, the noncitizen may be eligible to apply for Cancellation of Removal based on the accrual of the new continuous presence (§ 240A(b)) or new continuous residence (§ 240A(a)). Importantly, note that Cisneros-Gonzalez was applied to § 240A(b) [Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal], rather than § 240A(a) [LPR Cancellation of Removal]. Under 240A(d)(1), however, the stop-time rule applies to both LPR Cancellation of Removal’s continuous residence requirement (§ 240A(a)(2)) and Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal’s continuous physical presence requirement (§ 240A(b)(2)).

MATTER OF DEANDA-ROMO, 23 I. & N. Dec. 597 (BIA 2003) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether a noncitizen who has committed two crimes involving moral turpitude is precluded from establishing the requisite 7 years of continuous residence for cancellation of removal under INA §240A(a)(2), where his first crime was a petty offense that was committed within the 7-year period and the second crime was committed more than 7 years after his admission to the U.S.?

HOLDING The stop-time rule is triggered by crimes for which a noncitizen is inadmissible; however, the stop-time rule is not triggered by petty offenses.

Respondent Jose Abraham Deanda-Romo, was admitted to the U.S. as an LPR on January 8, 1992. On September 21, 1999, he was convicted in Texas of two misdemeanor offenses of assault with bodily injury to his spouse, one occurring on October 30, 1998, and the other on June 20, 1999. He was sentenced to imprisonment for both offenses. He conceded removability and applied for LPR Cancellation of Removal. The IJ terminated the application after finding that the noncitizen was ineligible for relief
under the "stop-time" rule. The Board held that the noncitizen was not precluded by the stop-time rule from establishing the requisite seven years of continuous residence because his first crime qualified as a petty offense, under INA 212(a)(2)(A)(ii)(II), and therefore did not render him inadmissible. Thus, according to the Board, the noncitizen had accrued the requisite seven years of continuous residence before the second offense was committed.

- This case is important because the court held that the stop-time rule does not apply until the second conviction where the first conviction was a petty offense.

**IN RE BLANCAS-LARA, 23 I. & N. Dec. 458 (BIA 2002) [Precedent]:**

**ISSUE** Whether the period of a noncitizen's residence in the U.S. after admission as a nonimmigrant may be considered in calculating the 7 years of continuous residence required to establish eligibility for cancellation of removal.

**HOLDING** A noncitizen’s admission as a nonimmigrant may be used to calculate the start of 7-year continuous residence requirement.

- Respondent Eduardo Blancas-Lara was first admitted to the U.S. in August 1986 with a border-crossing card. He adjusted his status to that of an LPR on August 5, 1991. The noncitizen's period of continuous residence under section 240A(a)(2) of the Act ended on April 1, 1998, when he was served with a Notice to Appear. At that point, the noncitizen had resided in the U.S. as an LPR for about 6 years and 8 months. The IJ concluded that the noncitizen could count time he spent in the U.S. as a child before his admission as an LPR toward the accrual of 7 years of continuous residence under section 240A(a)(2), because the lawful residence of his father, a citizen and resident of the U.S., could be imputed to him. On appeal the Board found that the noncitizen established that, at the time of his application for relief, he had resided in the U.S. continuously for 7 years after having been admitted as a nonimmigrant. Thus, an applicant who is admitted with a nonimmigrant visa, and accrues the 7 years of continuous residence to meet the second element of the statute, does not need an imputation argument. Accordingly, the Board concurred with the IJ's decision and dismissed the appeal.

- This case is important because the Board stated that the period of a noncitizen's residence in the U.S. after admission as a nonimmigrant may be considered in calculating the seven years of continuous residence required to establish eligibility for cancellation of removal.
MATTER OF SOTELO-SOTELO, 23 I.& N. Dec. 201 (BIA 2001) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether a noncitizen is required to satisfy a threshold test of showing "unusual or outstanding equities" for the consideration of whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted?

HOLDING The noncitizen does not have to show "unusual or outstanding equities." Rather, favorable and adverse factors should be weighed to determine whether the person warrants discretionary relief.

- Respondent Javier Sotelo-Sotelo adjusted his status to that of an LPR on December 1, 1990. On July 24, 2000, he was convicted of the following offenses: possession and passing fraudulent resident alien cards, failure to provide migrant workers with terms and conditions of employment, and illegal entry or aiding and abetting illegal entry. The noncitizen was sentenced to 8 months of imprisonment for each of the first two offenses, and to 6 months of imprisonment for the third offense. In proceedings before the IJ, the noncitizen conceded removability as charged and applied for Cancellation of Removal under INA §240A(a). The IJ denied the noncitizen's application for relief, and the noncitizen appealed. The Board found that the favorable factors presented in support of the noncitizen's application for cancellation of removal did not outweigh the adverse factors. In doing so, the Board rejected the use of an 'outstanding and unusual equities' requirement as a threshold for relief and instead found that the IJ should weigh the favorable and adverse factors to determine whether the 'totality of the evidence' on balance indicates that a favorable discretion is warranted.

- This case is important because the Board rejected the use of an 'outstanding and unusual equities' requirement as a threshold for relief and instead found that the IJ should weigh the favorable and adverse factors to determine whether the 'totality of the evidence' on balance indicates that a favorable discretion is warranted.

MATTER OF CAMPOS-TORRES, 22 I. & N. Dec. 1289 (BIA 2000) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether the noncitizen's commission of a firearms offense, which is not referred to in INA § 212(a)(2), precluded him from satisfying the requirement in INA § 240A(a)(2) that he have resided in the U.S. continuously for 7 years after having been admitted in any status?

HOLDING A noncitizen triggers the stop-time rule when s/he violates a provision that is actually found in 212(a)(2).

- Respondent Ignacio Campos-Torres, was admitted to the U.S. as a temporary resident on May 4, 1988, and adjusted his status to that of a LPR on December 13, 1990. On September 23, 1993 the noncitizen was
convicted of a single offense of unlawful use of a weapon. The noncitizen was sentenced to 18 months of probation. On June 25, 1997, the INS issued and served a NTA, commencing removal proceedings and charging the noncitizen with removability. The issue that was raised before the IJ and argued in the initial briefs submitted on appeal concerned the appropriate date to apply in determining when accrual of continuous residence ends. The noncitizen argued that under the plain language of the statute, firearms offenses do not cut off continuous residence because they are not "referred to" in § 212(a)(2) of the Act. The government argued that the plain language of INA § 240A(d)(l) does not clearly support either its position or that of the noncitizen because the statute is ambiguous. The Board found that because the noncitizen's firearms offense, which rendered him deportable under INA § 237(a)(2)(C), is not referred to in INA § 212(a)(2), it did not stop time under INA § 240A(d)(l).

This case is important because the Board held that “an offense must be one ‘referred to in section 212(a)(2)” of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2) (1994 & Supp. II 1996), to terminate the period of continuous residence or continuous physical presence required for cancellation of removal.’”

MATTER OF PEREZ, 22 I. & N. Dec. 689 (BIA 1999) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether the "stop-time" rule operates to terminate the period of continuous residence required for Cancellation of Removal as of the date the noncitizen commits the offense that renders him/her deportable?

HOLDING The stop-time rule is triggered by a noncitizen who violates a provision in INA § 212(a)(2), § 237(a)(2) or 237(a)(4).

• Respondent Cristobal Perez, admitted each of the factual allegations in the Notice to Appear. Specifically, he admitted that was first admitted as a temporary resident on September 21, 1989, and that his status was subsequently adjusted to that of an LPR on December 7, 1990. The noncitizen further admitted that he was convicted on July 11, 1997, in Texas, of possession of cocaine, and that this offense was committed on or about August 4, 1992. The noncitizen conceded that he was removable as charged under section 237(a)(2)(B)(i) of the Act on the basis of this conviction and the IJ ordered him removed. The noncitizen appealed to the Board on the basis of the retroactive effect of § 240A, arguing that the section's rules limiting eligibility for relief from removal should not apply to him. The Board, after finding that applying Section 240A would not have an impermissible "retroactive effect," concluded that the respondent's period of continuous residence is deemed to have ended on the date he committed his controlled substance violation. The commission of that offense was
prior to his attainment of the required 7 years of continuous residence. Therefore, he was statutorily ineligible for section 240A(a) Cancellation of Removal. Accordingly, the Board found that the IJ's pretermission of his application for Cancellation of Removal was proper.

- This case is important because the Board concluded that "admission in any status" includes admission as a temporary resident. Also, "Under INA 240A(d)(1)(B), continuous residence is deemed to end upon the commission of an offense under INA § 212(a)(2), or INA § 237(a)(2) or § 237(a)(4). The time period is measured from the commission of the crime, not the conviction."

**MATTER OF EDWARDS, 20 I. & N. Dec. 191 (BIA 1990) [Precedent]:**

**ISSUE** Whether Section 212(c) provides an indiscriminate waiver for individuals who demonstrate statutory eligibility?

**HOLDING** Section 212(c) does not provide an indiscriminate waiver for individuals who demonstrate statutory eligibility.

- Respondent Edwards, who was admitted as an LPR in 1968. He married a US citizen with whom he had four US citizen children. He incurred criminal convictions while in the US that entailed him serving some 2 and 1/2 years of imprisonment. The noncitizen implored that he be allowed to remain in the US because of his family. He insisted that he would work hard to change his ways. He stated that his wife and children, as well as his mother and siblings, resided here and that he knew no one in Barbados. The IJ determined that the noncitizen was statutorily eligible for a section 212(c) waiver. However, he denied that relief in the exercise of discretion. On appeal, Edwards argued that the IJ erred by failing to consider all of the favorable factors presented in his case. The Board balanced the various factors in the noncitizen's case and took note of his favorable equities, which the board found to be unusual or outstanding. However, when the Board weighed these equities against the adverse factors of the noncitizen's extensive criminal record, the Board determined that a favorable exercise of discretion was not warranted.

- This case is important because the Board states that under former INA § 212(c), courts should consider the record as a whole. Additionally, this case clarified confusion that was found from the rehabilitation factor in Matter of Marin. Some courts found that “a clear showing of reformation is an absolute prerequisite to a favorable exercise of discretion;” however, the Board clarified the rehabilitation is not an absolute prerequisite. Rather, each instance should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
MATTER OF MARIN, 16 I. & N. Dec. 581 (BIA 1978) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether a waiver of deportation/cancellation of removal provides an indiscriminate waiver for all who demonstrate statutory eligibility for such relief?

HOLDING Waivers of deportation/cancellation do not provide indiscriminate relief for all who demonstrate statutory eligibility for such relief. Rather, the adjudicator will consider positive and adverse factors, as set forth below.

- Respondent Marin was admitted as a LPR on February 3, 1965. In March 1976, he pled guilty to the felony charge of criminal sale of cocaine. He served 30 months in New York State penal institutions. In May 1977 he was served with an order to show cause and was charged with being deportable. The IJ found him deportable and he appealed. The noncitizen argued that he was eligible for 212(c) relief. The Board stated that Section 212(c) does not provide an indiscriminate waiver for all who demonstrate statutory eligibility for such relief. Instead, the Attorney General is required to determine as a matter of discretion whether an applicant warrants the relief sought. The Board concluded that the noncitizen bears the burden of demonstrating that his application merits favorable consideration. The noncitizen was unable to advance any substantial equities and the Board dismissed his appeal.

- This case is important because the Board courts should consider a noncitizen's record as a whole. Courts should balance the adverse factors evidencing the noncitizen's undesirability as a permanent resident with the social and humane considerations presented in his or her behalf to determine whether relief should be granted. Adverse factors include: (1) “the nature and underlying circumstances of the exclusion ground at issue,” (2) “the presence of additional significant violations of this country's immigration laws,” (3) “the existence of a criminal record and, if so, its nature, recency, and seriousness,” and (4) “the presence of other evidence indicative of a respondent's bad character or undesirability as a permanent resident of this country.” Positive equities include: (1) family ties within the US, (2) residence of long duration in this country (particularly when the inception of residence occurred while the respondent was of young age), (3) evidence of hardship to the respondent and family if deportation occurs, (4) service in this country's Armed Forces, (5) a history of employment, (6) the existence of property or business ties, (7) evidence of value and service to the community, (8) proof of a genuine rehabilitation if a criminal record exists, and (9) other evidence attesting to a respondent's good character (e.g., affidavits from family, friends, and responsible community representatives).”
(b). Arranged by Statutory Element

(1). Has been an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence for not less than 5 years

(A). Conditional Lawful Permanent Residents

GALLIMORE V. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 619 F.3d 216 (3d Cir. 2010) [Precedent]:

ISSUE 1 Whether a noncitizen who had mistakenly responded falsely on an application for adjustment of status is considered to have been “lawfully admitted for permanent residence?”

ISSUE 2 Whether a noncitizen is considered to have been “lawfully” admitted for permanent residence when admitted on a conditional basis or when the conditions were removed?

HOLDING 1 A noncitizen who had mistakenly responded falsely on an application for adjustment of status is not considered to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

HOLDING 2 A noncitizen is considered to have been admitted as a lawful permanent resident when s/he is admitted on a conditional basis.

• The Respondent, Earl Gallimore, entered the U.S. on August 7, 1993 pursuant to a nonimmigrant visa. On September 25, 1993, police found five pounds of marijuana in Respondent’s car on a car stop. On January 12, 1994, Respondent married a US citizen and applied for adjustment of status. On the application for adjustment of status, Respondent answered no to the following question: “Have you ever, in or outside the U.S. been arrested, cited, charged, indicted, fined, or imprisoned for breaking or violating any law or ordinance...?” On September 13, 1994, Respondent was arrested for the pending indictment for possession of marijuana and eventually pled guilty to the charge. On April 1, 1996, Respondent applied to have the conditions on his status removed. When Respondent applied for the removal of the conditions, his wife answered on a supporting document that Respondent had never been convicted of violating any law. On December 17, 2001, Gallimore applied for naturalization and was denied. Due to Respondent’s previous failure to disclose the indictment, he was found to have poor moral character. On April 3, 2006 he was served a Notice to Appear. Respondent explained to the IJ that he had not understood that he had been arrested during the car stop. The IJ found that Respondent had “willfully failed to disclose” his arrest on his application for adjustment, and that he had not been eligible for Cancellation of Removal because he had never been “lawfully admitted for permanent residence.” The Board agreed...
with the IJ’s conclusion, and the Third Circuit affirmed. The Third Circuit concluded that his 1995 conviction rendered the Respondent inadmissible. As such, the Respondent was inadmissible at the time adjustment, and he had not been “lawfully” admitted for permanent residence. However, the Third Circuit found that this was not the end of the inquiry as the date that Respondent could be considered to have obtained “lawful” permanent residence is January 12, 1994, the date in which Respondent had applied for conditional permanent residence. The Third Circuit found that the Board did not speak to this issue. While finding that the word “permanent” may connote a meaning that did not encompass noncitizens given a conditional status, the Third Circuit found this interpretation to be inconsistent with Section 1186(a), which concerns “conditional permanent residents’ eligibility for citizenship.” The statutes states: “For purposes of [naturalization] in the case of an alien who is in the United States as an LPR resident on a conditional basis under this section, the alien shall be considered to have been admitted as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence and to be in the United States as an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.” Further, Section 1186(a) is further corroborated by 8 C.F.R. § 216.1, which states that conditional residents are to be considered LPRs, as well. Therefore, the Third Circuit indicates that the court is not aware of any reason to conclude that a conditional permanent resident is not a “lawful” permanent resident. However, the Third Circuit leaves this decision to the Board to make an affirmative holding that a conditional permanent resident is considered a “lawful” permanent resident.

• This case is important for three reasons. The case affirms the Board’s holding that a noncitizen who fraudulently or mistakenly completed an application for lawful permanent residence will not be considered to have “lawfully” entered. The noncitizen will not be considered to have “lawfully” entered even if it is the agency that had erroneously conferred LPR status. Further, this case indicates that a noncitizen who is a conditional permanent resident, is an LPR.

MATTER OF PAEK, 26 I. & N. 403 (BIA 2014), aff’d, 793 F.3d 330 (3d Cir. 2015) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether a noncitizen who was admitted to the U.S. as a conditional permanent resident is considered a lawful permanent resident?

HOLDING A noncitizen spouse lawfully admitted as a permanent resident on a conditional basis, is considered an LPR.

• Respondent Ka A. Paek, was admitted into the U.S. in 1991. Respondent was convicted of theft in 2005 and robbery in 2006, and removal
proceedings were initiated in July 2013. Respondent then applied for adjustment of status pursuant to his marriage to a U.S. citizen and applied for Section 212(h) waiver. However, the waiver states that “No waiver shall be granted under this subsection in the case of an alien who has previously been admitted to the United States as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if... since the date of his admission the alien has been convicted of an aggravated felony.” Therefore, if the Respondent was considered a “lawful” permanent resident at the time of his convictions, he would not be eligible for the waiver. The Board found that “notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, an alien spouse.... shall be considered, at the time of obtaining the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to have obtained such status on a conditional basis to the provisions of this section.”

While this case deals with § 212(h) waivers, this case further indicates that a conditional permanent resident will be considered to have “lawfully” entered.

(B). Burden of Proof for Abandonment of Lawful Permanent Resident Status

MATTER OF HUANG, 19 I. & N. Dec. 749 (BIA 1988) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Who has the burden of establishing abandonment of lawful permanent resident status?

HOLDING The DHS has the burden of establishing abandonment of lawful permanent residence status.

• The noncitizen family members were natives and citizens of Taiwan and included an adult female and her two minor children. They were initially admitted to the US as LPRs on June 5, 1982. The noncitizen's husband was admitted as a lawful permanent resident one week earlier. The noncitizen's husband, after receiving his Alien Registration Receipt Card, returned to Japan to continue studying and working at a university's medical school as a medical doctor. Soon after, the noncitizen wife and the children returned to Japan. The noncitizen and her two children last sought to reenter the U.S. on May 10, 1986, at which time they were placed in exclusion proceedings and ordered removed. She appealed. The INS contended on appeal that the noncitizens had abandoned their LPR statuses. The Board noted that the INS has the burden of proving that a noncitizen is ineligible for admission as a returning permanent resident. In determining whether the DHS has met its burden of proof, the IJ should look to whether the LPR has an unrelinquished residence after a temporary visit abroad. A temporary visit abroad may be an extended period of absence, “if
the end of the period of absence can be fixed by some early event.” The noncitizen’s professed intent to return is not sufficient to support a finding that the visit was “temporary.” The Board found that the INS had met the burden and the Board ordered the noncitizen and her children removed from the U.S.

- This case is important because the Board held that the DHS bears the ultimate burden of showing abandonment of LPR status.

(C). Ability to Impute a Parent’s Lawful Permanent Resident Status

HOLDER V. MARTINEZ GUTIERREZ, 132 S. Ct. 2011 (2012) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether a parent’s lawful permanent resident status can be imputed to a child for purposes of calculating the 5 years of lawful permanent residence required to establish eligibility for cancellation of removal under § 240A(a)(1)?

HOLDING A child of an LPR may not impute the parent’s length of time as an LPR for purposes of 5 years of lawful permanent residence and 7-year continuous residence requirement.

- This case decided two consolidated cases about imputation, one with regard to the 5-year LPR requirement and the other with regard to 7-year continuous residence requirement. Only Respondent Martinez Gutierrez involved imputation with regard to the five years of lawful permanent residence requirement. Martinez Gutierrez, illegally entered the U.S. with his family in 1989, when he was five years old. Respondent’s father obtained a LPR status two years later; however, respondent never adjusted his status until 2003. Two years later respondent was apprehended and admitted to smuggling undocumented people across the border. He then applied for cancellation of removal. The IJ determined he could qualify for LPR § 240A(a)(1) and (a)(2) on his own because of his father’s status, but the Board reversed. Respondent appealed to the Court of Appeals, which reversed and remanded the decision to the Board. On appeal from the Ninth Circuit, the Supreme Court concluded that the Board’s interpretation of §240A(a)(1) is “based on a permissible construction of the statute,” and reversed the Ninth Circuit’s decision.

- This case is important because the Supreme Court reaffirmed the Board’s holding that a parent’s LPR status may not be imputed to their children to give the child the necessary 5 years of LPR status to qualify for cancellation or 7 years’ continuous residence.
(2). Has resided in the U.S. continuously for 7 years after having been admitted in any status

(A). Retroactivity

JURADO-DELGADO v. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 498 Fed. App. 101 (3d Cir. 2009) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether INA § 240A(a) can be applied retroactively to crimes committed by an LPR in 1991, before INA §240 was enacted?

HOLDING A noncitizen who committed crimes for which s/he was deportable under pre-Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act may be deportable under post-IIRIRA proceedings; the court left open the question as to whether Lawful Permanent Resident Cancellation of Removal can be applied retroactively to crimes committed before IIRIRA was enacted.

- Respondent, Jimmy Jurado-Delgado, a native and citizen of Ecuador, was admitted to the U.S. as an LPR in 1985. Jurado-Delgado conceded before an IJ that he was removable either under INA §237(a)(2)(A)(ii) for having been convicted of two crimes involving moral turpitude in 1997, or under INA § 237(a)(3)(D), for having falsely represented himself to be a U.S. citizen, but he requested Cancellation of Removal under INA §240A(a). The court held that Jurado-Delgado's 1991 crimes stopped his accrual of time toward a period of seven years of continuous residence because they were crimes involving moral turpitude, which rendered him inadmissible under § 212(a)(2)(A)(i). Jurado-Delgado petitioned for review of a final order of the Board. He argued, among other things, that the Board's determination that he was ineligible for Cancellation of Removal is the result of an impermissible, retroactive application of that statute. In his view, the Board, when determining whether he was statutorily eligible for Cancellation Of removal, was not entitled to take into account crimes that he committed prior to Congress's creation of that remedy. Because the Board applied the law in effect at the time Jurado-Delgado committed the deportable offense, no question of retroactivity was implicated. Here, the Third Circuit Court denied Jurado-Delgado's petition for review.

- This case is important because it suggests that INA § 240A(a) can be applied retroactively to crimes committed by an LPR before INA § 240A was enacted, such that the crimes can stop accrual of time toward a period of seven years of continuous residence.
GUZMAN V. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 770 F.3d 1077 (3d Cir. 2014) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether the stop-time rule can be applied retroactively to terminate the accrual of continuous residence for LPR Cancellation of Removal?

HOLDING The stop-time rule can be applied retroactively to terminate accrual of time required to satisfy the requisite 7-year continuous physical presence.

• Respondent, Cristian Guzman is a 38-year-old citizen of the Dominican Republic. He was admitted to the U.S. as an LPR on October 8, 1994 and had continually resided in the U.S. since that time. In 1995, Guzman was arrested in NY and charged with Criminal Possession of a Controlled Substance. On December 19, 1995, Guzman pled guilty to a lesser possession charge and was sentenced to 3 years’ probation. In 2005, he was again arrested and charged with Criminal Possession of a Controlled Substance and pled guilty. On December 1, 2005 he was sentenced to time served. On March 6, 2012, DHS served Guzman with an NTA and took him into custody based on the 2005 conviction pursuant to a controlled substance abuse (INA §237(a)(2)(B)(i)). He conceded removability, but applied for LPR Cancellation of Removal. The Government argued that Guzman was ineligible for the relief because the stop-time rule terminated his continuous residence when he committed the 1995 drug offense. Guzman argued that he could have accrued 7 years of continuous residence. Specifically, Guzman argued that (1) the application of the stop-time rule was impermissibly retroactive because the rule became effective on April 1, 1997 through IIRIRA, after he committed his 1995 drug offense; (2) he should be able to apply for the 212(c) deportation waiver, which was available prior to IIRIRA, and he should be able to delay his deportation, which was a strategy available prior to IIRIRA to allow him to accrue the 7 years of continuous presence for the 212(c) waiver; and, (3) the retroactive application of the stop-time rule was arbitrary and capricious because only LPRs who committed crimes within 7 years of admission were punished by being subject to the rule. Therefore, Guzman moved to terminate his deportation to apply for naturalization. The IJ held the stop-time rule was not arbitrary; therefore, Guzman was ineligible for Cancellation of Removal and for 212(c) because he had only accrued 1 year of continuous residence by the time he committed the 1995 crime. Further, Guzman had not made affirmative communication with DHS regarding his prima facie eligibility for naturalization, which is required to terminate the deportation so that the Petitioner can seek naturalization (In re Acosta Hidalgo). The Board affirmed the IJ’s holding and found that Guzman could not apply simultaneously for 212(c) relief and LPR Cancellation of Removal because 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(c)(6) explicitly precludes applying for both. Additionally, even if he could obtain a 212(c) waiver
notwithstanding his 1995 conviction, the conviction would still have ended his continuous residence for purposes of Cancellation of Removal because the 212(c) waiver does not serve to pardon, expunge, or eliminate all negative immigration consequences stemming from a noncitizen’s criminal conviction. The 3rd Circuit Court affirmed the Board’s decision that Guzman was ineligible to apply for the 212(c). The Court cited St. Cyr, wherein the noncitizen has accrued the required 7 years of continuous residence before IIRIRA became effective and removal proceedings commenced after IIRIRA became effective, thus, retroactive application of IIRIRA was held a “new disability” because the LPR already had a vested right to use 212(c) when he plead guilty. The 3rd Circuit Court also cited to Sinotes-Cruz, where the noncitizen committed a crime pre-IIRIRA that was later reclassified by IIRIRA as a deportable crime. Retroactive application was impermissible in that case because the LPR relied on the pre-IIRIRA law when he pled guilty. In the present case, the 3rd Circuit held that Guzman has no vested right in 212(c) because he did not have the requisite 7 years of continuous residence at the time he committed the 1995 crime, and the 1995 crime made him deportable. Thus, the stop-time rule was triggered and made him ineligible for LPR Cancellation of Removal.

- This case is important because the 3rd Circuit reinforced that an LPR may use 212(c) as relief only when the vested right to qualify under 212(c) existed at the time in which the crime was committed and that the stop-time rule does apply retroactively to terminate the accrual of continuous presence for purposes of LPR Cancellation of Removal. Additionally, the 3rd Circuit did not rule on whether the Board’s interpretation is correct when the Board held that an LPR cannot apply concurrently for 212(c) relief and LPR Cancellation of Removal.

(B). Re-entry After a Clock Stopping Event

MATTER OF CISNEROS-GONZALEZ, 23 I. & N. Dec. 668 (BIA 2004) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether a noncitizen who departed the U.S. after being served with a valid charging document can seek relief in a subsequent removal proceeding,

---

67 See, Sinotes-Cruz v Gonzales, 468 F.3d 1190 (9th Cir. 2006) (holding that the stop-time rule may not be applied retroactively to prevent noncitizens from fulfilling the seven-year continuous residence requirement when the noncitizen pleads guilty under the expectation that his plea will not affect his immigration status based on the law in effect at the time the noncitizen pleads guilty).
based on a new period of continuous physical presence measured from the date of his return?

**HOLDING** For purposes of applying for Cancellation of Removal, a noncitizen’s period of continuous physical presence ends when s/he is served with the charging document on which the current removal proceeding is based (8 U.S.C. § 1229b(d)(1)); the stop-time rule does not refer to charging documents served in prior proceedings.

- Respondent Ignacio Cisneros-Gonzalez’s first removal proceeding was in December 28, 1990. He was served with an Order to Show Cause, Notice of Hearing, and Warrant for Arrest of Alien (Form I-221S), charging him with deportability for having entered without inspection (former 8 U.S.C. §1251(a)(2)). On January 10, 1991 he was deported. On January 11, 1991 he returned to the U.S. without being admitted or paroled. On January 5, 2001, he applied for Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal, which requires continuous physical presence for 10 years. The IJ cited to Matter of Mendoza-Sandino as authority to apply the stop-time rule to Cisneros-Gonzalez’s first deportation proceeding from 1990, which would have made him ineligible for the relief. However, the Board’s legislative history analysis determined that Congress did not intend for the stop-time rule under INA §240A(d)(1) to ban noncitizens from seeking Cancellation of Removal relief. The “stop-time” rule was not intended to extend to charging documents issued in earlier proceedings. Thus, the Board sustained Cisneros-Gonzalez’s appeal and remanded the case.

- This case is important because the Board distinguishes this case from Matter of Mendoza-Sandino, 22 I. & N. Dec. 1236 (BIA 2000). There, the noncitizen applied for suspension of deportation based on a single order to show cause. Here, however, multiple charging documents existed. When the DHS does not or cannot reinstate a prior order of removal against a previously deported noncitizen and instead issues a new order of removal, the noncitizen may be eligible to apply for Cancellation of Removal based on the accrual of the new continuous presence (§ 240A(b)) or new continuous residence (§ 240A(a)). Importantly, note that Cisneros-Gonzalez was applied to § 240A(b) [Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal], rather than § 240A(a) [LPR Cancellation of Removal]. Under § 240A(d)(1), however, the stop-time rule applies to both LPR Cancellation of Removal’s continuous residence requirement (§ 240A(a)(2)) and Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal’s continuous physical presence requirement (§ 240A(b)(2)).

**ISSUE** Whether a noncitizen is entitled to a new period of continuous physical presence based on a new period of continuous physical presence measured from the date of his return?
presence, commencing upon his lawful reentry into the U.S., so as to allow him to accrue the time required to establish eligibility for Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal?

**HOLDING** A noncitizen who lawfully reenters the U.S. after overstaying a visa may start a new accrual of time for purposes of satisfying the requisite 10-year continuous physical presence when the noncitizen’s Notice to Appear exclusively charges the noncitizen with being a visa overstay.

- Respondent, Anderson Jude Okeke, a native and citizen of Nigeria, petitioned for review of two orders from the Board. Those orders affirmed the Immigration Judge's decision that Okeke could not demonstrate the requisite continuous physical presence in the U.S. in order to qualify for Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal. Essentially, the Board found that the 'stop-time' provision (INA § 240A(d)(1)), once triggered, precluded the accrual of a new period of continuous presence, which in this case commenced with Okeke's lawful reentry into the U.S. The lawful reentry, which was the critical fact on appeal, occurred after Okeke committed a controlled substance offense, which, pursuant to INA § 240A(d)(1), clearly ended any prior period of continuous physical residence. This court concluded that the clock restarted upon Okeke's reentry. Pursuant to the express terms of the NTA, it was the last reentry into the U.S. that should have been considered in calculating continuous physical presence.

- This case is important because a noncitizen is entitled to a new period of continuous physical presence under INA § 240A(d)(1), commencing upon his lawful reentry into the U.S., so as to allow him to accrue the time required to establish eligibility for Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal. Here, the Third Circuit is applying the holding in Cisneros. Though this holding applies to Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal, the holding could also apply to LPR Cancellation of Removal as INA § 240A(d)(1) refers to both continuous physical presence under Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal and continuous residence under LPR Cancellation of Removal.

**MATTER OF NELSON, 25 I. & N. Dec. 410 (BIA 2011) [Precedent]:**

**ISSUE** Whether a noncitizen is entitled to a new period of continuous residence, commencing upon his reentry into the U.S., so as to allow him to accrue the time required to establish eligibility for LPR Cancellation of Removal?

**HOLDING** “Once an alien has been convicted of an offense that stops the accrual of the 7-year period of continuous residence required for cancellation of removal...section 240A(d)(1) of the Act does not permit such residence to restart simply because the alien has departed from, and returned to the United States.”
Respondent, Michael Alexander Nelson, a native and citizen of Jamaica, was admitted as a LPR on November 3, 1994. On February 20, 1999, Respondent was convicted of a New York offense for possession of marijuana. In August 2000, Respondent visited Canada and thereafter returned to the U.S.. On November 26, 2008, Nelson was served with an NTA because of his criminal offense of possession of marijuana. The IJ found that Nelson was removable based on his 1999 convictions and that Nelson failed to show eligibility for Cancellation of Removal because he had not accrued continuous residence for 7 years. Specifically, the IJ found that Nelson could not re-start the clock when he re-entered after his trip to Canada. Thus, according to the IJ, the clock stopped for purposes of accruing continuous residence time on February 20, 1999, at which point Nelson had not resided in the U.S. for 7 years. On appeal, Nelson argued that he was eligible for Cancellation of Removal because his reentry into the U.S. after his trip to Canada, restarted the clock. Thus, the date that the stopped the time for accrual of residence was November 2008, rather than February 1999. The Board affirmed the IJ’s decision. In so holding, the Board found that the facts in Okeke v. Attorney General differ. In Okeke, the respondent had been removed for possession of marijuana, and thereafter returned to the U.S. lawfully on a student visa. The respondent in Okeke, was then placed into removal proceedings for failing to maintain a student status. Here, the Board found that the fact that the new removal proceedings were related to the clock stopping event distinguished the Nelson’s case from that of Okeke. Unlike the respondent in Okeke, here Nelson’s removal proceedings are on account of his conviction. Therefore, the Board concluded that Okeke, was not “binding” in this case. However, the Board did suggest that it may have come to a different result should Nelson have received a waiver prior to his reentry into the U.S..

This case is important because the holding provides that lawful reentry into the U.S. after a clock-stopping event will not re-start the clock for purposes of 7-years continuous residence when the clock-stopping event was the basis for removal. Further, this distinguishes the holding in Okeke v. Attorney General, providing a further wrinkle in that the clock cannot restart after lawful re-entry, if the basis for removal is the prior clock stopping event.

SINGH V. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 807 F.3d 547 (3d Cir. 2015) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether a noncitizen convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude (CIMT) can use a re-entry to restart the clock to satisfy the seven-year continuous residency requirement?

HOLDING An LPR convicted of a CIMT cannot reenter as a method to restart the clock
to accrue the requisite 7-year continuous residence.

• Respondent, Narinder Singh, was a native and citizen of India. He was granted asylum on July 1, 1993, and adjusted to LPR status on June 1, 1994. On September 14, 2000, he was convicted in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Florida of conspiracy to counterfeit passports, counterfeiting and using visas, and mail fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371. He was also convicted of unlawful possession of forged, counterfeited, altered, and falsely made nonimmigrant U.S. visas in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1546. Singh departed the U.S and re-entered on January 20, 2003. In October 2009, he applied for admission to the U.S. as an LPR. On January 10, 2010, Immigration and Customs Enforcement detained him. On January 19, 2010, he was served with a Notice to Appear charging him as inadmissible because he had a counterfeiting conviction, a crime involving moral turpitude. Singh applied for Cancellation of Removal but the IJ denied the petition and the Board dismissed his appeal based on a finding that he had not accrued seven years of continuous residence in the U.S. to be eligible for Cancellation of Removal pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(a) [240A(a)]. Singh then filed a petition for review arguing that his 2003 re-entry restarted the clock for purposes of the seven-year residence requirement. However, the Court held that when Singh committed the CIMT, the clock both stopped and permanently prevented the clock from restarting. The Third Circuit cited to its Okeke decision that where there is a entry, the clock starts “anew.” However, the Third Circuit court distinguishes Okeke from the present case because in the former, the basis for removal was that the noncitizen was a visa-overstay. Thus, the court relied instead on the Nelson case in which the noncitizen’s removal was based on a crime that terminated his continuous residence and his continuous presence. Because Singh’s conviction involved a CIMT, the CIMT terminated his continuous residence and continuous presence so his re-entry could not restart the clock.

• This case is important because it reaffirms that re-entry can re-start the clock after a “clock stopping event” (i.e., receipt of a NTA), except when the NTA states the “clock stopping event” as the cause for removal. Here, the Third Circuit distinguished in part and applied in part the holding in Okeke and thereby Cisneros-Gonzalez, to the context of LPR Cancellation of Removal.

(C). An Incomplete NTA’s Application to Stop-Time Rule

MATTER OF CAMARILLO, 25 I. & N. Dec. 644 (BIA 2011) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether an NTA that does not include the date and time of the initial
Hearing can stop the clock for purposes of Cancellation of Removal?

**HOLDING**

In-person service of an NTA that does not indicate a date or time of hearing is nevertheless sufficient to terminate the continuous residence of an LPR.

- Respondent, Judith Camarillo, was a native and citizen of Guatemala who became a LPR in 2000. On August 29, 2005, she was served in person with a Notice to Appear, which included the phrase “To be set” in the space provided for the date and time of the hearing. The NTA was later filed with the Harlingen Immigration Court, which issued a notice of hearing on November 9, 2007. She was charged with alien smuggling and the IJ found her removable. But the IJ granted her petition for Cancellation of Removal on the grounds that Camarillo had accrued the required seven-years of continuous residence by the time the Court issued the notice that contained the hearing date. The IJ interpreted the terms in 239(a)(1) of 8 U.S.C. §1229(a)(1)(G), “[t]he time and place at which the proceedings will be held,” as requirements for an NTA so that the stop-time rule takes effect. DHS appealed, arguing that section §1229(a)(1) specifies that an NTA must be served, and the terms in §1229(a)(1)(G) help identify what an NTA is. The Board agreed with the DHS that the key phrase was “served a notice to appear” and the Congress intended the phrase “under section 239(a)” after “notice to appear” to specify the document the DHS must serve to trigger the “stop-time” rule. Additionally, the court highlighted that removal proceedings commence when the NTA is **filed** with the Immigration Court. 8 C.F.R. § 1239.1(a) (2011). Since the commencement of proceedings is a separate issue from the **service** of the NTA, what mattered was the NTA that Camarillo was served in person. Thus, Camarillo was not eligible for Cancellation of Removal because she had not accrued seven-years at the time she was served in 2005. The court sustained the appeal by DHS.

- This case is important because the holding found that the NTA will suffice to end continuous residence, regardless if there is a date or time for the hearing on the NTA at the time the noncitizen is served. The court also distinguished that the date that mattered for purposes of terminating continuous residence is the date that the NTA was served and not the date on which removal proceedings commence nor the date that the NTA is filed. Peculiarly, the Board never makes any conclusions regarding Camarillo’s criminal conviction for smuggling aliens into the U.S., which could have been a reason to stop time for purposes of the 7 years of continuous residence.
(D). Ability to Impute Parent’s Continuous Residence Time

MATTER OF RAMIREZ-VARGAS, 24 I.& N. Dec. 599 (BIA 2008) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether a parent's lawful permanent resident status can be imputed to a child for purposes of calculating the 5 years of lawful permanent residence required to establish for cancellation of removal under § 240A(a)(1)?

HOLDING A parent’s LPR residence may not be imputed to his or her child for purpose of the 7-year continuous residence requirement.

- Respondent, Ramirez-Vargas, a native and citizen of Mexico and an LPR of the U.S., was found removable as a noncitizen convicted of a controlled substance violation but granted his application for Cancellation of Removal. The DHS appealed, arguing that the IJ erred in finding the respondent statutorily eligible for that relief because the lawful permanent residence of the noncitizen's father could not be imputed to the noncitizen. The Board sustained the appeal by DHS. The Board held that a parent's period of residence in the U.S. cannot be imputed to a child for purposes of calculating the 7 years of continuous residence required to establish eligibility for Cancellation of Removal under INA § 240A(a)(2).

- This case is important because it rejected the 9th Circuit Court’s holding that imputation of a parent’s LPR status to a child was permissible. Matter Of Escobar, 24 I. & N. Dec. 231 (BIA 2007). Matter of Escobar was vacated in 2009 and currently all Circuit Courts hold that imputation of a parent’s continuance residence is impermissible.

AUGUSTIN v. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 520 F.3d 264 (3d Cir. 2008) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether a noncitizen who entered the U.S. as a minor can impute his parent's years of continuous residence in order to meet the seven-year requirement for Cancellation of Removal?

HOLDING A parent’s LPR residence may not be imputed to his or her child for purpose of the 7-year continuous residence requirement.

- Respondent, Luckson Augustin, was admitted to the U.S. as an LPR at the age of 13 to join his parents who had previously come to the U.S.. Approximately five years after coming to the U.S., the noncitizen committed a crime involving moral turpitude. He was later charged with being removable based in part on that crime. The noncitizen admitted the allegations but argued that he was eligible for Cancellation of Removal based on his father's seven years of continuous residence in the U.S. prior to any of the crimes being committed. The Board rejected that argument, interpreting the statute as requiring that the noncitizen himself actually
dwell in the U.S. for seven years before committing the crime. On review, the court held that the Board's denial of Cancellation of Removal and its refusal to impute the father's years of residence was permissible because it was a straightforward application of the statute's requirements.

● This case is important because it affirms, under Chevron deference, the view that a parent's residence may not be imputed to his or her minor child for purposes of the seven-year residence provision of cancellation. This case affirms the Board’s reasoning in Matter of Ramirez Vargas, 24 I. & N. Dec. 599 (BIA 2008).

(E). Date to Stop Time of Continuous Residence

MATTER OF PEREZ, 22 I. & N. Dec. 689 (BIA 1999) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether the "stop-time" rule operates to terminate the period of continuous residence required for Cancellation of Removal as of the date the noncitizen commits the offense that renders him/her deportable?

HOLDING The stop-time rule is triggered by a noncitizen who violates a provision in INA § 212(a)(2), § 237(a)(2) or 237(a)(4).

● Respondent Cristobal Perez, admitted each of the factual allegations in the Notice to Appear. Specifically, he admitted that was first admitted as a temporary resident on September 21, 1989, and that his status was subsequently adjusted to that of an LPR on December 7, 1990. The noncitizen further admitted that he was convicted on July 11, 1997, in Texas, of possession of cocaine, and that this offense was committed on or about August 4, 1992. The noncitizen conceded that he was removable as charged under section 237(a)(2)(B)(i) of the Act on the basis of this conviction and the IJ ordered him removed. The noncitizen appealed to the Board on the basis of the retroactive effect of § 240A, arguing that the section's rules limiting eligibility for relief from removal should not apply to him. The Board, after finding that applying Section 240A would not have an impermissible "retroactive effect," concluded that the respondent's period of continuous residence is deemed to have ended on the date he committed his controlled substance violation. The commission of that offense was prior to his attainment of the required 7 years of continuous residence. Therefore, he was statutorily ineligible for section 240A(a) Cancellation of Removal. Accordingly, the Board found that the IJ's pretermission of his application for Cancellation of Removal was proper.

● This case is important because the Board concluded that "admission in any status" includes admission as a temporary resident. Also, "Under INA
240A(d)(l)(B), continuous residence is deemed to end upon the commission of an offense under INA § 212(a)(2), or INA § 237(a)(2) or § 237(a)(4). The time period is measured from the commission of the crime, not the conviction."

MATTER OF CAMPOS-TORRES, 22 I. & N. Dec. 1289 (BIA 2000) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether the noncitizen’s commission of a firearms offense, which is not referred to in INA § 212(a)(2), precluded him from satisfying the requirement in INA § 240A(a)(2) that he have resided in the U.S. continuously for 7 years after having been admitted in any status?

HOLDING A noncitizen triggers the stop-time rule when s/he violates a provision that is actually found in 212(a)(2).

- Respondent Ignacio Campos-Torres, was admitted to the U.S. as a temporary resident on May 4, 1988, and adjusted his status to that of an LPR on December 13, 1990. On September 23, 1993 the noncitizen was convicted of a single offense of unlawful use of a weapon. The noncitizen was sentenced to 18 months of probation. On June 25, 1997, the INS issued and served a NTA, commencing removal proceedings and charging the noncitizen with removability. The issue that was raised before the IJ and argued in the initial briefs submitted on appeal concerned the appropriate date to apply in determining when accrual of continuous residence ends. The noncitizen argued that under the plain language of the statute, firearms offenses do not cut off continuous residence because they are not "referred to" in § 212(a)(2) of the Act. The government argued that the plain language of INA § 240A(d)(l) does not clearly support either its position or that of the noncitizen because the statute is ambiguous. The Board found that because the noncitizen's firearms offense, which rendered him deportable under INA § 237(a)(2)(C), is not referred to in INA § 212(a)(2), it did not stop time under INA § 240A(d)(l).

- This case is important because the Board held that "an offense must be one 'referred to in section 212(a)(2)' of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2) (1994 & Supp. II 1996), to terminate the period of continuous residence or continuous physical presence required for cancellation of removal.'"

MATTER OF DEANDA-ROMO, 23 I. & N. Dec. 597 (BIA 2003) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether a noncitizen who has committed two crimes involving moral turpitude is precluded from establishing the requisite 7 years of continuous residence for cancellation of removal under INA §240A(a)(2), where his first crime was a petty offense that was committed within the 7-year period and the second crime was committed more than 7 years after his admission to the U.S.?
HOLDING The stop-time rule is triggered by crimes for which a noncitizen is inadmissible; however, the stop-time rule is not triggered by petty offenses.

- Respondent Jose Abraham Deanda-Romo, was admitted to the U.S. as an LPR on January 8, 1992. On September 21, 1999, he was convicted in Texas of two misdemeanor offenses of assault with bodily injury to his spouse, one occurring on October 30, 1998, and the other on June 20, 1999. He was sentenced to imprisonment for both offenses. He conceded removability and applied for LPR Cancellation of Removal. The IJ terminated the application after finding that the noncitizen was ineligible for relief under the "stop-time" rule. The Board held that the noncitizen was not precluded by the stop-time rule from establishing the requisite seven years of continuous residence because his first crime qualified as a petty offense, under INA 212(a)(2)(A)(ii)(II), and therefore did not render him inadmissible. Thus, according to the Board, the noncitizen had accrued the requisite seven years of continuous residence before the second offense was committed.

- This case is important because the court held that the stop-time rule does not apply until the second conviction where the first conviction was a petty offense.

DUDNEY v. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 129 Fed. Appx. 747 (3d Cir. 2005) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether an LPR's 1998 conviction stopped the clock for purposes of the continuous residence requirement of INA §240A(a)(2)?

HOLDING The stop-time rule may be triggered by a noncitizen when s/he commits a crime for which a noncitizen is deportable.

- Respondent Barrington Dudney, was admitted to the U.S. as an immigrant in August 1992. In October 1998, he was convicted of possession and possession with the intent to deliver a controlled substance (92 packets of marijuana). On August 3, 1999, he was convicted of possession of a controlled substance, simple assault and for resisting arrest during an August 20, 1998 incident. Dudney also was convicted on August 31, 1999 of charges of simple assault, possession of an instrument of crime and recklessly endangering another person in an incident on February 19, 1999. In June 1999, the INS issued a NTA charging Dudney with removability based upon his October 1998 conviction. A removal order was entered after Dudney failed to appear for his hearing, but the IJ later terminated the proceedings due to insufficient evidence. In October 2001, the INS issued another NTA charging Dudney with removability for having committed an aggravated felony (drug trafficking), two crimes involving moral turpitude not arising out of a single scheme of criminal misconduct, and a violation of
law relating to a controlled substance, other than a single offense involving possession for one's own use of 30 grams or less of marijuana. These charges were based on the October 1998 and August 31, 1999 convictions. The NTA was then amended, and the August 3, 1999 convictions for drug possession and simple assault, and another aggravated felony charge were added. Through counsel, Dudney sought cancellation of removal as a permanent resident pursuant to INA § 240A(a). The IJ found Dudney removable for a violation of law relating to a controlled substance, other than a single offense involving possession for one's own use of 30 grams or less of marijuana, based on his August 3, 1999 drug conviction. The Board also agreed with the IJ that Dudney was not eligible for cancellation of removal because he did not meet the requirement that he have continuous residence here for seven years. The Board explained that even if Dudney could not be removed based upon his October 1998 conviction because the proceedings related to this conviction were terminated, the October 1998 conviction stopped the clock for purposes of the seven-year residence requirement. Alternatively, Dudney’s continuous residence stopped as early as August 20, 1998 when the crime was committed.

- This case is important because it affirms that an LPR must satisfy INA § 240A(a)(2), the seven-year continuous residence requirement, in order to be eligible for LPR Cancellation of Removal, and furthermore that commission of the deportable crime or conviction for the deportable crime may stop the accrual of time.

MATTER OF JURADO, 24 I. & N. Dec. 29 (BIA 2006) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether a noncitizen needs to be charged with a crime and found inadmissible or removable in order for the criminal conduct in question to terminate continuous residence?

HOLDING A noncitizen who committed crimes for which s/he was deportable under pre-IIRIRA may be deportable under post-IIRIRA proceedings; the Board left open the question as to whether LPR cancellation of removal can be applied retroactively to crimes committed before IIRIRA was enacted.

- Respondent Jimmy Roberto Jurado, was admitted to the U.S. as an LPR on September 15, 1985. He was convicted in 1991 of retail theft in violation of Pennsylvania law. In 1992 he was also convicted of unsworn falsification to authorities. In addition, the noncitizen was convicted in 1997 of two crimes involving moral turpitude that were the basis of the charge of removability in his NTA. In proceedings before the IJ, the noncitizen conceded that he was removable, both on the initial charge
and on a lodged charge that he falsely represented himself to be a U.S. citizen. He applied for Cancellation of Removal under section 240A(a) of the Act, which the IJ granted. On appeal, the DHS contended that the noncitizen failed to demonstrate the requisite period of continuous residence to establish his eligibility for Cancellation of Removal. The Board agreed and found that the IJ erred in concluding that the noncitizen was eligible for cancellation of removal.

- This case is important because the Board concluded that the time period of a crime is measured from the commission of the crime, not the conviction.

(F). Stop-Time Rule’s Application to 5 years as Lawful Permanent Resident

JOSEPH v. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 236 Fed. Appx. 787 (3d Cir. 2007) [Precedent]:

ISSUE  Whether an LPR is eligible for Cancellation of Removal when he commits a controlled substance violation, triggering the statute's "stop-time" provision under § 240A(d)(1)?

HOLDING  The stop-time rule only terminates the accrual of time for purposes of satisfying the requisite 7-year continuous residence; the stop-time rule does not apply to the 5-years of permanent residency requirement.

- Respondent George Russel Joseph entered the U.S. in 1992 as a conditional resident and became an LPR in 1994. A NTA that was dated June 15, 2005 placed him in removal proceedings. He was charged with being removable because in August of 1997 he committed a controlled substance violation and an aggravated felony. He was convicted in January of 1998. The IJ found him removable for committing the controlled substance violation, but found that the Government had not met its burden of showing that any of his convictions were also aggravated felonies. Nevertheless, the IJ found Joseph ineligible for Cancellation of removal under INA § 240A(a). Joseph appealed to the Board, but the Board affirmed that Joseph was ineligible for LPR Cancellation of Removal because he did not have the required 5 years of permanent residence. The Board applied the stop-time rule to Joseph’s permanent residence status, and calculated that his status as a permanent resident began in 1994 and terminated in 1998 when he was convicted. Joseph then appealed to the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, which held that the Board impermissibly applied the stop-time rule to the requirement of 5 years of permanent residence, and the stop-time rule only applies to the 7 years of continuous residence. Joseph had met the permanent residency requirement. However, the Board still found him ineligible for LPR Cancellation of Removal because his conviction did trigger
the stop-time rule for purposes of the 7 years of continuous residence requirement. To calculate Joseph’s continuous residence, the Board counted the time from when Joseph was admitted in 1992 to the date he committed the crime in 1997 and determined he did not have the 7 years of continuous residence. Thus, the court denied Joseph’s petition for review.

- This case is important because it reaffirms that the stop-time rule applies only to the requirement of 7 years of continuous residence.

**G. Nonimmigrant Status and 7 Years Continuous Residence Requirement**

**IN RE BLANCAS-LARA, 23 I. & N. Dec. 458 (BIA 2002) [Precedent]:**

**ISSUE** Whether the period of a noncitizen's residence in the U.S. after admission as a nonimmigrant may be considered in calculating the 7 years of continuous residence required to establish eligibility for cancellation of removal.

**HOLDING** A noncitizen’s admission as a nonimmigrant may be used to calculate the start of 7-year continuous residence requirement.

- Respondent Eduardo Blancas-Lara was first admitted to the U.S. in August 1986 with a border-crossing card. He adjusted his status to that of an LPR on August 5, 1991. The noncitizen's period of continuous residence under section 240A(a)(2) of the Act ended on April 1, 1998, when he was served with a Notice to Appear. At that point, the noncitizen had resided in the U.S. as an LPR for about 6 years and 8 months. The IJ concluded that the noncitizen could count time he spent in the U.S. as a child before his admission as an LPR toward the accrual of 7 years of continuous residence under section 240A(a)(2), because the lawful residence of his father, a citizen and resident of the U.S., could be imputed to him. On appeal the Board found that the noncitizen established that, at the time of his application for relief, he had resided in the U.S. continuously for 7 years after having been admitted as a nonimmigrant. Thus, an applicant who is admitted with a nonimmigrant visa, and accrues the 7 years of continuous residence to meet the second element of the statute, does not need an imputation argument. Accordingly, the Board concurred with the IJ's decision and dismissed the appeal.

- This case is important because the Board stated that the period of a noncitizen's residence in the U.S. after admission as a nonimmigrant may be considered in calculating the seven years of continuous residence required to establish eligibility for cancellation of removal.
**Has not been convicted of any aggravated felony**

**(A). Categorical Approach**

**ISSUE**

Whether a conviction for trafficking in counterfeit goods or services in violation of the Trademark Counterfeiting Act of 1984, 18 U.S.C. §2320, is a conviction for "an offense relating to ... counterfeiting," pursuant to INA §101(a)(43)(R) (and an aggravated felony)?

**HOLDING**

A noncitizen who commits an aggravated felony as defined in INA §101(a)(43) is ineligible for LPR Cancellation of Removal and 18 U.S.C. 2320 is an aggravated felony.

- **Respondent Yong Wong Park** was admitted to the U.S. as an immigrant on or around February 12, 1998. On February 18, 2000, Park pleaded guilty in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York to one count of trafficking in counterfeit goods or services from at least February 1997 through October 1997, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2320. After his conviction, the DHS initiated removal proceedings. The court found that Park's conviction under 18 U.S.C. §2320 was an offense relating to counterfeiting for purposes of the definition of "aggravated felony" under INA § 101(a)(43)(R). Park applied for LPR Cancellation under INA §240A(a) but because he had been convicted of an aggravated felony, he was ineligible for Cancellation of Removal. Park's petition for review was dismissed.

- **This case is important because a conviction for trafficking in counterfeit goods or services in violation of the Trademark Counterfeiting Act of 1984, 18 U.S.C. §2320, is an aggravated felony because it is a conviction for "an offense relating to ... counterfeiting," pursuant to INA § 101(a)(43)(R). Therefore, a noncitizen with this type of conviction will be unsuccessful applying for LPR Cancellation of Removal.**

**ISSUE**

Whether a conviction under a statute that criminalizes conduct described by the Controlled Substance Act’s (CSA) 21 U.S.C. §841’s felony provision and its misdemeanor provision, such as a statute that punishes all marijuana distribution without regard to the amount or remuneration, is a conviction for an offense punishable as a felony under the CSA?

**HOLDING**

To be a categorical federal drug offense for immigration purposes, a state drug offense must necessarily correspond to an offense punishable as a felony under the Controlled Substance Act.
Respondent Adrian Moncrieffe legally entered the U.S. in 1984. In 2007 he was stopped for a traffic violation and was found in possession of 1.3 grams of marijuana. He pleaded guilty under Georgia law to possession of marijuana with intent to distribute. He was placed in removal proceedings on the grounds that his conviction was an aggravated felony because possession of marijuana with intent to distribute is a Controlled Substance Act offense, 21 U.S.C. §841(a), punishable by up to five years' imprisonment, §841(b)(1)(D). An IJ ordered his removal, and the Board affirmed. The Fifth Circuit denied Moncrieffe’s petition to review his argument that his conviction met CSA’s §841(b)(4), which makes marijuana distribution punishable as a misdemeanor if the offense involves a small amount for no remuneration. The U.S. Supreme Court granted certiorari to resolve whether the state conviction qualified as an aggravated felony when applying the categorical approach. A state drug offense must meet two conditions: 1) the offense must “necessarily” proscribe conduct that is an offense under the CSA, and 2) the CSA must “necessarily” prescribe felony punishment for that conduct. Unlike the federal statute, the Georgia statute is ambiguous as to whether the conduct proscribed involved remuneration or the amount of controlled substances needed to be a violation. Thus, because the conviction did not “necessarily” involve facts that correspond to an offense punishable as a felony under the CSA, the Court held the offense was not a categorical aggravated felony. The Court reversed and remanded the case.

This case is important because when there is ambiguity in the state conviction, then the facts may not “necessarily” correspond to an offense punishable as a felony under the CSA. A noncitizen’s conviction for a marijuana distribution offense can fail to qualify as an aggravated felony if there is no remuneration or no more than a small amount of marijuana.

MELLOULI V. LYNCH, 135 S. Ct. 1980 (2015) [Precedent]:

**ISSUE**

Whether a state drug-paraphernalia misdemeanor meets the categorical definition of controlled substance under the Controlled Substance Act when the state misdemeanor is silent as to the controlled substance?

**HOLDING**

To be a categorical federal drug offense for immigration purposes, a state law violation for controlled substances must be an offense for a controlled substance as defined in the Controlled Substance Act.

Respondent Moones Mellouli, a citizen of Tunisia, entered the U.S. on a student visa in 2004. In 2009, he became a conditional permanent resident and, in 2011, an LPR. In 2010, he pleaded guilty to a misdemeanor offense under Kansas law, the possession of drug paraphernalia to “store, contain,
conceal, inject, ingest, inhale or otherwise introduce a controlled substance into the human body.” Kan. Stat. Ann. §21-5709(b)(2). Under the Kansas law, it was immaterial whether the substance was scheduled in the Controlled Substance Act, 21 U. S. C. §802. The State did not charge, or seek to prove, that Mellouli possessed a substance on the §802 schedules. The sole “paraphernalia” Mellouli was charged with possessing was a sock in which he had placed four orange tablets. The criminal charge and plea agreement did not identify the controlled substance involved, although Mellouli had acknowledged the tablets were Adderall. Mellouli was sentenced to a suspended term of 359 days and 12 months’ probation, after which DHS placed him in removal proceedings. The Board affirmed the immigration judge's decision and he was removed. The Eighth Circuit denied Mellouli’s petition for review. The Supreme Court then granted certiorari and applied the categorical approach. The Court held that since the record did not prove that Mellouli’s conviction was based on possession of a drug on the §802 schedule, the conviction could not be a categorical controlled substance conviction.

This case is important because an offense for drug-paraphernalia possession must specify whether the controlled substance is scheduled in the Controlled Substance Act to meet the criteria for a controlled substance offense. Please note Mellouli was not found deportable of an aggravated felony, but rather deportable because Mellouli was found guilty of a crime involving controlled substance under INA §237(a)(2)(B). This case is included as an example of the application of the categorical approach.

(B). Modified Categorical Approach

DESCAMPS V. U.S., 133 S.Ct. 2276 (2013) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether the modified categorical approach applies to statutes that “contain a single, “indivisible” set of elements?”

HOLDING The modified categorical approach does not apply to statutes that contain a single, indivisible set of elements.

• Respondent Michael Descamps was convicted of being “a felon in possession of a firearm” and the government sought an enhanced sentence “based on Descamps’ prior state convictions for burglary, robbery, and felony harassment.” To be subject to the enhanced sentencing, the statute requires that the person had been previously convicted of a 3 violent felonies or a serious drug offense. A “violent felony” is one which “has as an element the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against the person of another,” or that is a “burglary, arson or extortion, involves
use of explosives or otherwise involves conduct that presents a serious potential risk of physical injury to another.” Descamps argued that his past conviction was not within the meaning of the “violent felony” and therefore he could not be subject to the enhanced sentencing. The prior California felony that Descamps had been convicted found guilty a “person who enters” certain locations “with intent to commit grand or petit larceny or any felony.” Unlike the federal statute, Descamps argues, the California statute did not require that a person enter into the location unlawfully; therefore, the California statute was not a categorical match. Both the District Court and the Ninth Circuit disagreed with Descamps, and applied the modified categorical approach to look to “certain documents, including the record of the plea colloquy, to discover whether Descamps had “admitted the elements of a generic burglary” when entering his plea.” The District Court and the Ninth Circuit concluded that Descamps’ crime was within the meaning of the federal statute of burglary but Descamps appealed. The Supreme Court concluded that the California statute was indivisible, and therefore, the lower courts erred in applying the modified categorical approach. The Court found that the purpose of the modified categorical approach was to help “effectuate the categorical analysis when a divisible statute, listing potential offense elements in the alternative, renders opaque which element played a part in the defendant’s conviction.” The Court illustrated that a statute may be indivisible, for example, when a statute of burglary includes both “entry into an automobile as well as a building.” In such a situation, entering an automobile, would not be within the generic federal definition; however, the alternative, “entry into… a building” would be within the generic federal definition. Because, in this hypothetical situations, the statute would not reveal which alternative the defendant was convicted, courts could look to the plea agreement, the colloquy between the judge and the defendant, or indictment so as to determine which alternative was used. On the other hand, where a statute is indivisible, courts should apply the categorical approach and may “only look to the statutory definitions,” of the defendant’s prior offenses, and not “to the particular facts underlying those convictions.” Here, the statute of Descamps prior conviction was not divisible, as the statute does not have a list of alternatives.

This case is important because it shows an example of the application of the modified categorical approach and sets forth that the “sentencing courts may not consult additional documents when a defendant was convicted under an “indivisible” statutes.”
(C). Simultaneous Applications for Relief if Applicant Committed an Aggravated Felony

RODRIGUEZ-MUNOZ v. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 419 F.3d 245 (3d Cir. 2005) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether a noncitizen who has been convicted of an aggravated felony can seek simultaneous INA §212(c) and cancellation of removal relief.

HOLDING A crime involving moral turpitude that may be waivable under §212(c) may nevertheless be an aggravated felony that renders a noncitizen ineligible for LPR Cancellation of Removal?

• Respondent Richard Jose Rodriguez-Munoz was admitted to the U.S. as an LPR in 1976. In 1992, he pled guilty to four drug offenses in New York state court, including third degree criminal sale of a controlled substance (crack cocaine). In 1994, the INS charged Rodriguez-Munoz with deportability as a noncitizen convicted of an aggravated felony and as being convicted of a violation relating to a controlled substance. While the immigration proceedings were pending, Rodriguez-Munoz pled guilty in New York to two additional offenses: fifth degree criminal possession of marijuana and seventh degree criminal possession of a controlled substance. The government acknowledged that there was no question that Rodriguez-Munoz was eligible to apply for a INA § 212(c), waiver of deportation concerning his 1992 conviction. Indeed, § 212(c) relief remained available for noncitizens whose convictions were obtained through plea agreements and who, notwithstanding those convictions, would have been eligible for § 212(c) relief at the time of their plea under the law then in effect. Rodriguez-Munoz apparently did not argue before the Board that his 1992 conviction was not an aggravated felony, nor did he raise such an argument on appeal. Although a waiver of deportation gave him a chance to stay in the U.S. despite his misdeed, it did not expunge his conviction. Thus, even if Rodriguez-Munoz's deportation based on his 1992 conviction were waived under § 212(c), that conviction would nonetheless remain an aggravated felony for purposes of precluding his application for cancellation of removal under INA§ 240A. Thus, he was deportable.

• This case is important because a noncitizen who has an aggravated felony conviction along with other crimes of moral turpitude cannot seek simultaneous INA § 212(c) and Cancellation of Removal relief, because the aggravated felony makes him or her ineligible for Cancellation of Removal.
(D). Availability of Alternative Discretionary Relief if Convicted of an Aggravated Felony

SCHEIDEMANN v. INS, 83 F.3d 1517 (3d Cir. 1996) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether an LPR who has served at least five years of imprisonment for a crime defined as an aggravated felony (under the original 1988 definition) is eligible to apply for a discretionary waiver of deportation under § 212(c).

HOLDING A noncitizen who has been convicted of an aggravated felony with a 5-year sentence is ineligible for relief under INA § 212(c).

• Respondent James Scheidemann was an LPR since 1959. Scheidemann sought review of an order of the Board, which dismissed his appeal to overturn a deportation order. Scheidemann faced deportation on account of a 1987 drug trafficking conviction for which he had served over five years in prison. Scheidemann did not contest his deportability. Rather, he argued that he was eligible to apply for a discretionary waiver of deportation under INA § 212(c). The court held that Congress intended § 212(c) to restrict the Attorney General's power to exercise discretionary relief, immediately after the amendment to the aggravated felony statute, with respect to noncitizens who had served at least five years imprisonment for crimes defined as aggravated felonies under the original 1988 definition, regardless of the conviction date. Accordingly, Scheidemann's petition for review was denied.

• This case is important because an LPR who has served at least five years of imprisonment for a crime defined as an aggravated felony (under the original 1988 definition) will not be eligible to apply for a discretionary waiver of deportation under the former § 212(c).

(4). Discretionary Component of LPR Cancellation of Removal

(A). Standard for Determining Discretionary Component

MATTER OF MARIN, 16 I. & N. Dec. 581 (BIA 1978) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether a waiver of deportation/cancellation of removal provides an indiscriminate waiver for all who demonstrate statutory eligibility for such relief?

HOLDING Waivers of deportation/cancellation do not provide indiscriminate relief for all who demonstrate statutory eligibility for such relief. Rather, the adjudicator will consider positive and adverse factors, as set forth below.

• Respondent Marin was admitted as a LPR on February 3, 1965. In March
1976, he pled guilty to the felony charge of criminal sale of cocaine. He served 30 months in New York State penal institutions. In May 1977 he was served with an order to show cause and was charged with being deportable. The IJ found him deportable and he appealed. The noncitizen argued that he was eligible for 212(c) relief. The Board stated that Section 212(c) does not provide an indiscriminate waiver for all who demonstrate statutory eligibility for such relief. Instead, the Attorney General is required to determine as a matter of discretion whether an applicant warrants the relief sought. The Board concluded that the noncitizen bears the burden of demonstrating that his application merits favorable consideration. The noncitizen was unable to advance any substantial equities and the Board dismissed his appeal.

This case is important because the Board courts should consider a noncitizen's record as a whole. Courts should balance the adverse factors evidencing the noncitizen's undesirability as a permanent resident with the social and humane considerations presented in his or her behalf to determine whether relief should be granted. Adverse factors include: (1) “the nature and underlying circumstances of the exclusion ground at issue,” (2) “the presence of additional significant violations of this country's immigration laws,” (3) “the existence of a criminal record and, if so, its nature, recency, and seriousness,” and (4) “the presence of other evidence indicative of a respondent's bad character or undesirability as a permanent resident of this country.” Positive equities include: (1) family ties within the US, (2) residence of long duration in this country (particularly when the inception of residence occurred while the respondent was of young age), (3) evidence of hardship to the respondent and family if deportation occurs, (4) service in this country's Armed Forces, (5) a history of employment, (6) the existence of property or business ties, (7) evidence of value and service to the community, (8) proof of a genuine rehabilitation if a criminal record exists, and (9) other evidence attesting to a respondent's good character (e.g., affidavits from family, friends, and responsible community representatives).

MATTER OF EDWARDS, 20 I. & N. Dec. 191 (BIA 1990) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether Section 212(c) provides an indiscriminate waiver for individuals who demonstrate statutory eligibility?

HOLDING Section 212(c) does not provide an indiscriminate waiver for individuals who demonstrate statutory eligibility.

• Respondent Edwards, who was admitted as an LPR in 1968. He married a US citizen with whom he had four US citizen children. He incurred
criminal convictions while in the US that entailed him serving some 2 and 1/2 years of imprisonment. The noncitizen implored that he be allowed to remain in the US because of his family. He insisted that he would work hard to change his ways. He stated that his wife and children, as well as his mother and siblings, resided here and that he knew no one in Barbados. The IJ determined that the noncitizen was statutorily eligible for a section 212(c) waiver. However, he denied that relief in the exercise of discretion. On appeal, Edwards argued that the IJ erred by failing to consider all of the favorable factors presented in his case. The Board balanced the various factors in the noncitizen' s case and took note of his favorable equities, which the board found to be unusual or outstanding. However, when the Board weighed these equities against the adverse factors of the noncitizen’s extensive criminal record, the Board determined that a favorable exercise of discretion was not warranted.

- This case is important because the Board states that under former INA § 212(c), courts should consider the record as a whole. Additionally, this case clarified confusion that was found from the rehabilitation factor in Matter of Marin. Some courts found that “a clear showing of reformation is an absolute prerequisite to a favorable exercise of discretion;” however, the Board clarified the rehabilitation is not an absolute prerequisite. Rather, each instance should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

MATTER OF SOTELO-SOTELO, 23 I.& N. Dec. 201 (BIA 2001) [Precedent]:

ISSUE  Whether a noncitizen is required to satisfy a threshold test of showing "unusual or outstanding equities" for the consideration of whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted?

HOLDING  The noncitizen does not have to show “unusual or outstanding equities.” Rather, favorable and adverse factors should be weighed to determine whether the person warrants discretionary relief.

- Respondent Javier Sotelo-Sotelo adjusted his status to that of an LPR on December 1, 1990. On July 24, 2000, he was convicted of the following offenses: possession and passing fraudulent resident alien cards, failure to provide migrant workers with terms and conditions of employment, and illegal entry or aiding and abetting illegal entry. The noncitizen was sentenced to 8 months of imprisonment for each of the first two offenses, and to 6 months of imprisonment for the third offense. In proceedings before the IJ, the noncitizen conceded removability as charged and applied for Cancellation of Removal under INA §240A(a). The IJ denied the noncitizen's application for relief, and the noncitizen appealed. The Board found that the favorable factors presented in support of the
noncitizen’s application for cancellation of removal did not outweigh the adverse factors. In doing so, the Board rejected the use of an 'outstanding and unusual equities' requirement as a threshold for relief and instead found that the IJ should weigh the favorable and adverse factors to determine whether the 'totality of the evidence' on balance indicates that a favorable discretion is warranted.

• This case is important because the Board rejected the use of an 'outstanding and unusual equities' requirement as a threshold for relief and instead found that the IJ should weigh the favorable and adverse factors to determine whether the 'totality of the evidence' on balance indicates that a favorable discretion is warranted.

LEE V. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 431 Fed. Appx. 184 (3d Cir. 2011) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether the IJ abused his discretion in denying Cancellation of Removal for a respondent who was statutorily eligible for relief?

HOLDING The IJ did not abuse his discretion.

• Respondent Mun Seok Lee conceded removability on account of his conviction of possession of a handgun without a permit and applied for Cancellation of Removal. Although Respondent was statutorily eligible, the IJ denied Cancellation of Removal on a discretionary basis. The IJ stated: “[Respondent] has not demonstrated that he is worthy of the Court’s favorable exercise of discretion based on [his] pattern of engaging in unlawful conduct relating to his alcohol intoxication as reported in conviction and/or arrest records occurring from 1993 to 2008.” The Board affirmed, finding that Respondent had not displayed that his “positive equities do not outweigh the adverse factors in this case.” The Board stated that Respondent’s positive equities included his lengthy stay in the U.S., the fact that he owns “several successful businesses that employ about 40 people, his history of paying taxes, and his active participation in his church and community.” The adverse factors included his criminal history, the “recency, the quantity of the[] alcohol-related arrests and convictions[,] and the serious nature of them poses a public risk...,” the fact that his rehabilitation is not supported by the record, the fact that he only attended Alcoholics Anonymous that were mandated because of his criminal convictions, and the fact that “he was not forthcoming in his testimony about his use of alcohol in connection with his arrests, and that, by his own admission, he continued to drink alcohol.” The Third Circuit concluded that the Board correctly “weigh[ed] the favorable and adverse factors.”

• This case is important because the case provides an example of how the positive and adverse factors will be applied.
(B). Court of Appeals Jurisdiction to Hear Appeals Concerning
the Discretionary Component

VARGAS V. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 543 Fed. Appx. 162 (3d Cir. 2013)⁶⁸ [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether the Court of Appeals lacked jurisdiction to review a petitioner’s claim that the Board gave insufficient consideration to discretionary factors?

HOLDING The Court of Appeals lacks jurisdiction to review a petitioner’s claim, unless the Board engaged in “impermissible fact finding.”
- Respondent Emmanuel De La Cruz Vargas was found to be statutorily eligible for Cancellation of Removal; however, he was denied application on account of discretionary factors. Respondent argued that the IJ erred because the Judge did not meaningfully consider all discretionary factors. The government argues that the Courts of Appeal generally lack jurisdiction to review discretionary matters. The Third Circuit agreed with the government finding that the court lacked authority to review claims based on the Immigration Judge’s discretion; however, the Third Circuit found that the court can review for “impermissible fact finding.”
- This case is important because it holds that the Third Circuit will not look to whether the Board or IJ insufficiently weighed the equities, but will look at only those scenarios which the Board engaged in “impermissible fact finding.”

(C). Retroactivity

INS v. ENRICO ST. CYR, 533 U.S. 289 (2001) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether the post-IIRAIRA statutory restrictions on discretionary relief apply to noncitizens who plead guilty to a deportable crime prior to the enactment of IIRAIRA?

HOLDING Post-IIRAIRA statutory restrictions on discretionary relief do not apply to noncitizens who pled guilty to a deportable crime prior to the enactment of IIRAIRA.
- Respondent Enrico St. Cyr was admitted as an LPR in 1986. A decade later in Connecticut, he pled guilty in a Connecticut state court to selling a

⁶⁸ See e.g., Padmore v. Holder, 609 F.3d 62, 70 (2d Cir. 2010) (finding the BIA “improperly found facts which it held to be “significant” and “important” to its decision denying him relief”).
controlled substance, $100 worth of cocaine, and thus became deportable. If the INS had taken custody of St. Cyr at the completion of his sentence, he would have been eligible for a waiver of deportation under INA § 212(c). Because the INS did not begin proceedings against St. Cyr until 1997, St. Cyr would be subject to the new laws passed in 1996, the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA) and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA), if the court found that the statutes were retroactive. Therefore, St. Cyr could no longer file a motion for § 212(c), even though he pled to the crime when the waiver was still being granted. Represented by the ACLU, St. Cyr sued the federal government on the grounds that he was lawfully eligible for the waiver. The case reached the U.S. Supreme Court in 2001. The Court ruled that Congress never intended for INS to apply its new rule retroactively in cases involving plea bargains made prior to the enactment of IIRIRA. That meant that St. Cyr, and other immigrants whose convictions were obtained through plea agreements, remain eligible for § 212(c) waiver if they would have been eligible for § 212(c) relief at the time of their plea.

- This case is important because it held that the effective date of the changes from INA § 212(c) to Cancellation of Removal for LPRs, April 1, 1997, does not bar § 212(c) relief for certain pre-IIRIRA convictions.

**ATKINSON v. ATTORNEY GENERAL, 479 F.3d. 222 (3d Cir. 2007) [Precedent]**

**ISSUE** Whether the post-IIRIRA statutory restrictions on discretionary relief apply to noncitizens who were convicted of a deportable crime prior to the enactment of IIRIRA?

**HOLDING** Post-IIRIRA statutory restrictions on discretionary relief do not apply to noncitizens who were convicted of a deportable crime prior to the enactment of IIRIRA.

- Respondent Claudius Atkinson was convicted of state criminal offenses in 1991. He received a notice to appear in 1997, notifying him that he was removable based upon his convictions. The IJ denied the noncitizen's request for a waiver of deportation under former § 212(c) (repealed 1996), finding that he was ineligible for that relief. A month after the BOARD denied the noncitizen's appeal, the U.S. Supreme Court issued its decision in **St. Cyr**. The noncitizen filed his habeas petition after his reconsideration motion, based on **St. Cyr**, was denied. The District Court held that the he was not entitled to relief because he failed to show that he had relied on § 212(c) when he was convicted in 1991. In conformity with the REAL ID Act, the court treated the habeas petition as a petition for review. The court held that the noncitizen was not precluded from applying for § 212(c) relief. IIRIRA
did not apply retroactively to noncitizens who were convicted of aggravated felonies prior to IIRIRA's effective date, regardless of whether they pleaded guilty or were convicted by a jury.

This case is important because the Third Circuit held that § 212(c) is available to individuals who elected to go to trial and were convicted (as opposed to entering a plea agreement).

MURALI KRISHNA PONNAPULA v. ASHCROFT, 373 F.3d 480 (3d Cir. 2004) [Precedent]:

ISSUE Whether the post-IIRIRA statutory restrictions on discretionary relief apply to noncitizens who were convicted of a deportable crime prior to the enactment of IIRA, but who turned down a misdemeanor plea deal?

HOLDING A noncitizen who turned down a misdemeanor plea deal, and was later convicted of an aggravated felony is not subject to the statutory restrictions of IIRA.

Respondent Murali Krishna Ponnapula was indicted for grand larceny and falsifying business records in violation of New York law after his brother submitted a loan application with the noncitizen's forged signature and without the noncitizen's knowledge. In reliance on counsel's advice, the noncitizen turned down a misdemeanor plea agreement, went to trial when former INA § 212(c) was still in effect, and was convicted. The court rejected the Government's contention that St. Cyr precluded the noncitizen from claiming an impermissible retroactive effect of the repeal of § 212(c). With respect to the noncitizen, who reasonably could have relied on the potential availability of § 212(c) relief, the court found the repeal of § 212(c) had an impermissible retroactive effect. Although the court concluded that actual reliance was not necessary, the court found that the noncitizen demonstrated clear and reasonable actual reliance on the former statutory scheme in making the decision to go to trial.

This case is important because the noncitizen reasonably believed that even if he was convicted of a felony after trial he would still likely be eligible for hardship relief from deportation pursuant to former § 212(c). In reliance of this, the noncitizen decided to turn down the misdemeanor offer and proceeded to trial. The Third Circuit court utilized St. Cyr and allowed the noncitizen to avail himself of § 212(c) relief.
VI. PRACTICE ADVISORIES

Of the following guidance from stakeholders, some are direct quotes and some have been paraphrased. Some practitioner comments, as labeled in the footnotes, are from 2009 and some are from 2016. Please note that the practitioner comments are provided for general litigation strategies, and specific facts about the application process may have changed since 2009.

(a). How to Apply for LPR Cancellation of Removal
The following is an explanation of how an attorney should file an application for LPR Cancellation of Removal on behalf of a client.

Preparing the Application
An LPR that has been placed in removal proceedings before an Immigration Court and who is prima facie eligible for relief may apply for LPR Cancellation. An attorney should first determine whether the LPR is eligible for LPR Cancellation under INA §240A(a) by interviewing the LPR and obtaining his or her criminal and immigration records. If the attorney determines that the LPR is eligible, the attorney should obtain relevant and necessary information from the LPR and complete an LPR Cancellation application. In order to prepare the application, the attorney should do the following:

1. Complete Form EOIR-42A, Application for Cancellation of Removal for Certain Permanent Residents. This Form requires the applicant to supply basic information about his or her self, information about his or her presence in the U.S., marital status and spouse, employment and financial status, and family.

2. Include a birth certificate of the applicant or other identification with a translation if it is not in English, a copy of the LPR card (Green Card), passport

---

69 An applicant proceeding pro se should follow the same steps as an attorney when applying for LPR Cancellation, but should not include Form EOIR-28 in his or her application.

70 An attorney should note the importance of making sure that he or she uses the most current version of all forms (Form EOIR-42A, Form G-325A, and Form EOIR-28). These forms are updated frequently and it is easy to locate and use an outdated form by mistake. E-mail from Ms. Powers, Esq., (Nov. 30, 2009).
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How to Apply for LPR Cancellation of Removal stamp, DHS Form I-94, proof of fee payment and biometrics, a full copy of the applicant's criminal record, affidavits from the applicant and others, a brief in support of the application, and other supporting documentation.

(3) Complete Form G-325A, Biographic Information. This Form requires the applicant to supply information pertaining to his or her residence in the last five years, last address outside the U.S. of more than one year, employment during the last five years, and last occupation abroad.

(4) Complete Form EOIR-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Representative Before the Immigration Court. This Form requires the applicant's attorney to supply information pertaining to his or her bar membership and good standing, and authority to represent the applicant.

(5) Note that every block of each form should be filled in completely and clearly. If a particular section does not apply to an applicant, the attorney should write "not applicable" rather than leaving it blank. In addition, an attorney should note that all documents filed with the Immigration Court must be in English or accompanied by a certified English translation. An affidavit or declaration in

72 See, PART 2: I. ADVICE FOR PRACTITIONERS BY PRACTITIONERS, available only upon request of Center for Immigrants' Rights at centerforimmigrantsr@pennstatelaw.psu.edu.
73 United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, available at www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis (follow "Forms" hyperlink; then follow " follow "Form G-325A" hyperlink), (last visited May 12, 2016)
76 Refer to the Form EOIR-42A application instructions found in 'PART I: Appendix IX: Sample Documents and Forms From Government Entities and Select Non-Profit Organizations' of this toolkit and to the United States Department of Justice, Executive Office for Immigration Review (follow "Form EOIR-42A" hyperlink) available at www.justice.gov/eoir/formslist.htm. In addition, an attorney should look to pro se packets available from the Florence Immigrant and Refugee Rights Project found in 'PART I: Appendix VIII: Pro Se Packets' of this toolkit and at the Florence Immigrant and Refugee Rights Project available at www.firrrp.org (choose "Resources" and follow "How to Defend Your Case" hyperlink, scroll to "Cancellation of Removal for Legal Permanent Residents (green card holders) and select “English” hyperlink), (last visited May 12, 2016).
How to Apply for LPR Cancellation of Removal

English by a person who does not understand English must include a certificate of interpretation stating that the affidavit or declaration has been read to the person in a language that the person understands and that s/he understood it before signing.  

(6) Include a witness list with the application. The witness list should include the following information for each witness, except the applicant: the name of the witness, if applicable, the alien registration number ("A number"), a written summary of the testimony, the estimated length of the testimony, the language in which the witness will testify, and a curriculum vitae or resume, if called as an expert.

Supporting Documents

In addition to filing Form EOIR-42A and Form G-325A, an attorney should attach supporting documents on behalf of an LPR. These documents should correspond with each statutory element of INA §240A(a). For example an attorney should submit documentary evidence to show that an LPR has been an LPR for at least five years, has resided continuously in the U.S. after having been lawfully admitted in any status, and has not been convicted of an aggravated felony.

An attorney should attach the supporting documents to the application for LPR cancellation and include a table of contents with the documents. Also, an attorney should include copies of original documents rather than the originals. The IJ has discretion to retain original documents in the Record of Proceedings. The IJ notes on the record when original documents are turned over to DHS or the Immigration Court.

---

79 See Id. at 64.
81 See Id. at 62.
82 See Id.
Required Biometric and Biographical Information
An attorney must complete Form G-325A for Biographic Information to submit with an LPR Cancellation application for applicants 14 years of age or older.\(^{83}\) Form G-325A is available for download from the Internet through USCIS\(^{84}\) and requires an applicant to supply information pertaining to his or her residence in the last five years, last address outside the U.S. of more than one year, employment during the last five years, and last occupation abroad.\(^{85}\)

When an individual who is detained applies for LPR Cancellation, his or her biometrics and fingerprinting will be handled by the facility in which s/he is detained.\(^{86}\) DHS is responsible for obtaining biometrics and any other biographical information with respect to any individual in detention.\(^{87}\)

When an individual who is not detained has submitted an LPR Cancellation application to the Department of Homeland Security, s/he will be given instructions on how to complete the biometrics requirement and pay the application fees. The instructions are called "Instructions for Submitting Certain Applications in Immigration Court and for Providing Biometric and Biographic Information to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services."\(^{88}\) The applicant will be notified in writing of the location of the Applicant Support Center (ASC) or the designated Law Enforcement Agency where s/he must go to provide biometric and biographic information.\(^{89}\) The applicant will also be given a date

---


\(^{84}\) United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, available at [www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis](http://www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis) (follow "Forms" hyperlink; then follow " follow "Form G-325A" hyperlink), (last visited May 12, 2016).

\(^{85}\) See Id.


\(^{87}\) 8 C.F.R. §1003.47(d) (2016)
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How to Apply for LPR Cancellation of Removal and time for his or her appointment. When s/he goes to the interview noted on the receipt issued by the DHS, the applicant's fingerprints will be taken and s/he will be given a biometrics confirmation document. It is important that an applicant comply with the instructions during this process in order to avoid delays.

Fees

An attorney must pay a required $100 filing fee and $85 biometrics fee to the Department of Homeland Security before filing Form EOIR-42A with the Immigration Court. The Immigration Court does not collect fees. Evidence of payment of these fees in the form of a copy of a DHS notice of fee receipt and biometrics appointment instructions must accompany the Form EOIR-42A when it is filed with the Immigration Court. The attorney should submit the fees in the exact amount to the DHS. The DHS will not accept a payment of cash; it will only accept payments made by personal check, cashier’s check, certified bank check, bank international money order, or foreign draft drawn on a financial institution in the U.S. and payable to the "Department of Homeland Security" in U.S. currency. If a check is drawn on an account of a person other than the LPR applicant, the name and alien registration number of the applicant must be entered on the face of the check. In addition, all checks must be drawn on a bank located in the U.S. Furthermore, an attorney should note that the required fees will not be reimbursed if the application is granted.

90 See Id.
91 See Id.
92 8 C.F.R. § 1240.20(a) (2016).
95 See Id.
96 See Id.
97 See Id.
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If an LPR is unable to pay the filing fee, his or her attorney may ask the IJ for permission to file the application without fee (fee waiver). The IJ has the discretion to waive the fee if the applicant shows that s/he is unable to pay the fee.\textsuperscript{99} If an applicant wants to request a fee waiver, his or her attorney should notify the IJ and submit an affidavit, or unsworn declaration made pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1746, substantiating the applicant's inability to pay the fee.\textsuperscript{100} An attorney should note that if s/he submits an application without a required fee and the LPR's request for a fee waiver is denied, the filing will be deemed defectively filed and may be rejected or excluded from evidence.\textsuperscript{101}

**Serving and Filing the Application**

After preparing an application for LPR Cancellation, an attorney should make a minimum of three copies of the application so that s/he can retain at least one copy for his or her records. The attorney should then file the application and serve it on opposing counsel. The attorney should do the following\textsuperscript{102}:

1. File a copy of the application (Form \textit{EOIR-42A}), Form \textit{G-325A}, Form \textit{EOIR-28}, and the required $100 filing fee and $85 biometrics fee with the DHS at the appropriate USCIS Service Center before filing the application with the Immigration Court. The DHS will send a copy of a notice of fee receipt and biometrics appointment instructions to the applicant.

2. If the applicant is detained, DHS is responsible for obtaining biometrics. If the applicant is not detained, instruct him or her to go to his or her biometrics interview noted on the receipt from the DHS with the required documents designated on the receipt. The applicant will have fingerprints taken and receive a written confirmation once biometrics are complete.

3. File the original application and copies of all supporting documents with the Immigration Court with evidence of payment of the fees and biometrics.\textsuperscript{103} This evidence should be in the form of a copy of the DHS notice of fee receipt and biometrics appointment instructions.

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{99} See \textit{Id.}.
\textsuperscript{100} \textit{Id.}; 8 C.F.R. § 103.7 (2016).
\textsuperscript{101} See \textit{Id.}
\textsuperscript{103} 8 C.F.R. § 1240.20 (2016).
\end{footnotesize}
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(4) Mail or deliver a copy of the packet to the Assistant Chief Counsel for the DHS at the time the Immigration Court is served. Call the Assistant Chief Counsel prior to the hearing to make certain that s/he received the packet.

(5) In addition to filing a copy of the application and all supporting documents with the Immigration Court, the attorney should include a completed certificate showing service of the documents on the Assistant Chief Counsel.

The application package should contain, in the following order:\(^{104}\):

- Form **EOIR-28** (if required)
- Cover page
- If applicable, fee receipt (stapled to the application) or motion for a fee waiver
- Application
- Proposed exhibits (if any) with table of contents; and
- Proof of Service

---

(b). Release from Detention Information

Bond
A noncitizen who is detained is eligible for bond or conditional parole, unless s/he is subject to mandatory detention or is considered an “arriving alien.” Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) will make an initial determination about bond eligibility. However, if the noncitizen does not agree with ICE, s/he is able to motion for a bond redetermination in front of an Immigration Judge (IJ). Bond redetermination is discretionary, and the IJ will consider whether the noncitizen poses a flight risk, danger to the community, and the severity of the offense committed by the alien. Additionally, for a noncitizen who is detained for a prolonged amount of time, s/he may be eligible for habeas relief.

Habeas Corpus
In the case of a noncitizen who is ordered removed, the Attorney General is supposed to remove the person from the United States within a period of 90 days. Noncitizens in prolonged detention may be eligible to petition for a writ of habeas corpus so that the habeas court can measure the “reasonableness” of detention that is beyond the 90 day period. The Supreme Court held that after a “6-month period, once the alien provides good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future, the Government must respond with evidence sufficient to rebut that showing.” “An alien may be held in confinement until it has been determined that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future.”

In the Diop case, the Third Circuit held that a respondent who had been granted withholding of removal and was released from custody could still have standing for a

\[105\] INA § 236(a).
\[106\] INA § 236(c); INA § 236(A).
\[107\] 8 C.F.R. § 1236.1(c)(2) (2016).
\[109\] INA § 236(c)(2).
\[112\] Id.
\[113\] Id.
habeas corpus appeal. The court concluded that the respondent’s 35 months of detention “without any post-Joseph hearing inquiry into whether it was necessary to accomplish the purposes of § 1226(c) was unreasonable.” The Government had argued that the respondent’s habeas case was moot because he had been released from custody after the crime for which he was mandatorily detained was vacated. However the Third Circuit Court found that the respondent could again be taken into custody if the decision that vacated his crime were overturned and because a second conviction could be grounds for being detained again.

Noncitizens who are still in removal proceedings and have not received a final order of deportation may also seek to file a writ of habeas corpus. The Third Circuit Court of Appeals applied the reasonableness test to cases where the noncitizen has been detained for over the “6-month” period.

For more information about bond, bond redetermination, and habeas corpus see the following sources:


---

114 Diop v ICE/Homeland Sec., 656 F.3d 221 (3d Cir. 2011), citing United States v. Frumento, 552 F.2d 534.
115 Diop v ICE/Homeland Sec., 656 F.3d 221 (3d Cir. 2011).
116 Id.
117 Id.
118 Chavez-Alvarez v. Warden York Cnty. Prison, 783 F.3d 469 (3d Cir. 2015)
119 Id.
(c). How to Obtain Client’s Records

Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Requests
The following is applicable to FOIA requests processed by the following agencies: Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR), U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), U.S. Customs and Border Patrol (CBP), and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS).

Processing Tracks
FOIA requests are placed on one of three (3) tracks. Requests are entered into tracks based upon the complexity of the request:

- Track 1: Track one is for those requests that seek and receive expedited processing pursuant to subsection (a)(6)(E) of the FOIA.
- Track 2: Track two is for those requests that do not involve a significant volume of records or lengthy consultations with other entities.
- Track 3: Track three is for those requests that do involve a significant volume of records and for which lengthy or numerous consultations are required, or those requests which may involve sensitive records.

Processing Times
The goal is to respond within 20 business days of receipt of the request; however, the FOIA does permit a 10-day extension of this time period. If the request involves a significant volume of records, requires that the agency collect records from separate offices, or requires that the agency consult with another agency, the agency where the request was sent will invoke the 10-day extension for the completion of the request.

Expediting Requests
To have a FOIA request expedited, the request must demonstrate a compelling need such as: (1) imminent threat to the life or physical safety of an individual; (2) an urgency

---

to inform the public concerning actual or alleged Federal Government activity if the request is made by a person primarily engaged in disseminating information; (3) loss of substantial due process rights; or (4) a matter of widespread and exceptional media interest in which there exist possible questions about the government's integrity which

**Fees**

123 There is no fee to file a FOIA request. However, FOIA established three fee categories that agencies use to determine if fees will be charged. As pertaining to attorneys (non-commercial requesters), applicants are charged for photocopying after 100 pages and for time spent searching for records in excess of two hours. Indicate a specific amount that you are willing to pay, should there be a fee incurred beyond the free allotment. If no amount is indicated, a fee of up to $25 may be assessed.
Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) FOIA Request

Requests for information about a person other than the requester require proper authorization allowing release of the information. Requests regarding applications filed with DHS should not be made with EOIR and DHS forms should not be used to request records from EOIR. To obtain nonpublic information, such as the record of proceedings before an immigration court regarding a person you represent, the FOIA Service Center recommends the following:

How to Request the Information Sought

(1) Include in the request an authorization to release information from the person who is the subject of the request (or include an explanation about how the public interest outweighs the privacy interest of the subject of the record.

(2) The person who is the subject of the FOIA request must certify as to his or her identity by completing Form DOJ-361 or reasonably describing the records sought and including identifying information. For example, if a FOIA request seeks a record of proceedings, the request, if possible, should include the following:
   • The noncitizen's full name; aliases
   • Immigration hearing location
   • Alien registration (A) number (if known). If the A number is not known or the case occurred before 1988, provide the date of the Order to Show Cause, the country of origin, and the location of the immigration hearing.

(3) An attorney of record may provide evidence of that fact such as a valid entry of appearance, Form EOIR-27 or Form EOIR-28.

(4) FOIA requests may be submitted to the following:
   • Office of the General Counsel
     Attn: FOIA Service Center
     Executive Office for Immigration Review
     5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1903
     Falls Church, VA 22041
   • EOIR.FOIARequests@usdoj.gov

Tracking Requests

To follow up on the status of a FOIA request, call (703) 605-1297 and ask to speak to (1) the FOIA Specialist assigned to your request or (2) Crystal Souza, the FOIA Public Liaison. Additional information on FOIA procedures can be found here.

---

Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) FOIA Request

ICE FOIA requests must be submitted in writing. The request can be made using Form G-639 or by using the online FOIA Request Form. Requests must be for access to existing records only. The ICE FOIA Office will not "create" records for the purpose of responding to a FOIA.

How to Request the Information Sought

1. The request must be in writing, including a daytime phone number.
2. Provide as much information as possible on the subject matter to help expedite the search process.
   - Date of Birth
   - Alien number (A number)
   - Any Alias(es) (possibly used at the time of entry or apprehension)
   - Dates (Note: Travel Records only go back to 1982).
   - Times
   - Type of document
   - Entry numbers
   - Officer names (if available)
   - Certificate numbers
3. Requests may be submitted by any of the following:
   - Faxed to: (202) 732-4265
   - Mailed to:
     FOIA Office
     U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement
     800 North Capitol St., NW
     5th Floor, Suite 585
     Washington, DC 20536
   - E-mailed to: [ICE-FOIA@dhs.gov](mailto:ICE-FOIA@dhs.gov)

Tracking Requests

The requestor should receive an acknowledgement letter within 3-5 business days after ICE receives the request. This letter will contain a tracking number that ICE that should be on hand when checking the status of the request.

---

Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) FOIA Request

CBP FOIA responses may provide the following information:\(^\text{126}\)

- Apprehension by Border Patrol between Official Ports of Entry
  - CBP does not have complete records of apprehensions made by Border Patrol before 2000. Pre-2000 records of apprehensions may be available in the A-File maintained by USCIS.
  - Requests for Alien Files should be submitted to USCIS.
- Detention by Border Patrol or at Ports of Entry
- Expedited Removal by Border Patrol or at Ports of Entry
- I-94 Records
- Information Regarding Entry and Exit
  - CBP does not have records on the entry and exit of persons arriving or departing the U.S. before 1982.
- Records Regarding Inspection or Examination upon Arrival at a U.S. Port of Entry
- Voluntary Return

CBP FOIA requests may be submitted online. Register to create a FOIA account. From the Agency Selection drop-down, choose U.S. Customs and Border Protection. Reports are delivered to the registered account. Should the agency need to contact the attorney, the agency will use the contact information provided during the account registration.

How to Request the Information Sought

The following information will be needed to provide accurate reports.

1. Provide a clear and detailed description of the records being requested. Include as much of the following as is available:
   - Date of Birth
   - Alien number (A number)
   - Any Alias(es) (possibly used at the time of entry or apprehension)
   - Dates (Note: Travel Records only go back to 1982).
   - Times
   - Type of document

• Entry numbers
• Officer names (if available)
• Certificate numbers

(2) Attorneys must attach a written consent from the subject of record.
• Submit Form G-28, Form G-639 or a written notarized consent.

**Tracking Requests**
From the account, a view of the request will be provided. Click on the desired request number for additional details. Alternatively, call the CBP FOIA Office at 202-325-0150, Mon-Fri 8am-5pm EST. However, they can only provide you with the same information that you can obtain online.
Citizenship & Immigration Services (USCIS) Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)

Visit the USCIS website to request the Freedom of Information Act record. USCIS FOIA requests must be submitted in writing by mail to the National Records Center. USCIS FOIA responses may provide the following information:

- Deportation Records; Detention and Removal Records
- A-file
- Petitions (I-130, I-485, I-589, N-400, etc.)
- USCIS Background Investigations
- Certification of non-existence of a record

How to Request the Information Sought

1. Form G-639 may be used to submit the written request.
2. Send form to the following physical address:
   - U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
     National Records Center, FOIA/PA Office
     P. O. Box 648010
     Lee’s Summit, MO 64064-8010

Tracking Requests

To check the status of the FOIA request, visit, https://egov.uscis.gov/foiawebstatus/ and enter the “Control Number” that was provided after receipt of the FOIA request. The “Control Number” will begin with the letters NRC, COW, etc..

- If your request is pending, the status will indicate the position of your request relative to all pending USCIS requests in the same processing track.
- If your request has been processed and responded to within the past six months, you will be given the date your request was processed.

---

128 For assistance contact USCIS by Telephone 800-375-5283; Fax 802-288-1793 or 816-350-5785; Email uscis.foia@uscis.dhs.gov; or visit the USCIS FOIA Request Guide, available at, https://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/About%20Us/FOIA/How%20to%20File%20a%20FOIA%20Privacy%20Act%20Request/USCIS_FOIA_Request_Guide.pdf (last visited May 12, 2016).
Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Background Check
FBI Background check reports can be processed within 13 to 15 weeks and additional time should be allocated for delivery.\(^{131}\)

How to Request the Information Sought\(^ {132}\)
(1) Complete the Application Information Form \(^{133}\) with the Noncitizen’s Information
   • The mailing address may be the attorney’s business mailing address.
   • The telephone number and e-mail address may be the attorney’s business contact information.
(2) Obtain a set of fingerprints on the Standard Fingerprint Form FD-258\(^ {134}\)
   • The card must be of original fingerprints. Copies will not be accepted.
   • The noncitizen’s name and date of birth must be provided on the card.
   • The fingerprinting must include rolled impressions of all 10 fingerprints (these are sometimes referred to as plain or flat impressions).
     ◦ Fingerprints taken with ink or via live scan are acceptable. If fingerprints are not legible, the fingerprint card will be rejected.
     ◦ If possible, have the fingerprints taken by a fingerprinting technician.
       ▪ e.g. UPS in Pennsylvania does fingerprinting. However, UPS requires the noncitizen to register with the CogentID.com agency to process the fingerprinting fee that UPS charges.
(3) Obtain a $18 Money Order made out to Treasury of the United States. Be sure to have the noncitizen sign where required
(4) Mail to the FBI Criminal Justice Information Services Division.
   • FBI CJIS Division – Summary Request
     1000 Custer Hollow Road
     Clarksburg, WV 26306

Tracking Requests
To check the status of the FOIA request, visit, https://vault.fbi.gov/fdps-1/@@search-fdps or email, foipaquestions@ic.fbi.gov.\(^ {135}\)

State Criminal Records
The manner to request records differs from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. The information provided below will detail the steps to obtain records in the states under the jurisdiction of the Third Circuit (Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware).

Pennsylvania
In Pennsylvania, there are two methods of requesting a Criminal Record, including 1) an online request or 2) submitting a request form. Response time for record requests vary depending on the volume of requests, but can be expected to take between four to six weeks.

Online Request Steps
2. Select “Submit a New Record Check.”
3. Select “Individual Request.”
4. Read Terms and Conditions and select “Accept”
5. Complete questions as prompted. Prompts will include background information about the requestor and the background information about the subject of the background check.
   (a) Required information about the requestor will include: 1) Full name, 2) Phone number, and 3) Address.
   (b) Information about the subject of the background check will include: 1) Full name, 2) Social Security number, 3) Date of birth 4) Sex, 5) Race, and 6) Aliases and/or maiden name.
6. Complete payment information. For each request, there is a $8.00 non-refundable fee.
7. If the person has no criminal record, this information will be provided immediately. Otherwise, record the control number to check status of request.

---

137 Please note that different fees apply to different requests. If the person requesting the criminal record is a “volunteer” the person may not be subject to a fee. A volunteer may press “New Record Check” to request criminal records.
Paper Request Steps

1. Download and complete the Individual Access and Review Request Form – SP4-164A. Information requested by the form includes:
   (a) Requester information (Name, Address, Phone Number).
   (b) Information Involving the Subject of the Record Check (Name, Social Security Number, Date of Birth, Sex, Race)
2. Make check payable to Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Fee is $10.00.
3. Send completed application to:
   - Pennsylvania State Police Central Repository – RCPU
     1800 Elmerton Avenue
     Harrisburg, PA 17110-9758

New Jersey

In New Jersey, criminal history background checks are obtained through live scan fingerprinting. Follow the steps below to be fingerprinted:

1. Download and complete the Universal Form which can be found at http://www.njsp.org/info/pdf/20150129_universforma.pdf.
2. Visit www.bioapplicant.com/nj or call 1-877-503-5981 to schedule a live scan fingerprinting appointment.
3. Bring the Universal Form and photo identification to the scheduled live scan fingerprinting appointment.
4. At the appointment, pay the $40.70 fee with Visa, MasterCard or e-check.
5. If no response is received within 10 days, contact 609 882-2000 ext. 2918.

Delaware

In Delaware, criminal history background checks are obtained through fingerprints.

Steps for In-State Requestors

1. Go to 1 of 3 fingerprinting sites.

---

(a) Blue Hen Corporate Center, 655 South Bay Road, Suite 1B, Dover, Delaware, DE 19901. Hours of operation are Mondays, 8:30am to 6:30pm and Tuesday through Friday, 8:30am to 3:30pm. No appointment is necessary.

(b) Thurman Adams State Service Center, 546 S. Bedford Street, Room 202, Georgetown, DE 19947. Hours of operation are Monday through Thursday 8:30am to 3:30pm. To schedule an appointment, call 302-739-2528. Cash is not accepted. Results of the completed certified criminal history are not returned the same day. The results are forwarded as soon as possible.

(c) Delaware State Police Troop 2, 100 Langrange Ave, Newark, DE 19702. Hours of operation are Monday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday from 8:30am to 3:15pm. To schedule an appointment, call 302-739-2528. Results of the completed certified criminal history are not returned to same day. Results are forwarded as soon as possible.

(2) Provide photo identification at the fingerprinting site.

(3) Pay at fingerprinting site. Payment options include cash, credit, debit, certified checks, money orders or company checks made out to Delaware State Police. American Express or personal checks are not accepted. The fee is $52.50.

Steps for Out-of-State Requestors

(1) Get fingerprints taken at local police agency or any fingerprinting agency

(2) Obtain fingerprint cards. If the fingerprint agency does not provide fingerprint cards, print a FD-258 fingerprint card on the Federal Bureau of Investigation website at https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/identity-history-summary-checks/fd-258-1 and present card to the agency for fingerprinting.

(3) Mail an authorization letter, fingerprint card, and certified check or money order, made payable to Delaware State Police. The fee is $52.50.

(4) Mail to:

- Delaware State Police
  State Bureaus of Identification
  P.O. Box 430
  Dover, DE 199903
VII. ALTERNATIVES TO §240A(a) – Alternative Forms of Relief, Prosecutorial Discretion, Administrative and Judicial Options for Individuals Denied or Ineligible for LPR Cancellation of Removal Relief

Noncitizens who do not meet the statutory requirements of INA § 240A(a) LPR Cancellation of Removal may be eligible to apply for the alternative forms of relief discussed below. In addition to meeting the statutory requirements for some of these alternative forms of relief, the REAL ID Act of 2005 allows the Immigration Judge (IJ) greater independence in determining credibility and requiring corroboration evidence from the noncitizen. The IJ has greater discretion in determining whether or not the testimony of the noncitizen or other witness in support of the noncitizen is credible, is persuasive, and refers to specific facts sufficient to demonstrate that the noncitizen has satisfied his/her burden of proof.

(a). Alternative Forms of Relief
Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal
Cancellation of Removal for non-lawful permanent resident is available to noncitizens who have been physically present in the United States for at least 10 years, are of good moral character, have not been convicted of any crimes that would make the individual inadmissible or deportable, and can show that upon removal a qualifying relative would suffer “exceptional and extremely unusual hardship.” Lawful permanent residents who are ineligible LPR Cancellation under INA § 240A(a), may apply to Non-LPR Cancellation of Removal under part INA § 240A(a).

Incomplete Notice to Appear (Third Circuit Court Jurisdiction)

In Orozco-Velasquez v. Attorney General, the Third Circuit overturned the Board precedent, Matter of Camarillo, 25 I. & N. Dec. 644 (BIA 2011) by holding that that the NTA needs to include all statutory stipulations in order to stop the time for purposes of continuous physical presence, stipulations which include the date and time of the removal hearing.\(^{145}\) The court held that 8 U.S.C. § 1229(a)(1), necessarily requires specification of the “time and place at which the proceedings shall be held.”\(^{146}\) The Court found that the word “shall” in the statute is a requirement, and in the absence of another conflicting canon of statutory construction such a requirement is mandatory. Because the statute requires that an “alien [be] served a notice to appear under 8 U.S.C. § 1229(a)” the statute also “compels” the government to follow all the statutory stipulations set forth for an NTA, which includes stating the time and place of the hearing.\(^{147}\) Until the government has set forth all such stipulations, the NTA “will not stop the...clock” for purposes of Cancellation of Removal eligibility.\(^{148}\) Thus, the incomplete NTA will not preclude the noncitizen from continuing to accrue continuous physical presence for the purpose of fulfilling the required 10 years of continuous physical presence requirement of INA § 240A(a) eligibility.

§ 212(c) Waiver

A section 212(c) discretionary waiver, now repealed under the INA, provides that noncitizens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, who committed a crime or other act rendering him or her inadmissible or deportable from the U.S.; who has not had an order of deportation, and who has had a lawful unrelinquished domicile of seven consecutive years, may be eligible for a waiver of deportation.\(^{149}\) However, this relief is only available to those who pleaded guilty prior to April 1, 1997 with the intention to apply for § 212(c) relief.\(^{150}\) The IJ weighs the negative factors, such as the severity of the crime, against positive factors, such as the noncitizen’s rehabilitation and connections with the community, in making his or her determination on whether the noncitizen merits a favorable exercise of discretion.\(^{151}\)

\(^{146}\) Id.
\(^{147}\) Id.
\(^{148}\) Id.
\(^{149}\) 8 U.S.C. § 1182(c) (2016); INA § 212(c).
§ 212(h) Waiver

Noncitizens who have committed crimes of moral turpitude, have a single controlled substance violation involving possession of thirty grams or less of marijuana, have engaged in prostitution, or have received immunity from prosecution, may obtain a § 212(h) waiver. Such individuals may qualify for a § 212(h) waiver if (1) the crime was committed more than fifteen years before the application or admission or if it was a prostitution offense, the noncitizen has been rehabilitated and, (2) the individual is the spouse, parent, son, or daughter of a U.S. citizen or permanent legal resident and denying the waiver would cause extreme hardship to the citizen or permanent resident; or (3) the individual is seeking permanent residence after being battered by a U.S. citizen or permanent resident spouse or parent.\(^\text{152}\) When the waiver is sought based on the passage of 15 years since the commission of the offense, the noncitizen also must show that admission would not be contrary to the national welfare, safety, or security and that the noncitizen has been rehabilitated.\(^\text{153}\) One bar from relief under § 212(h) states that “[n]o waiver shall be granted...in the case of an alien who has previously been admitted to the United States as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if... since the date of such admission the alien has been convicted of an aggravated felony...” Until recently, there was a Circuit split on the issue of whether a noncitizen need not only be considered an LPR at the time of the application, but also have had the LPR status when the noncitizen entered to be eligible for § 212(h) relief.\(^\text{154}\) However, recently the Board has held that a noncitizen who had not been admitted to the U.S. as an LPR, but who adjusted to lawful permanent residence status while residing in the U.S., is not barred from establishing eligibility for a waiver of

\(^{152}\) 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h) (2016); INA §§ 212(h).


\(^{154}\) Medina-Rosales v. Holder, 778 F.3d 1140, 1146 (10th Cir. 2015) (holding that the § 212(h) bar to eligibility for relief did not include those who adjusted their status to a lawful permanent resident while present in the U.S.); Negrete-Ramirez v. Holder, 741 F.3d 1047 (9th Cir. 2014) (holding that the § 212(h) bar to eligibility for relief did not include those who adjusted their status to a lawful permanent resident while present in the U.S.); Hanif v. United States, 694 F.3d 479, 48 (3d Cir. 2012) (holding that the § 212(h) bar to eligibility for relief did not include those who adjusted their status to a lawful permanent resident while present in the U.S.); Bracamontes v. Holder, 675 F.3d 380, 387-388 (4th Cir. 2012) (holding that § 212(h) bar to eligibility for relief did not include those who adjusted their status to lawful permanent resident in the U.S.); Martinez v. Mukasey, 519 F.3d 532, 545 (5th Cir. 2008) (holding that the §212(h) bar to eligibility for relief did not include those who adjusted their status to a lawful permanent resident in the U.S.); But see, Roberts v. Holder, 745 F.3d 928 (8th Cir. 2014) (holding that § 212(h) bar to eligibility for relief included those who adjusted their status to a lawful permanent resident in the U.S.).
inadmissibility under section INA §212(h) as a result of an aggravated felony conviction.\footnote{Matter of J-H-J, 26 I. & N. Dec. 563, 564 (BIA 2015).}

**Asylum**

A person may apply for asylum as a defense to removal if the noncitizen meets the definition of "refugee" under the Act and is not subject to one of the statutory bars.\footnote{8 U.S.C. § 1158 (2016); INA § 208.} A "refugee" is defined as “any person who is outside any country in which such person’s nationality or…any country in which such person last habitually resided, and who is unable or unwilling to return to, and is unable or unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of that country because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.”\footnote{8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(42)(A); INA §101(a)(42)(A).}

**Withholding of Removal**

A noncitizen in removal proceedings may apply for withholding of removal if s/he can show that s/he may not be returned to a place where s/he will face persecution because of his or her race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular group, or political opinion.\footnote{8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(3)(A) (2016); INA § 241(b)(3)(A).} Withholding is similar to asylum in that it provides protection for persons fleeing persecution on account of one of the aforementioned five grounds, but withholding, in fact, requires a higher standard of proof. Thus, in order to obtain withholding of removal, the noncitizen must show by a clear probability that s/he faces the requisite harm of a threat to life or freedom in the proposed country of removal.\footnote{8 C.F.R. § 208.16(c) (2016).}

**Protection under the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT)**

The Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment of Punishment, which Congress codified into U.S. law, prohibits the removal of a noncitizen to a country where there are substantial grounds for believing that the noncitizen would be in danger of torture or subject to inhuman or degrading
torture. A noncitizen in removal proceedings may apply for this form of relief if s/he can establish that it is more likely than not that s/he would be tortured if removed to the proposed country of removal.”

**Temporary Protected Status (TPS)**
Noncitizens from certain countries may request this form of relief. The Secretary of Homeland Security, after consulting with “appropriate” government agencies, may designate a foreign state or part of a foreign state under and of the three circumstances: (A) There is an ongoing armed conflict that would pose a serious threat to the personal safety of the state’s nationals if they were returned there; (B) An environmental disaster has substantially but temporarily disrupted living conditions, and the state has requested designation because it cannot adequately handle the return of its nationals; (C) “[E]xtraordinary and temporary conditions” prevent safe return, and permitting the state’s nationals to remain temporarily in the U.S. would not be contrary to the national interests.

Countries that are currently designated for TPS are: El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Somalia, and Sudan.

**Voluntary Departure**
Noncitizens in removal proceedings who meet the statutory requirements of INA § 240B may request voluntary departure instead of receiving a formal removal order. There are three different forms of voluntary departure, depending on the stage of the proceeding when granted. Voluntary departure can be granted: (1) before the removal hearing; (2) during the removal hearing; and (3) after the removal hearing. Under § 240B(a), the Secretary of Homeland Security may permit certain noncitizens to depart voluntarily, either in lieu of removal proceedings or before

---

161 8 C.F.R. §§ (1)208.16, (1)208.17, (1)208.18 (2016).
162 8 U.S.C. §§§ 1254a(b)(1)(A), (B), (C) (2016); INA § 244(b)(1).
165 8 U.S.C. § 1229c (2016); INA § 240B.
166 Id.
removal proceedings have been completed, at the noncitizen's own expense. 167 If granted pre or post-hearing departure, the noncitizen has to depart within 120 days and s/he may be required to post bond. 168 Under § 240B(b) noncitizens may get voluntary departure at the conclusion of the removal proceedings, at the noncitizen's expense. 169 Bond for subsection (b) applicants is mandatory. 170 If voluntary departure is granted under subsection (b), the maximum period the noncitizen has to depart is 60 days. 171 Persons who have been convicted of an aggravated felony or who are deportable as terrorists are ineligible for this form of relief. 172

One who is granted voluntary departure but fails to depart within the designated time becomes ineligible for several other immigration options. 173 Additionally, civil penalties for failure to depart within the time period specified include: (A) a civil penalty of not less than $1,000 and not more than $5,000; (B) ineligibility for a period of 10 years, to receive any further relief under § 240B, § 240A, § 245, § 248, and § 249. 174

---

169 8 U.S.C. § 1229c(b) (2016); INA § 240B(b).
170 8 U.S.C. § 1229c(b)(3) (2016); INA § 240B(b)(3).
(b). Prosecutorial Discretion

Prosecutorial discretion refers to decision the DHS makes about whether to enforce immigration laws against a person. According to the 2014 Jeh Johnson Memorandum, the “DHS must exercise prosecutorial discretion in the enforcement of law,” meaning, the DHS officer can make a decision not to enforce the law. The use of Prosecutorial Discretion applies to a variety of enforcement actions including: (1) “whether to parole an alien into the United States;” (2) “whether to commence removal proceedings and what charges to lodge against the respondent;” (3) “whether to pursue formal removal proceedings;” (4) “whether to cancel a Notice to Appear or other charging document before jurisdiction vests with an immigration judge;” (4) “whether to grant deferred action or extended voluntary departure;” (5) “whether to appeal an immigration judge’s decision or order, and whether to file a motion to reopen;” (6) “whether to invoke an automatic stay during the pendency of an appeal; and, (7) “whether to impose a fine for particular offenses.”

In addition to the types of prosecutorial discretion listed above, the government agent may also exercise prosecutorial discretion in issuing a Notice to Appear. Specifically, the DHS can choose not to initiate removal proceedings against someone who has positive equities. Some positive equities that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) may consider in determining whether to exercise Prosecutorial Discretion include: “extenuating circumstances involving the offense of conviction; extended length of time since the offense of conviction; length of time in the U.S.; military service; family or community ties in the U.S.; status as a victim, witness or plaintiff in civil or criminal proceedings; or compelling humanitarian factors such as poor health, age, pregnancy, a young child, or a seriously ill relative.” This list of factors is not exhaustive. Attorneys

178 Center for Immigrants’ Rights and the American Bar Association, To File or Not to File a Notice to Appear: Improving the Government’s Use of Prosecutorial Discretion (last visited May 12, 2016).
179 Id.
should inform DHS officers of the positive equities the client possesses, in order to request any form of Prosecutorial Discretion.

(c). Administrative and Judicial Options to Challenge Removal
The following are a non-exhaustive list of forms of adjudicatory review and are meant to provide a general understanding of the procedures.

Motions to Reopen or Reconsider
A noncitizen may move to reopen or to reconsider a previous decision by filing a timely motion with an IJ or the Board. The central purpose of a motion to reopen\(^\text{181}\) is to introduce new and additional evidence that is material and that was unavailable at the original hearing. A motion to reconsider\(^\text{182}\) seeks a reexamination of the decision based on alleged errors of law and facts. Unless an exception applies, a party may file only one motion to reopen and one motion to reconsider. With a few exceptions, a motion to reopen proceedings must be filed within 90 days of the final removal order, while a motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the date of the final order. The filing of such motions does not suspend the execution of the removal decision unless a stay is ordered by the IJ, the Board, DHS, or the alien seeks to reopen an in absentia order (a decision made when the alien was absent at the proceeding).

Stay of Removal
A Stay of Removal prevents DHS from executing an order of removal, deportation, or exclusion. Depending on the situation, a stay of removal may be automatic or discretionary. A noncitizen is entitled to an automatic stay of removal during the time allowed to file an appeal (unless a waiver of the right to appeal is filed), while an appeal is pending before the Board, or while a case is before the Board by way of certification.\(^\text{183}\)

---

\(^\text{181}\) Before the Immigration Judge 8 C.F.R. § 1003.23(b)(3) (2016); INA § 240(c)(7)). Before the Board of Immigration Appeals 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2 (2016).
\(^\text{182}\) 8 C.F.R. § 1003.23(b)(2) (2016).
Except in cases involving in absentia orders, filing a motion to reopen or reconsider will not stay the execution of any decision made in a case. Similarly, filing a petition for review in federal court also does not result in an automatic stay of a removal order. Thus, a removal order can proceed unless the alien applies for and is granted a stay of execution as a discretionary form of relief by the Board, IJ, DHS, or a federal court. Such a stay is temporary and is often coupled with a written motion to reopen or reconsider filed with the Immigration Court, the Board, or an appeal to a federal Circuit Court.

**Judicial Review**

The Immigration and Nationality Act confers federal courts jurisdiction over certain decisions appealed from the Board. However, subsequent laws have substantially restricted judicial review of removal orders. A noncitizen has 30 days from the date of a final removal decision to file a judicial appeal, which is generally filed with the Court of Appeals.

**Administrative Appeal**

The Board is the highest administrative body with the authority to interpret federal immigration laws. The Board has jurisdiction to hear appeals from decisions of IJs and certain decisions of DHS. Either a noncitizen or DHS may appeal a decision from the IJ. In deciding cases, the Board can dismiss or sustain the appeal, remand the case to the deciding IJ, or, in rare cases, refer the case to the Attorney General for a decision. A precedent decision by the Board is binding on DHS and IJs throughout the country unless the Attorney General modifies or overrules the decision. With respect to the filing deadline, the appeal of an Immigration Judge’s decision must be received by 30 calendar days from the date it was issued by the court.

---

184 8 C.F.R. § 1003.23(b)(v) (2016).
186 8 U.S.C. § 1252 (c),(d) (2016); INA § 242(c), (d).
187 8 U.S.C. § 1252 (b) (2016); INA § 242(b).
VIII. APPENDIX – Pro-se packets from the Florence Immigrant and Refugee Rights Project

The Florence Immigrant and Refugee Rights Project, available at [http://www.firrp.org](http://www.firrp.org) (choose "Resources" and follow "How to Defend Your Case" hyperlink, scroll to “Cancellation of Removal for Legal Permanent Residents (green card holders) and select “English” hyperlink), (last visited May. 12, 2016).
A Roadmap to Winning Your Case for “LPR Cancellation of Removal”

This guide was prepared and updated by the staff of the Florence Immigrant & Refugee Rights Project and was written for immigrant detainees in Arizona who are representing themselves pro se in their removal proceedings. This guide is not intended to provide legal advice or serve as a substitute for legal counsel. The Florence Project is a nonprofit legal services organization and does not charge for its services to immigrant detainees in Arizona. This guide is copyright protected but can be shared and distributed widely to assist indigent immigrants around the country. All of our guides are available to download on our website: www.firrp.org. We kindly ask that you give credit to the Florence Project if you are adapting the information in this guide into your own publication.
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Important Words to Know

Immigration Law has a lot of technical words. Here’s a list of some of the words you’ll see a lot in this guide and an short explanation of what they mean.

- **Immigration Judge ("Judge"):** This is the person who will make a decision about your case. He or she holds hearings in the courtroom and wears a black robe. This person doesn’t work for ICE. It’s her job to look at the facts of your case and apply the law fairly.

- **Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE"):** This is the agency that has put you in deportation proceedings and is in charge of detaining you. ICE is part of the Department of Homeland Security, or “DHS.”

- **Government Attorney:** This is the lawyer who represents ICE when you go to your court hearings. He or she sits at the table next to you and also talks to the Judge. It’s usually this attorney’s job to ask the Judge to order you deported.

- **Deportation:** ICE has put you in deportation proceedings, which are also called “removal proceedings.” If the Judge orders you deported or “removed” from the United States, you will be sent back to the country where you are a citizen and will not be able to return legally to the U.S. for at least ten years.

- **The Florence Project:** This is a group of lawyers and legal assistants who provide free legal help to people without lawyers. The Florence Project wrote this guide to help you understand your case.
1. Introduction

If you are legal permanent resident (LPR) of the United States (also called a “green card” holder) and you’ve been convicted of certain crimes or broken other immigration laws, ICE may put you into deportation proceedings.

However, you may be able to apply for a one-time-only pardon that allows you to cancel your deportation.

In order to get the pardon, you’ll have to show the Judge that the good things about you—like your family ties here, your work history, and your contributions to the community—outweigh the bad things in your life, like your criminal history or your addiction to drugs or alcohol.

If you are eligible to apply for “LPR Cancellation of Removal”, there’s a pretty good chance that you’ll win your case—if you do your homework and prepare well, that is. Remember, you’ll have to apply while you’re in deportation proceedings—you can’t apply if you’ve been deported already. If you decide to take the deportation and not fight for “LPR Cancellation of Removal,” you’ll face some big consequences:

- You will not able to apply for another chance to live in the United States for at least 10 years.
- Depending on your convictions, you may never be able to apply for another chance to live here.
- If you come back to the US without permission and get caught, you may be sentenced to years in federal prison.
We know it’s not easy to be detained. But, taking the time to put together an “LPR Cancellation of Removal” case could let you go on living in the United States. This guide will give you a road map to winning your case. It can be a long road to release with a few detours along the way, but we hope to give you the tools you need for a safe and smooth trip. Best of luck with your case!

2. What Does “LPR Cancellation of Removal Mean?”

It means that you may be able to stop your deportation and keep your green card if you meet ALL of the requirements below.

- You’ve been a Legal Permanent Resident (green card holder) for at least the last five years
- You’ve been in the United States with some form of legal status for at least seven years, without committing certain offenses or being put into deportation proceedings
- You haven’t been convicted of an “aggravated felony.” An aggravated felony usually means any conviction with a sentence over one year. But, there are many exceptions.

Remember, the requirements for “LPR Cancellation of Removal” can be a little technical and depend a lot on the details of your life.

If you are eligible for “LPR Cancellation of Removal,” that doesn’t mean that you’ll automatically win your case. You’ll need to convince the Judge that you deserve a second chance here in the United States. You can do that by showing that your deportation would cause you and the people family a lot of suffering. You’ll also need to show that you understand that you’ve made mistakes in the past and that you won’t repeat them in the future.
3. Hitting the Road to Cancellation of Removal: Your First Court Hearings

First, let’s talk about the basics of immigration court. If you feel confused about court, you’re not alone! Immigration law is complicated, even for lawyers. Let’s figure out who is going to in court and what’s going to happen in your first hearings.

The Judge will be at the front of the room and will ask you questions. He will be dressed like the man on the left. The Judge will be making the decision about your case so it’s important to be respectful, polite, and prepared.

- A government attorney. When you go to court, a lawyer representing ICE will be there. He’s called the government attorney. His job is to represent ICE and try to get an order of deportation against you.

- An interpreter. Don't worry if you don't speak English—an interpreter will be there in person or over the phone. Just make sure you speak up and tell the IJ that you don't speak or understand English well and need an interpreter.

The first few hearings that you’ll go to will be “master calendar” hearings. At those hearings, you’ll be in court with a group of other detainees. At “master calendar” hearings, the Judge will check in with you about your case and see what you want to do. It isn’t time yet to show her all your evidence of the reasons why you should stay in the country. If you want more time to talk to an attorney, the judge will give you a few weeks to do so. You’ll then come back for another master calendar hearing.

When you come back to court, the Judge will ask you if you want to admit or deny the changes against you. That means that the Judge wants
to know if you want to force the government attorney to prove the charges against you. If the government attorney says that you should be deported because of your criminal convictions, making him prove the charges against you can be an important step. To learn more about how to do that, read the Florence Project’s guide on denying the charges against you.

Certain types of criminal convictions, even for pretty minor crimes, can affect your deportation case, so it’s good to get some legal advice before admitting any criminal charges against you. If you can’t speak to an attorney first, you might want to consider denying your criminal charges just to be safe.

a. Eligibility for “LPR Cancellation of Removal”

If the Judge decides that at least some of the charges against you are correct, she’ll then ask you questions to figure out if you are eligible for “LPR Cancellation of Removal.” She’ll ask questions to make sure you meet the requirements to apply. Take a look at the requirements on page 6 if you can’t remember. If the Judge agrees that you are eligible to present your case for “LPR Cancellation” to her, she’ll give you a copy of the application.

Remember, just because the Judge says you’re eligible for “LPR Cancellation” does not mean that you’ve won your case! It means that the Judge thinks that you’ve met the basic requirements and is giving you a chance to show her that you deserve to have your deportation cancelled.

b. Filling out and turning in the application

Before your final hearing, you’ll come back to court for one more “master calendar” hearing to turn in your application for “LPR Cancellation of Removal.” It’s important that you fill out the application completely so that the Judge will accept it and schedule a final hearing for you to present all your evidence. A short guide on how to fill out your application is at the end of this packet.
When you've completed the application, make two extra copies and bring them to court with you. The original will go to the Judge. Another copy will go to the government attorney and you'll keep a copy for yourself. This is important, so don’t forget!

Once you turn in your application, the Judge will give you a date for a final hearing. At this hearing, you'll appear without a group of detainees. The hearing will last a few hours. This hearing will be your chance to present your case to the judge.

4. Steering Toward Success: Gathering Evidence for Your Case

As we talked about earlier, winning your case for “LPR Cancellation” is like following a roadmap for a long trip. You got started on your trip by going to your master calendar hearing and filling out your application. Now it’s time to hit the road and begin gathering evidence to support your case. Every piece of evidence you gather means that you’re a little further toward the finish line!

Start gathering evidence as soon as you decide that you want to apply for “LPR Cancellation of Removal.” Take a look at the list of evidence in Appendix 3. This will give you ideas of what documents to gather. Many of these documents take time for your family to find and to mail to you. We know it’s not easy to gather all of these documents while you’re detained. Ask a trusted family member or friend to help you get these documents together. Make sure that he mails you copies, not originals, of these documents.
The type of evidence that you'll gather depends on the facts of your case. Try and think of evidence that shows that you or your family would suffer a lot if you were deported. For example, if you have health problems and would have a hard time getting treatment in your home country, that evidence would be very helpful to your case.

Or, if you're a single mom whose kids have never been to your country, you'll want to get letters from their teachers about how they're doing in school and whether they have any special needs. You’ll need copies of their birth certificates to show that they’re U.S. citizens. You’ll want to document all the opportunities that they have here—scholarships, job trainings, camps—that they won’t have in your country.

Every person applying for “LPR Cancellation of Removal” should get as many letters of reference as possible. These should be from friends, family, and employers and should talk about all the good contributions that you’ve made to the United States. Again, there is a long list of examples of good types of evidence in Appendix 3.

Remember, all the documents you submit need to be in English. If you receive documents in another language, you can translate them. Just put your translation in with the original letter and attach a signed copy of the “Certificate of Translation” that’s at the end of this packet.
Once you have all your documents together, you'll want to organize them. Make a list of everything you have and then put it on top. You can divide your documents into categories like these:

1. Family Ties in the US (birth certificates, marriage certificates)
2. Evidence of Hardship to Me if I Am Deported
3. Evidence of Hardship to My Family
4. Evidence of Employment History and Property in the US
5. Evidence of Rehabilitation (if you have criminal history)

Attach a signed and dated copy of “Certificate of Service” at the end of this packet to the last page of all your evidence. Then make two copies of all your evidence. Just like the application, the original will go to the Judge, a copy will go to the government attorney and you'll keep a copy for yourself.

If you want to send the documents to the Judge before your final date, put a cover sheet with your name and A-number on top. Then put the packets in envelopes. One should say “To the Immigration Judge” and the other should say “To ICE Litigation.” Ask detention staff to make sure they are delivered or put them in the detention center's mailboxes that are delivered to the Judge and to ICE.
5. The Final Stretch: Preparing Your Testimony

You’re almost done with your journey toward “LPR Cancellation of Removal” and are about to see the finish line! Spending time preparing your testimony for the final hearing will help you with this final stretch of your case.

At your final hearing, you’ll have an opportunity to tell the judge why you think you should stay in the United States. Keep these tips in mind when practicing your testimony:

- **Be prepared.** Write a list of the specific reasons why you and your family would suffer if you were deported. Don’t just say things like “they’ll miss me” or “they need me to pay the bills.” That won’t be much help—all families go through that. **Think about the reasons why your family will suffer much more than normal if you’re deported and explain those reasons to the Judge.** Write them down on a piece of paper.

  For example, you’ll need to explain how much your child’s cancer treatment costs, how you take care of her when she’s sick, how this treatment isn’t available in your home country, and how you pay all the family’s medical bills. Practice explaining this to a friend or a family member over the phone.

- **Be honest.** Your job is to tell the Judge about the circumstances of your life. If you have criminal convictions and the Judge asks you about them, tell her what happened. Lying will just make things worse, and the Judge and government attorney often have ways to figure out if you are lying.
• **Turn negatives into positives.** If you had a problem with drugs and alcohol in the past, explain how you’ve overcome those problems—did you go to AA meetings or complete a rehabilitation program? Tell the Judge about those things, too.

• **Don't be defensive.** Admitting that you made mistakes can show the Judge that you are sorry. It can also show the Judge that you won’t repeat those mistakes in the future.

  • **Speak from the heart.** Judges see a lot of people every day. You can make your testimony stand out by speaking sincerely. Think of a funny story about your family to share. Think about a story that will show the Judge how much your family needs you. Explain to the Judge why your deportation would hurt you and your family very much. Don’t worry if you become nervous or emotional in court—it happens to almost everyone.

• **Ask your family members to testify in court.** Your family can come and tell the judge about the reasons why you should stay in the United States. Help your family member prepare by asking her to list all the reasons why she would suffer if you were in another country. Make sure she practices and writes the reasons down to have with her in court. Your family members can also come and watch your final hearing to show the Judge that they support you. Remember, some of the detention centers won’t let small children come to court, so have your family members call the detention center and ask about the rules before the come.

• **Answer the judge’s questions.** The judge may want to ask you some specific questions. A list of what she may ask is at the end of this guide. In addition to practicing your testimony, you should practice responses to those questions so you’ll be prepared. Remember, be respectful when the judge speaks. Refer to the judge as “Your Honor,” “Ma’am,” or “Sir.”
6. Weighing the Evidence: The Judge’s Decision

In most cases, the Judge will give you her decision at the end of your final hearing. She’ll tell you whether or not she’ll approve your application for “LPR Cancellation of Removal.” Other times, the Judge will tell you that she wants time to think about your case. She will write a decision and send it to you through the detention center’s mail within a few weeks.

There are a few possibilities for the Judge’s decision:

- If the Judge approves your application and the government attorney does not want to appeal that decision, you’ll likely be released the same day.

- If the Judge approves your application and the government attorney appeals that decision, you’ll likely have to wait until the Board of Immigration Appeals gives you a final decision. It usually takes at least three months.

- If the Judge denies your application, you have the choice of appealing that decision and saying that the Judge was wrong. You’ll need to tell the Judge at your final hearing that you want to appeal. She’ll give you some paperwork that needs to be mailed within 30 days of her decision. Take a look at the Florence Project’s guide to appealing your case or schedule an appointment to talk with an attorney about your appeal.

Final Thoughts

As you’ve seen, winning a case for “LPR Cancellation of Removal” is not easy. You need to show that you and your family would suffer if you were deported. It takes planning, lots of work gathering evidence, and really practicing your testimony. We wish you the best of luck with your case!
Appendix 1. Filling Out Your Application

This section addresses some common questions and mistakes that can happen when you’re filling out your application for Cancellation of Removal application. If you need an extra copy, it’s available at http://www.justice.gov/eoir/formslist.htm.

You must use a pen or typewriter to fill out the form. Do not use a pencil. Most importantly, if you are unsure or do not know the answer to a question, write that on the form. For example, if you can’t remember something about your criminal record, write down as much as you know and put “I can’t remember” or “this is to the best of my memory.” or indicate that you might have missing or incorrect information. If a question does not apply to you simply put “N/A” in the box, for example if you are not married and the question asks for information about your wife.

If there is not enough room on the form for you to answer a question completely, continue your answer on another piece of paper. Just make sure to write your name and A-number at the top of each piece of paper.

These are questions to watch out for:

42A Application for Cancellation of Removal

Part 1

- If you are detained, use the address for the detention center.

Part 2

- If you first entered the U.S. as a legal permanent resident, write down the date you entered and where. If you first entered the U.S. illegally and later applied for and received your legal permanent residency, put down the date you received your LPR status.
Part 3

- If you used a different name when you entered the U.S. include that information here.

- Mark here what your immigration status was when you entered the U.S. If you entered without papers, mark “entered without inspection”.

- Watch out for the question that asks you to list all of your entries and departures from the U.S. You should list every trip you’ve made out of the U.S., even if it was for less than one day. If you left and came back many times for the same reason (for example, if you went to Mexico several times just for the day to go shopping or to visit family) then you can write something like “day trip once a month to Mexico for shopping”. You may need another piece of paper to answer this question.

Part 4

- If you have never married, please mark “I am not married” and skip to question #36. If you have only been married ONE time, please answer questions 25-34 in full and on #35 mark “I have not been previously married”.

Part 5

- When listing your work history, begin with the job you had just before coming to detention and work backwards. If you cannot remember all of the details of your work history include as much information as you can remember.

Part 6

- Please include ALL children and listed relatives (parents, brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, and grandparents), whether they are in the U.S. or another country. If they live outside the U.S., then only put the country where they live. If necessary, continue information on additional pieces of paper.
Part 7

- **THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION** on the application is the one that asks about your criminal history. It is VERY important to include any and all arrests, court appearances, convictions, even if you think that ICE does not know about it or the charges were dismissed. This also includes any fines or traffic violations. ICE will obtain your “rap sheet” and other conviction documents before your hearing. If you do not list the charges on your application and they later come out at the hearing, the judge may think you trying to hide something and it will hurt your case. If you think that you may not remember your criminal history perfectly, then you can note that the answers provided are “to the best of your recollection” and that you “might be missing or forgetting an incident.”

**G-325A**

- If you’ve never been married before, just list N/A
- List your addresses from the most recent to the lease recent. If you’re currently detained, use the detention center’s address
- If you can’t remember exactly when you lived someplace, use the abbreviation “apprx” or “+/−” to show that you’re making an estimation
- List your previous jobs from most recent to least recent
- Check the box to indicate that the form is filed along with an application to be a Permanent Resident

**Fee Waiver**

- If you are currently detained and not paying any bills, you can put 0’s when asked about your monthly expenses and income.
Appendix 2: Questions to Expect from the Judge and Government Attorney

*Immigration History:*

1. Have you used any aliases in the United States?
2. When did you first enter the United States?
3. How did you enter?
4. How did you get your green card?
5. Have you left the U.S. since you got your green card? How many times? What is the longest amount of time you have spent outside of the U.S. after you got your green card?

*Family Life:*

1. Are you married? When did you get married (make sure you know the date!!!)? Where does s/he live? What is your husband or wife’s immigration status? Have you ever filed a petition for him or her? Why not?
2. If not married but living with someone, why haven't you gotten married? Have you ever made plans to marry this person that you live with? How long have you lived together?
3. Do you have children? When were they born (know dates!!!)? How old are your kids? Who do they live with? What immigration status do they have?
4. Are your parents still living? Where do they live? What is their immigration status?
5. Do you have any other relatives or family in the United States? What is their immigration status?
6. Do you have any relatives or family living in your country of origin? Could you go live with them if you are removed? Why not?

7. The Judge will also want to know about your involvement and the quality of your relationship with all of the people mentioned above:

   How often do you speak to each other?
   How often do you see each other?
   How is your relationship with this person?
   How involved are you with your kids?

_Hardship_

1. Will your wife or kids go with you if you are deported? Why not?

2. Do you have any medical conditions? Do you take any medication?

3. Do any of your relatives have medical conditions? What? Do you take care of them? How?

4. What will you do if you are deported? Where will you go? Who will you live with? How will you get your medicine? How will you work?

_Employment, Education, Community Involvement_

1. How far did you get with your schooling?

2. What was the last job you had? How much were you making per week? How long were you working there?

3. The judge will want to get a sense of your employment history for at least the last 5 to 10 years, if not the entire time that you have lived in the United States.

4. If you have had long periods of unemployment, be prepared to discuss what you were doing during that time and why.
5. Where will you work or how will you support yourself if you win your case?

6. Have you done volunteer work or community service? Was it court ordered or of your own choice?

7. Do you go to church or participate in any other types of community organizations? Which ones? How often?

8. Have you always filed taxes? If not, why not?

9. Have you ever received public assistance or benefits? For how long? Why?

10. If you are a man who lived in the United States between ages 18 and 25, did you register for the Selective Service? (Note: if you did not know that you were required to register, make sure to tell the judge that rather than try to make up a reason).

**Property**

1. Do you own a house? A car? Other property?

**Criminal Record and Other Negatives**

1. Have you had any incident reports while in detention? What for?

2. What has been your most recent offense (the conviction that brought you to immigration’s attention and custody)? What happened?

3. Do you have any other convictions? (List them all! Let the judge know if you can’t remember all of them and why you have trouble remembering!)

4. What happened in each of those incidents?
5. Do you have any other arrests? What were those for? What happened in each of those incidents?

6. Make sure to explain your criminal record in a way that is honest and reflective:
   a. First, explain exactly what happened and focus on the facts.
   b. Second, explain what you did wrong in the situation.
   c. Third, explain what you would do differently if you were in that situation again.
   d. Fourth, explain you plan to do to make sure that you are never in that kind of situation again.
   e. Fifth, explain to the judge what you have learned from this process.
   f. Sixth, explain to the judge if you have changed, how you have changed, and why you have changed.

**Drug or Alcohol use:**

1. Do or did you have a drug or alcohol problem?

2. What drugs have you tried? How often do you use?

3. When did you first begin to use or consume drugs or alcohol?

4. Did you consume or use in front of your kids? While pregnant?

5. Do you drive while under the influence?

6. When did you stop using? Why did you stop?

7. What do you plan to do if you are out and feel the urge to consume drugs or alcohol again?

8. What is your plan to stay away from drugs or alcohol in the future?
9. Have you ever participated in a drug or alcohol program before? How far did you get in the program? Name some steps in AA or NA.

10. What’s different this time? Why didn’t it work before?

Assault, Battery, Domestic Violence, Restraining orders:

1. What do you plan to do next time you get in an argument with your spouse or someone else?

2. Who was the victim of your acts? Did you hit him or her?

3. Have you hit or beat this victim or others before? How many times?

4. Please describe in detail how you hit the victim (punched? pulled? slapped? open fist? any scars left? who was there? who called the police?)

5. Do you believe you have problems with your spouse or with managing your anger?

6. How have you solved these problems? How?

7. Is your victim here to testify on your behalf? Has he or she written a letter of support? Why not? Is he or she afraid of you?

8. Is there a restraining order? Have you violated it?

9. If the victim is a relative, what is his or her immigration status?

Future

1. What do you plan to do if you win your case and get out?

2. How will you stay out of trouble?

3. Where will you live?
4. Where do you plan to work? What will you study?

**Appendix 3. Checklist of Documents**

We recommend that you try to obtain as many of the following types of documents as possible, BUT please do not become discouraged or feel that you have no chance if you do not have a lot of documents to submit or if you don’t have many family or friends. There are many ways to explain why these people are missing, to supplement your application in other ways, and to win your case even with a packet of evidence that is small.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letters of support from as many family members as possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including drawings from children)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of support from friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters from people who know me (neighbors, landlord, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters showing community involvement (church, volunteering)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof of financial support my family (rent receipt, child support)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters from past employers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters from religious organizations I belong to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos of family (birthday parties, holidays, pets, babies, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Certificates from Rehabilitation Programs                              |          |
| Informational Pamphlets on rehabilitation programs in my area          |          |
| (domestic violence, alcohol or drug abuse, anger management)           |          |
| Letter to my probation/parole officer explaining that I am in ICE custody |          |

<p>| Tax Records                                                            |          |
| Pay Stubs                                                              |          |
| Social Security Records                                                |          |
| Letter showing that I have a job when I get out of detention           |          |
| Proof of English Language Training, GED, college, etc.                 |          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificates and diplomas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copies of children’s school records, including letters from teachers about my children’s classroom performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copies of my medical records and my close relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copies of my children’s birth certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A copy of my green card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy of my marriage certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof of any debt that I have (mortgage, car loans, medical, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof of insurance (car, medical, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof of Property that I own in the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles about the situation in my country of origin (eg. poor medical care, war and violence, unemployment, poverty)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4. Certificate of Service

Use the following certificate if you will give the documents to the government attorney and the judge in court.

I, ________________________(your name here), hereby certify that I hand-delivered a copy of this document to a representative of ICE Litigation on the date below.

Signed:

Date:

Use the following certificate if you will mail the documents to the ICE attorney and judge before the hearing.

I, ________________________(your name here), hereby certify that I placed a copy of this document in the mail to ICE Litigation at _______________________

(list address for the ICE office at the detention center where you are staying) on the date below.

Signed:

Date:
Appendix 5. Sample Certificate of Translation

I, ________________________(name of translator), certify that I am competent to translate this document from its original language into English and that the translation is true and accurate to the best of my abilities.

Signature of translator
Date
IX. APPENDIX – Sample documents and forms from government entities; includes the application for LPR Cancellation of Removal from EOIR

Below you will find the applicable government forms. Please note that these forms can be revised; thus, the practitioner should check the government website for the latest edition of the following materials.

**From the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR), Forms**

Page 154  Advice to Applicant: Application for Cancellation of Removal for Certain Permanent Residents
Page 156  Instructions: Application for Cancellation of Removal for Certain Permanent Residents
Page 159  Form EOIR 42A: Application for Cancellation of Removal for Certain Permanent Residents
Page 166  Form EOIR 28: Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Representative Before the Immigration Court

**From the EOIR, Immigration Court Practice Manual**

Page 168  Sample Cover Page
Page 169  Sample Written Pleading
Page 173  Sample Proof of Service

**From the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS)**

Page 175  Form G-325A: Biographic Information

---


191 United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, available at [www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis](http://www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis) (follow "Forms" hyperlink; then follow "Form G-325A" hyperlink), (last visited May 12, 2016).
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ADVICE TO APPLICANT
PLEASE READ CAREFULLY. FEES WILL NOT BE RETURNED.

I. Permanent Resident Aliens Eligible for Cancellation of Removal: You may be eligible to have your removal cancelled under section 240A(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). To qualify for this benefit, you must establish in a hearing before an Immigration Judge that:

A. You have been a permanent resident for at least five (5) years;

B. Prior to service of the Notice to Appear, or prior to committing a criminal or related offense referred to in sections 212(a)(2) and 237(a)(2) of the INA, or prior to committing a security or related offense referred to in section 237(a)(4) of the INA;

-- you have at least seven (7) years continuous residence in the United States after having been lawfully admitted in any status; and

C. You have not been convicted of an aggravated felony.

NOTE: If you have served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for at least 24 months, you do not have to meet the requirements of continuous residence in the United States. You must, however, have been in the United States when you entered the Armed Forces. If you are no longer in the Armed Forces, you must have been separated under honorable conditions.

II. Permanent Resident Aliens NOT Eligible for Cancellation of Removal: You are not eligible to have your removal cancelled under section 240A(a) of the INA if you:

A. Entered the United States as a crewman after June 30, 1964;

B. Were admitted to the United States as, or later became, a nonimmigrant exchange alien as defined in section 101(a)(15)(J) of the INA in order to receive a graduate medical education or training, regardless of whether you are subject to or have fulfilled the 2-year foreign residence requirement of section 212(e) of the INA;

C. Were admitted to the United States as, or later became, a nonimmigrant exchange alien as defined in section 101(a)(15)(J) of the INA, other than to receive graduate medical education or training, and are subject to the 2-year foreign residence requirement of section 212(e) of the INA but have neither fulfilled nor obtained a waiver of that requirement;

D. Are an alien who is either inadmissible under section 212(a)(3) of the INA or deportable under section 237(a)(4) of the INA;

E. Are an alien who ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of an individual because of the individual's race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; or

F. Are an alien who was previously granted relief under section 212(c) of the INA, or section 244(a) of the INA as such sections were in effect prior to the enactment of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, or whose removal has previously been cancelled under section 240A of the INA.
III. **How Permanent Resident Aliens Can Apply for Cancellation of Removal**

If you believe that you have met all the requirements for cancellation of removal, you must answer all the questions on the attached Form EOIR-42A fully and accurately. You must pay the filing and biometrics fees and comply with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) instructions for providing biometric and biographic information to USCIS [available at http://uscis.gov]. You must also serve a copy of your application on the Assistant Chief Counsel for the DHS, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) as required in the proof of service on page 7 of this application, and you must file your application with the appropriate Immigration Court. Please read the following instructions carefully before completing your application.
INSTRUCTIONS

1. PREPARATION OF APPLICATION.

To apply for cancellation of removal as a permanent resident alien under section 240A(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), you must fully and accurately answer all questions on the attached Form EOIR-42A. You must also comply with all of the instructions on this form. These instructions have the force of law. A separate application must be prepared and executed for each person applying for cancellation of removal. An application on behalf of an alien who is mentally incompetent or is a child under 14 years of age shall be executed by a parent or guardian.

Your responses must be typed or printed legibly in ink. Do not leave any questions unanswered or blank. If any questions do not apply to you, write "none" or "not applicable" in the appropriate space.

To the extent possible, answer all questions directly on the form. If there is insufficient room to respond fully to a question, please continue your response on an additional sheet of paper. Please indicate the number of the question being answered next to your response on the additional sheet, write your alien registration number, print your name, and sign, date, and securely attach each additional sheet to the Form EOIR-42A.

2. BURDEN OF PROOF.

The burden of proof is on you to prove that you meet all of the statutory requirements for cancellation of removal for certain permanent resident aliens under section 240A(a) of the INA and that you are entitled to such relief as a matter of discretion. To meet this burden, your responses to the questions on the application should be as detailed and complete as possible. You should also attach to your application any documents that demonstrate your eligibility for relief (see "SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS" below).

3. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.

You should submit with your application copies of any documents which the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), formerly the Immigration and Naturalization Service, issued to you. You should also submit all documents related to your criminal history, including all conviction records. The Immigration Judge may require you to submit additional records relating to your request for cancellation of removal.

The original of all supporting documents must be available for inspection at the hearing. If you wish to have the original documents returned to you, you should also present reproductions.

4. REQUIRED BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION.

Each applicant 14 years of age or older must also comply with the requirement to supply biometric and biographic information. You will be given instructions on how to complete this requirement. You will be notified in writing of the location of the Application Support Center (ASC) or the designated Law Enforcement Agency where you must go to provide biometric and biographic information. You will also be given a date and time for the appointment. It is important to furnish all the required information. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in a delay in your appointment or in your application being deemed abandoned and dismissed by the Immigration Court.

5. TRANSLATIONS.

Any document in a foreign language must be accompanied by an English language translation and a certificate signed by the translator stating that he/she is competent to translate the document and that the translation is true and accurate to the best of the translator's abilities. Such certification must be printed legibly or typed.
6. FEES.

Before you file your Form EOIR-42A with the Immigration Court, you must pay the required $100 filing fee and the biometrics fee to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Evidence of payment of these fees in the form of a copy of the DHS, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) ASC notice of fee receipt and biometrics appointment instructions must accompany your Form EOIR-42A. These fees will not be refunded, regardless of the action taken on your application. Therefore, it is important that you read the advice, instructions, and application carefully before responding. If you are unable to pay the filing fee, you may ask the Immigration Judge to permit you to file your Form EOIR-42A without fee (fee waiver).

**DO NOT SEND CASH.** All fees must be submitted in the exact amount. Remittance may be made by personal check, cashier's check, certified bank check, bank international money order, or foreign draft drawn on a financial institution in the United States and payable to the "Department of Homeland Security" in United States currency. If the applicant resides in the Virgin Islands, the check or money order must be payable to the "Commissioner of Finance of the Virgin Islands." If the applicant resides in Guam, the check or money order must be payable to the "Treasurer, Guam." Personal checks are accepted subject to collectibility. An uncollectible check will render the application and any documents issued pursuant thereto invalid. A charge of $30.00 will be imposed if a check in payment of a fee is not honored by the bank on which it is drawn. When the check is drawn on an account of a person other than the applicant, the name and alien registration number of the applicant must be entered on the face of the check. All checks must be drawn on a bank located in the United States.

7. SERVING & FILING YOUR APPLICATION.

A. You must first comply with the DHS instructions for providing biometric and biographic information to USCIS, which involves sending a copy of the application to the appropriate USCIS Service Center. The DHS instructions also address payment of the application fees.

B. You must then serve the following documents on the Assistant Chief Counsel for DHS, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE):

   - a copy of your Form EOIR-42A, Application for Cancellation of Removal, with all supporting documents and additional sheets;
   - a copy of the USCIS ASC notice of fee receipt and biometrics appointment instructions; and
   - the original Biographical Information Form G-325A.

You must file the following documents with the appropriate Immigration Court:

   - the original Form EOIR-42A with all supporting documents and additional sheets;
   - a copy of the USCIS ASC notice of fee receipt and biometrics appointment instructions;
   - a copy of the Biographical Information Form G-325A; and
   - a completed certificate showing service of these documents (See Part 10 of the Application on page 7) on the ICE Assistant Chief Counsel, unless service is made on the record at the hearing.

Retain your USCIS ASC biometrics confirmation document or a copy of your Fingerprint Card, FD-258, if applicable, as proof that your biometrics were taken, and bring it to your future Immigration Court hearings.

8. PENALTIES.

You must answer all questions on Form EOIR-42A truthfully and submit only genuine documents in support of your application. **You will be required to swear or affirm that the contents of your application and the supporting documents are true to the best of your knowledge.** Your answer to the questions on this form and the supporting documents you present will be used to determine whether your removal should be cancelled and whether you should be permitted to retain your permanent resident status. Any answer you give and any supporting document you present may also be used as evidence in any proceeding to determine your right to be admitted or readmitted, re-enter, pass through, or reside in the United States. Your application may be denied if any of your answers or supporting documents are found to be false.
Presenting false answers or false documents may also subject you to criminal prosecution under 18 U.S.C. section 1546 and/or subject you to civil penalties under 8 U.S.C. section 1324c if you submit your application knowing that the application, or any supporting document, contains any false statement with respect to a material fact, or if you swear or affirm that the contents of your application and the supporting documents are true, knowing that the application or any supporting documents contain any false statement with respect to a material fact. If convicted, you could be fined up to $250,000, imprisoned for up to ten (10) years, or both. 18 U.S.C. sections 1546(a), 3559(a)(4), 3571(b)(3). If it is determined you have violated the prohibition against document fraud and a final order is entered against you, you could be subject to a civil penalty up to $2,000 for each document used or created for the first offense, and up to $5,000 for any second, or subsequent offense. In addition, if you are the subject of a final order for violating 8 U.S.C. section 1324c, relating to civil penalties for document fraud, you will be removable from the United States.

9. PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT NOTICE.

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act, a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. We try to create forms and instructions that are accurate, can easily be understood, and which impose the least possible burden on you to provide us with information. Often, this process is difficult because some immigration laws are very complex. The reporting burden for this collection of information is computed as follows: (1) learning about the form, 50 minutes, (2) completing the form, 2 hours, and (3) assembling and filing the form, 3 hours, for an average of 5 hours, 50 minutes per application. If you have comments regarding the accuracy of this burden estimate, or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, you may write to the U.S. Department of Justice, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Office of the General Counsel, 5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 2600, Falls Church, Virginia 22041.
### PART 1 - INFORMATION ABOUT YOURSELF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) My present true name is: (Last, First, Middle)</th>
<th>2) Alien Registration (or “A”) Number(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) My name given at birth was: (Last, First, Middle)</td>
<td>4) Birth Place: (City and Country)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Date of Birth: (Month, Day, Year)</td>
<td>6) Gender: ❏ Male ❏ Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Height:</td>
<td>8) Hair Color:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Eye Color:</td>
<td>10) Current Nationality and Citizenship:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Social Security Number:</td>
<td>12) Home Phone Number: ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Work Phone Number: ( )</td>
<td>14) I currently reside at:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Apt. number and/or in care of**
- **Number and Street**
- **City or Town**
- **State**
- **Zip Code**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15) I have been known by these additional name(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 16) I have resided in the following locations in the United States: (List PRESENT ADDRESS FIRST, and work back in time for at least 7 years.) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street and Number - Apt. or Room # - City or Town - State - Zip Code</th>
<th>Resided From: (Month, Day, Year)</th>
<th>Resided To: (Month, Day, Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PART 2 - INFORMATION ABOUT THIS APPLICATION

17) I, the undersigned, hereby request that my removal be cancelled under the provisions of section 240A(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). I believe that I am eligible for this relief because I have been a lawful permanent resident alien for 5 or more years, have 7 years of continuous residence in the United States, and have not been convicted of an aggravated felony. I was admitted as or adjusted to the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence on

- **(Date)**

at

- **(Place)**

Please continue answers on a separate sheet as needed.
PART 3 - INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR PRESENCE IN THE UNITED STATES

18) My first arrival into the United States was under the name of: (Last, First, Middle)  
19) My first arrival to the United States was on: (Month, Day, Year)

20) Place or port of first arrival: (Place or Port, City, and State)

21) I: ☐ was inspected and admitted.  
☐ I entered using my Lawful Permanent Resident card which is valid until (Month, Day, Year).  
☐ I entered using a (Specify Type of Visa) which is valid until (Month, Day, Year).  
☐ was not inspected and admitted.  
☐ I entered without documents. Explain: _________________________________.  
☐ I entered without inspection. Explain: _________________________________.  
☐ Other. Explain: _______________________________________.

22) I applied on ______________________ for additional time to stay and it was ☐ granted on ______________________ and valid until ______________________, or ☐ denied on ______________________.  

23) Since the date of my first entry, I departed from and returned to the United States at the following places and on the following dates: (Please list all departures regardless of how briefly you were absent from the United States.)

If you have never departed from the United States since your original date of entry, please mark an X in this box: ☐

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port of Departure (Place or Port, City and State)</th>
<th>Port of Return (Place or Port, City and State)</th>
<th>Purpose of Travel</th>
<th>Manner of Return</th>
<th>Inspected and Admitted?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Port of Departure (Place or Port, City and State)</td>
<td>Port of Return (Place or Port, City and State)</td>
<td>Departure Date (Month, Day, Year)</td>
<td>Return Date (Month, Day, Year)</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Port of Departure (Place or Port, City and State)</td>
<td>Port of Return (Place or Port, City and State)</td>
<td>Departure Date (Month, Day, Year)</td>
<td>Return Date (Month, Day, Year)</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24) Have you ever departed the United States:  
a) under an order of deportation, exclusion, or removal? ☐ Yes ☐ No  
b) pursuant to a grant of voluntary departure? ☐ Yes ☐ No

PART 4 - INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR MARITAL STATUS AND SPOUSE (Continued on page 3)

25) I am not married: ☐  
I am married: ☐

26) If married, the name of my spouse is: (Last, First, Middle)

27) My spouse’s name before marriage was:

28) The marriage took place in: (City and Country)

29) Date of marriage: (Month, Day, Year)

30) My spouse currently resides at:

Apt. number and/or in care of _________________________________.

Number and Street _________________________________.

City or Town _________________________________.

State/Country Zip Code _________________________________.

31) Place and date of birth of my spouse: (City & Country; Month, Day, Year)

32) My spouse is a citizen of: (Country)

33) If your spouse is other than a native born United States citizen, answer the following:

He/she arrived in the United States at: (Place or Port, City and State) _________________________________.

He/she arrived in the United States on: (Month, Day, Year) _________________________________.

His/her alien registration number(s) is: A# _________________________________.

He/she was naturalized on: (Month, Day, Year) _________________________________.

34) My spouse ☐ - is ☐ - is not employed. If employed, please give salary and the name and address of the place(s) of employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name and Address of Employer</th>
<th>Earnings Per Week (Approximate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PART 4 - INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR MARITAL STATUS AND SPOUSE (Continued)

35) I [ ] - have [ ] - have not been previously married: *(If previously married, list the name of each prior spouse, the dates on which each marriage began and ended, the place where the marriage terminated, and describe how each marriage ended.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of prior spouse: (Last, First, Middle)</th>
<th>Date marriage began:</th>
<th>Place marriage ended: (City and Country)</th>
<th>Description or manner of how marriage was terminated or ended:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36) Have you been ordered by any court, or are otherwise under any legal obligation, to provide child support and/or spousal maintenance as a result of a separation and/or divorce? [ ] - Yes  [ ] - No

### PART 5 - INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR EMPLOYMENT AND FINANCIAL STATUS

37) Since my arrival into the United States, I have been employed by the following named persons or firms: *(Please begin with present employment and work back in time. Any periods of unemployment or school attendance should be specified. Attach a separate sheet for additional entries if necessary.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name and Address of Employer</th>
<th>Earnings Per Week (Approximate)</th>
<th>Type of Work Performed</th>
<th>Employed From: (Month, Day, Year)</th>
<th>Employed To: (Month, Day, Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38) If self-employed, describe the nature of the business, the name of the business, its address, and net income derived therefrom:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

39) My assets (and if married, my spouse’s assets) in the United States and other countries, not including clothing and household necessities, are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Jointly Owned With Spouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash, Stocks, and Bonds........................</td>
<td>Cash, Stocks, and Bonds......................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate..................................</td>
<td>Real Estate..................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto (dollar value minus amount owed)......</td>
<td>Auto (dollar value minus amount owed)......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (describe on line below).............</td>
<td>Other (describe on line below).............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40) I [ ] - have [ ] - have not received public or private relief or assistance (e.g. Welfare, Unemployment Benefits, Medicaid, TANF, AFDC, etc.). If you have, please give full details including the type of relief or assistance received, date for which relief or assistance was received, place, and total amount received during this time:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

41) Please list each of the years in which you have filed an income tax return with the Internal Revenue Service:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
PART 6 - INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR FAMILY (Continued on page 5)

42) I have ____________ (Number of) children. Please list information for each child below, include assets and earnings information for children over the age of 16 who have separate incomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Child: (Last, First, Middle)</th>
<th>Citizen of What Country:</th>
<th>Now Residing At: (City and Country)</th>
<th>Immigration Status of Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child’s Alien Registration Number:</th>
<th>Birth Date: (Month, Day, Year)</th>
<th>Birth Date: (City and Country)</th>
<th>Estimated Total of Assets: $</th>
<th>Estimated Average Weekly Earnings: $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A#:  
- Estimated Total of Assets: $  
- Estimated Average Weekly Earnings: $  

43) If your application is denied, would your spouse and all of your children accompany you to your:

- Country of Birth - ☐ Yes ☐ No  
- Country of Nationality - ☐ Yes ☐ No  
- Country of Last Residence - ☐ Yes ☐ No

If you answered “No” to any of the responses, please explain: ________________________________

44) Members of my family, including my spouse and/or child(ren) ☐ have ☐ - have not received public or private relief or assistance (e.g., Welfare, Unemployment Benefits, Medicaid, TANF, AFDC, etc.). If any member of your immediate family has received such relief or assistance, please give full details including identity of person(s) receiving relief or assistance, dates for which relief or assistance was received, place, and total amount received during this time:

Name of Child: (Last, First, Middle)  
Alien Registration Number:  
Citizen of What Country:  
Birth Date: (Month, Day, Year)  
Relationship to Me:  
Birth Date: (City and Country)  
A#:  
Estimated Total of Assets: $  
Estimated Average Weekly Earnings: $

45) Please give the requested information about your parents, brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, and grandparents, living or deceased. As to residence, show street address, city, and state, if in the United States; otherwise show only country:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: (Last, First, Middle)</th>
<th>Citizen of What Country:</th>
<th>Relationship to Me:</th>
<th>Immigration Status of Listed Relative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alien Registration Number:</td>
<td>Birth Date: (Month, Day, Year)</td>
<td>Birth Date: (City and Country)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A#:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete Address of Current Residence, if Living: ________________________________

A#:  
Complete Address of Current Residence, if Living: ________________________________

Please continue answers on a separate sheet as needed.

(4) Form EOIR-42A
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46) I ☐ - have ☐ - have not entered the United States as a crewman after June 30, 1964.

47) I ☐ - have ☐ - have not been admitted as, or after arrival in the United States acquired the status of, an exchange alien.

48) I ☐ - have ☐ - have not submitted address reports as required by section 265 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

49) I ☐ - have ☐ - have never (either in the United States or in any foreign country) been arrested, summoned into court as a defendant, convicted, fined, imprisoned, placed on probation, or forfeited collateral for an act involving a felony, misdemeanor, or breach of any public law or ordinance (including, but not limited to, traffic violations or driving incidents involving alcohol). (If answer is in the affirmative, please give a brief description of each offense including the name and location of the offense, date of conviction, any penalty imposed, any sentence imposed, and the time actually served. You are required to submit documentation of any such occurrences.)

50) Have you ever served in the Armed Forces of the United States? ☐ - Yes ☐ - No. If “Yes” please state branch (Army, Navy, etc.) and service number:

Place of entry on duty: (City and State)________________________

Date of entry on duty: (Month, Day, Year)________________________ Date of discharge: (Month, Day, Year)________________________

Type of discharge: (Honorable, Dishonorable, etc.)________________________

I served in active duty status from: (Month, Day, Year)________________________ to (Month, Day, Year)________________________

51) Have you ever left the United States or the jurisdiction of the district where you registered for the draft to avoid being drafted into the military or naval forces of the United States? ☐ Yes ☐ No

52) Have you ever deserted from the military or naval forces of the United States while the United States was at war? ☐ Yes ☐ No

53) If male, did you register under the Military Selective Service Act or any applicable previous Selective Service (Draft) Laws? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If “Yes,” please give date, Selective Service number, local draft board number, and your last draft classification:

54) Were you ever exempted from service because of conscientious objection, alienage, or any other reason? ☐ Yes ☐ No

55) Please list your present or past membership in or affiliation with every political organization, association, fund, foundation, party, club, society, or similar group in the United States or any other place since your 16th birthday. Include any foreign military service in this part. If none, write “None.” Include the name of the organization, location, nature of the organization, and the dates of membership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Location of Organization</th>
<th>Nature of Organization</th>
<th>Member From: (Month, Day, Year)</th>
<th>Member To: (Month, Day, Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
56) Have you ever:

- [ ] Yes  [ ] No been ordered deported, excluded, or removed?
- [ ] Yes  [ ] No overstayed a grant of voluntary departure from an Immigration Judge or the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), formerly the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS)?
- [ ] Yes  [ ] No failed to appear for deportation or removal?

57) Have you ever been:

- [ ] Yes  [ ] No a habitual drunkard?
- [ ] Yes  [ ] No one whose income is derived principally from illegal gambling?
- [ ] Yes  [ ] No one who has given false testimony for the purpose of obtaining immigration benefits?
- [ ] Yes  [ ] No one who has engaged in prostitution or unlawful commercialized vice?
- [ ] Yes  [ ] No involved in a serious criminal offense and asserted immunity from prosecution?
- [ ] Yes  [ ] No a polygamist?
- [ ] Yes  [ ] No one who brought in or attempted to bring in another to the United States illegally?
- [ ] Yes  [ ] No a trafficker of a controlled substance, or a knowing assister, abettor, conspirator, or colluder with others in any such controlled substance offense (not including a single offense of simple possession of 30 grams or less of marijuana)?
- [ ] Yes  [ ] No inadmissible or deportable on security-related grounds under sections 212(a)(3) or 237(a)(4) of the INA?
- [ ] Yes  [ ] No one who has ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of an individual on account of his or her race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion?
- [ ] Yes  [ ] No a person previously granted relief under sections 212(c) or 244(a) of the INA or whose removal has previously been cancelled under section 240A of the INA?

If you answered “Yes” to any of the above questions, explain:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

58) The following certificates or other supporting documents are attached hereto as a part of this application: (Refer to the Instructions for documents which should be attached.)
PART 8 - SIGNATURE OF PERSON PREPARING FORM, IF OTHER THAN APPLICANT

(Read the following information and sign below)

I declare that I have prepared this application at the request of the person named in Part 1, that the responses provided are based on all information of which I have knowledge, or which was provided to me by the applicant, and that the completed application was read to the applicant in a language the applicant speaks fluently for verification before he or she signed the application in my presence. I am aware that the knowing placement of false information on the Form EOIR-42A may subject me to civil penalties under 8 U.S.C. 1324c.

Signature of Preparer: ___________________________  Print Name: ___________________________  Date: ___________

Daytime Telephone #: ___________________________  Address of Preparer: (Number and Street, City, State, Zip Code) ___________________________

PART 9 - SIGNATURE

APPLICATION NOT TO BE SIGNED BELOW UNTIL APPLICANT APPEARS BEFORE AN IMMIGRATION JUDGE

I swear or affirm that I know the contents of this application that I am signing, including the attached documents and supplements, and that they are all true to the best of my knowledge, taking into account the correction(s) numbered _______ to _______ , if any, that were made by me or at my request.

__________________________________
(Signature of Applicant or Parent or Guardian)

Subscribed and sworn to before me by the above-named applicant at ___________________________

__________________________________
Immigration Judge

Date: (Month, Day, Year)

PART 10 - PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Form EOIR-42A was: □ - delivered in person  □ - mailed first class, postage prepaid

on ___________________ to the Assistant Chief Counsel for the DHS (U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement-ICE)

(Month, Day, Year)

at ___________________________

(Number and Street, City, State, Zip Code)

__________________________________
Signature of Applicant (or Attorney or Representative)
(Type or Print)

**NAME AND ADDRESS OF REPRESENTED PARTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(First)</th>
<th>(Middle Initial)</th>
<th>(Last)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Number and Street)</th>
<th>(Apt. No.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(City)</th>
<th>(State)</th>
<th>(Zip Code)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ALIEN (“A”) NUMBER**

(Provide A-number of the party represented in this case.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry of appearance for (please check one of the following):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All proceedings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody and bond proceedings only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All proceedings other than custody and bond proceedings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attorney or Representative (please check one of the following):**

I am an attorney eligible to practice law in, and a member in good standing of, the bar of the highest court(s) of the following states(s), possession(s), territory(ies), commonwealth(s), or the District of Columbia (use additional space on reverse side if necessary) and I am not subject to any order disbarring, suspending, enjoining, restraining or otherwise restricting me in the practice of law in any jurisdiction (if subject to such an order, do not check this box and explain on reverse).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name of Court</th>
<th>Bar Number (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I am a representative accredited to appear before the Executive Office for Immigration Review as defined in 8 C.F.R. § 1292.1(a)(4) with the following recognized organization:

____________________________________________________________________

I am a law student or law graduate of an accredited U.S. law school as defined in 8 C.F.R. § 1292.1(a)(2).
I am a reputable individual as defined in 8 C.F.R. § 1292.1(a)(3).
I am an accredited foreign government official, as defined in 8 C.F.R. § 1291.1(a)(5), from __________ (country).
I am a person who was authorized to practice on December 23, 1952, under 8 C.F.R. § 1292.1(b).

**Attorney or Representative (please check one of the following):**

I hereby enter my appearance as attorney or representative for, and at the request of, the party named above.

EOIR has ordered the provision of a Qualified Representative for the party named above and I appear in that capacity.

I have read and understand the statements provided on the reverse side of this form that set forth the regulations and conditions governing appearances and representations before the Immigration Court. By signing this form, I consent to publication of my name and any findings of misconduct by EOIR, should I become subject to any public discipline by EOIR pursuant to the rules and procedures at 8 C.F.R. 1003.101 et seq. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

**SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OR REPRESENTATIVE**

X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EOIR ID NUMBER</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**NAME OF ATTORNEY OR REPRESENTATIVE, ADDRESS, FAX & PHONE NUMBERS, & EMAIL ADDRESS**

Name: ________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(First)</th>
<th>(Middle Initial)</th>
<th>(Last)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Address: ________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Number and Street)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(City)</th>
<th>(State)</th>
<th>(Zip Code)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Telephone: ____________________
Facsimile: ____________________
Email: ________________________

Check here if new address
Indicate Type of Appearance:

Primary Attorney/Representative          Non-Primary Attorney/Representative

On behalf of ______________________________ (Attorney’s Name) for the following hearing: _________________ (Date)

I am providing pro bono representation. Check one: yes no

Proof of Service

I (Name) _____________________________ mailed or delivered a copy of this Form EOIR-28 on (Date) __________________ to the DHS (U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement – ICE) at _________________________________________________

Signature of Person Serving

APPEARANCES - An attorney or Accredited Representative (with full accreditation) must register with the EOIR eRegistry in order to practice before the Immigration Court (see 8 C.F.R. § 1292.1(f)). Registration must be completed online on the EOIR website at www.justice.gov/eoir. An appearance shall be filed on a Form EOIR-28 by the attorney or representative appearing in each case before an Immigration Judge (see 8 C.F.R. § 1003.17). A Form EOIR-28 shall be filed either as an electronic form, or as a paper form, as appropriate (for further information, please see the Immigration Court Practice Manual, which is available on the EOIR website at www.justice.gov/eoir). The attorney or representative must check the box indicating whether the entry of appearance is for custody and bond proceedings only, for all proceedings other than custody and bond, or for all proceedings including custody and bond. When an appearance is made by a person acting in a representative capacity, his/her personal appearance or signature constitutes a representation that, under the provisions of 8 C.F.R. part 1003, he/she is authorized and qualified to represent individuals and will comply with the EOIR Rules of Professional Conduct in 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102. Thereafter, substitution or withdrawal may be permitted upon the approval of the Immigration Judge of a request by the attorney or representative of record in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 1003.17(b). Please note that although separate appearances in custody and non-custody proceedings are permitted, appearances for limited purposes within those proceedings are not permitted. See Matter of Velasquez, 19 I&N Dec. 377, 384 (BIA 1986). A separate appearance form (Form EOIR-27) must be filed with an appeal to the Board of Immigration Appeals (see 8 C.F.R. § 1003.38(g)). Attorneys and Accredited Representatives (with full accreditation) must first update their address in eRegistry before filing a Form EOIR-28 that reflects a new address.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT - This form may not be used to request records under the Freedom of Information Act or the Privacy Act. The manner of requesting such records is in 28 C.F.R. §§ 16.1-16.11 and appendices. For further information about requesting records from EOIR under the Freedom of Information Act, see How to File a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Request With the Executive Office for Immigration Review, available on EOIR's website at http://www.justice.gov/eoir.

PRIVACY ACT NOTICE - The information requested on this form is authorized by 8 U.S.C. §§ 1229(a), 1362 and 8 C.F.R. § 1003.17 in order to enter an appearance to represent a party before the Immigration Court. The information you provide is mandatory and required to enter an appearance. Failure to provide the requested information will result in an inability to represent a party or receive notice of actions in a proceeding. EOIR may share this information with others in accordance with approved routine uses described in EOIR's system of records notice, EOIR-001, Records and Management Information System, 69 Fed. Reg. 26,179 (May 11, 2004), or its successors and EOIR-003, Practitioner Complaint-Disciplinary Files, 64 Fed. Reg. 49237 (September 1999). Furthermore, the submission of this form acknowledges that an attorney or representative will be subject to the disciplinary rules and procedures at 8 C.F.R. 1003.101et seq., including, pursuant to 8 C.F.R. §§ 292.3(h)(3), 1003.108(c), publication of the name of the attorney or representative and findings of misconduct should the attorney or representative be subject to any public discipline by EOIR.

CASES BEFORE EOIR - Automated information about cases before EOIR is available by calling (800) 898-7180 or (240) 314-1500.

FURTHER INFORMATION - For further information, please see the Immigration Court Practice Manual, which is available on the EOIR website at www.justice.gov/eoir.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act, a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. We try to create forms and instructions that are accurate, can be easily understood, and which impose the least possible burden on you to provide us with information. The estimated average time to complete this form is six (6) minutes. If you have comments regarding the accuracy of this estimate, or suggestions for making this form simpler, you can write to the Executive Office for Immigration Review, Office of the General Counsel, 5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 2600, Falls Church, Virginia 22041.
APPENDIX F
Sample Cover Page

A. Tourney, Esquire
1234 Center Street
Anytown, ST 99999

Filing party. If pro se, the alien should provide his or her own name and address in this location. If a representative, the representative should provide his or her name and complete business address.

DETAINED

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW
IMMIGRATION COURT
ANYTOWN, STATE

In the Matters of:

Jane Smith
John Smith
Jill Smith

File Nos.: A 012 345 678
A 012 345 679
A 012 345 680

In removal proceedings

A numbers. The alien registration number of every person included in the submission should be listed.

Name and type of proceeding. The full name of every person included in the submission should be listed.

Immigration Judge Susan Jones
Next Hearing: September 22, 2008 at 1:00 p.m.

Name of the Immigration Judge and the date and time of the next hearing. This information should always be listed.

RESPONDENT’S PRE-HEARING BRIEF

Filing title. The title of the submission should be placed in the middle and bottom of the page.
APPENDIX L
Sample Written Pleading

Prior to entering a pleading, parties are expected to have reviewed the pertinent regulations, as well as Chapter 4 of the Immigration Court Practice Manual (Hearings before Immigration Judges).

[The name and address of attorney or representative]

United States Department of Justice
Executive Office for Immigration Review
Immigration Court
[The court’s location (city or town) and state]

In the Matter of:  )
) File No.: [The respondent’s A number]
) [The respondent’s name]
) In removal proceedings
)

RESPONDENT’S WRITTEN PLEADING

On behalf of my client, I make the following representations:

1. The respondent concedes proper service of the Notice to Appear, dated ________________.

2. I have explained to the respondent (through an interpreter, if necessary):
   a. the rights set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 1240.10(a);
   b. the consequences of failing to appear in court as set forth in INA § 240(b)(5);
   c. the limitation on discretionary relief for failure to appear set forth in INA § 240(b)(7);
   d. the consequences of knowingly filing or making a frivolous application as set forth in INA § 208(d)(6);
   e. the requirement to notify the court within five days of any change of address or telephone number, using Form EOIR-33/IC pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 1003.15(d).
3. The respondent concedes the following allegation(s) ________________, and denies the following allegation(s) ________________.

4. The respondent concedes the following charge(s) of removability ________________, and denies the following charge(s) of removability ________________.

5. In the event of removal, the respondent;

   □ names __________________ as the country to which removal should be directed;

   OR

   □ declines to designate a country of removal.

6. The respondent will be applying for the following forms of relief from removal:

   □ Termination of Proceedings
   □ Asylum
   □ Withholding of Removal (Restriction on Removal)
   □ Adjustment of Status
   □ Cancellation of Removal pursuant to INA § ____________
   □ Waiver of Inadmissibility pursuant to INA § ____________
   □ Voluntary Departure
   □ Other (specify) ________________
   □ None

7. If the relief from removal requires an application, the respondent will file the application (other than asylum), no later than fifteen (15) days before the date of the individual calendar hearing, unless otherwise directed by the court. The respondent acknowledges that, if the application(s) are not timely filed, the application(s) will be deemed waived and abandoned under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.31(c).

   If the respondent is filing a defensive asylum application, the asylum application will be filed in open court at the next master calendar hearing.

8. If background and security investigations are required, the respondent has received the DHS biometrics instructions and will timely comply with the instructions. I have explained the instructions to the respondent (through an interpreter, if necessary). In addition, I have explained to the respondent (through an interpreter, if necessary), that, under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.47(d), failure to provide biometrics or other biographical information within the time allowed will constitute abandonment of the application unless the respondent demonstrates that such failure was the result of good cause.
9. The respondent estimates that ____ hours will be required for the respondent to present the case.

10. □ It is requested that the Immigration Court order an interpreter proficient in the
    __________________________ language, __________________________ dialect;

    OR

    □ The respondent speaks English and does not require the services of an interpreter.

Date Attorney or Representative for the Respondent

RESPONDENT’S PLEADING DECLARATION

I, _______________________, have been advised of my rights in these proceedings by my attorney or representative. I understand those rights. I waive a further explanation of those rights by this court.

I have been advised by my attorney or representative of the consequences of failing to appear for a hearing. I have also been advised by my attorney of the consequences of failing to appear for a scheduled date of departure or deportation. I understand those consequences.

I have been advised by my attorney or representative of the consequences of knowingly filing a frivolous asylum application. I understand those consequences.

I have been advised by my attorney or representative of the consequences of failing to follow the DHS biometrics instructions within the time allowed. I understand those consequences.

I understand that if my mailing address changes I must notify the court within 5 days of such change by completing an Alien’s Change of Address Form (Form EOIR-33/IC) and filing it with this court.

Finally, my attorney or representative has explained to me what this Written Pleading says. I understand it, I agree with it, and I request that the court accept it as my pleading.

Date Respondent
CERTIFICATE OF INTERPRETATION

I, ________________________, am competent to translate and interpret from
(name of interpreter)

________________________ into English, and I certify that I have read this entire document to the
(name of language)

respondent in ______________________, and that the respondent stated that he or she understood
(name of language)

the document before he or she signed the Pleading Declaration above.

________________________________________
(signature of interpreter)

________________________________________
(typed/printed name of interpreter)

OR

I, ________________________, certify that ________________________, a telephonic
(name of attorney or representative) (name of interpreter)

interpreter who is competent to translate and interpret from ______________________ into English, read
(name of language)

this entire document to the respondent in ______________________ and that the respondent stated
(name of language)

that he or she understood the document before he or she signed the Pleading Declaration above.

________________________________________
(signature of attorney or representative)

________________________________________
(typed/printed name of attorney or representative)
APPENDIX G
Sample Proof of Service

Instructions:

By law, all submissions to the Immigration Court must be filed with a “Proof of Service” (or “Certificate of Service”). See Chapter 3.2 (Service on the Opposing Party). This Appendix provides guidelines on how to satisfy this requirement.

What is required. To satisfy the law, you must do both of the following:

1. Serve the opposing party. Every time you file a submission with the Immigration Court, you must give, or “serve,” a copy on the opposing party. If you are an alien in proceedings, the opposing party is the Department of Homeland Security.

2. Give the Immigration Court a completed Proof of Service. You must submit a signed “Proof of Service” to the Immigration Court along with your document(s). The Proof of Service tells the Immigration Court that you have given a copy of the document(s) to the opposing party.

Sample Proof of Service. You do not have to use the sample contained in this Appendix. You may write up your own Proof of Service if you like. However, if you use this sample, you will satisfy the Proof of Service requirement.

Sending the Proof of Service. When you have to supply a Proof of Service, be sure to staple or otherwise attach it to the document(s) that you are serving.

Forms that contain a Proof of Service. Some forms, such as the Application for Cancellation of Removal for Certain Permanent Residents (Form EOIR-42A), contain a Certificate of Service, which functions as a Proof of Service for the form. You must complete the Certificate of Service to satisfy the Proof of Service requirement for that form. Such a Certificate of Service only functions as a Proof of Service for the form on which it appears, not for any supporting documents that you file with the form. If you are filing supporting documents with a form that contains a Certificate of Service, you must file a separate Proof of Service for those documents.

Forms that do not contain a Proof of Service. Forms that do not contain a Certificate of Service are treated like any other document. Therefore, you must supply the Proof of Service for those forms.
Sample Proof of Service

(Name of alien or aliens)

(“A number” of alien or aliens)

PROOF OF SERVICE

On ______________________, I, ____________________________________________,
(date) (printed name of person signing below)

served a copy of this ____________________________________________
(name of document)

and any attached pages to ____________________________________________
(name of party served)

at the following address: ____________________________________________
(address of party served)

_______________________________________________________________
(address of party served)

by _____________________________.
(method of service, for example overnight courier, hand-delivery, first class mail)

_____________________________  __________________________
(signature)  (date)
# G-325, Biographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Middle Name</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Date of Birth (mm/dd/yyyy)</th>
<th>Citizenship/Nationality</th>
<th>File Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

All Other Names Used (include names by previous marriages) | City and Country of Birth | U.S. Social Security No. (if any) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Date of Birth (mm/dd/yyyy)</th>
<th>City, and Country of Birth (if known)</th>
<th>City and Country of Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Date of Birth (mm/dd/yyyy)</th>
<th>City and Country of Birth</th>
<th>Date of Marriage (mm/dd/yyyy)</th>
<th>Place of Marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Name (For wife, give maiden name)</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Date of Birth (mm/dd/yyyy)</th>
<th>City and Country of Birth</th>
<th>Date of Termination of Marriage (mm/dd/yyyy)</th>
<th>Place of Termination of Marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Applicant's residence last five years. List present address first.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name and Number</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Province or State</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>From Month</th>
<th>To Month</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Present Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Applicant's last address outside the United States of more than one year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name and Number</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Province or State</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>From Month</th>
<th>To Month</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Applicant's employment last five years. (If none, so state.) List present employment first.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name and Address of Employer</th>
<th>Occupation (Specify)</th>
<th>From Month</th>
<th>To Month</th>
<th>Present Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Last occupation abroad if not shown above. (Include all information requested above.)

This form is submitted in connection with an application for:

- Naturalization
- Other (Specify):

Signature of Applicant

Date

If your native alphabet is in other than Roman letters, write your name in your native alphabet below:

---

Penalties: Severe penalties are provided by law for knowingly and willfully falsifying or concealing a material fact.

**Applicant:** Print your name and Alien Registration Number in the box outlined by heavy border below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete This Box (Family Name)</th>
<th>(Given Name)</th>
<th>(Middle Name)</th>
<th>(Alien Registration Number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Form G-325 (Rev. 02/07/13) Y
Instructions

What Is the Purpose of This Form?

USCIS will use the information you provide on this form to process your application or petition.

Complete this biographical information form and include it with the application or petition you are submitting to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS).

If you have any questions on how to complete the form, call our National Customer Service Center at 1-800-375-5283. For TDD (hearing impaired) call: 1-800-767-1833.

Privacy Act Notice

We ask for the information on this form, and associated evidence, to determine if you have established eligibility for the immigration benefit for which you are filing. Our legal right to ask for this information can be found in the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended. We may provide this information to other government agencies. Failure to provide this information, and any requested evidence, may delay a final decision or result in denial of your immigration benefit.

Paperwork Reduction Act

An agency may not conduct or sponsor an information collection and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated at 15 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions and completing and submitting the form. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to: U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Regulatory Coordination Division, Office of Policy and Strategy, 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20529-2140, OMB No. 1615-0008. Do not mail your completed Form G-325 to this address.
X. APPENDIX – Citation Guidelines from EOIR Immigration Court Practice Manual

The following manual provides guidelines for writing citations in compliance with the Board of Immigration Appeals within the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR). An attorney should note that the Board generally follows A Uniform System of Citation, also known as the Blue Book, but digresses from that convention in certain ways. The Board appreciates but does not require citations that follow the examples used in the following manual. An attorney should adhere to the manual when writing citations but will not be penalized for doing otherwise.

---

APPENDIX J

Citation Guidelines*

When filing papers with the Immigration Court, parties should keep in mind that accurate and complete legal citations strengthen the argument made in the submission. This Appendix provides guidelines for frequently cited sources of law.

The Immigration Court generally follows A Uniform System of Citation (also known as the “Blue Book”), but diverges from that convention in certain instances. The Immigration Court appreciates but does not require citations that follow the examples used in this Appendix. The citation categories are:

I. Cases
II. Regulations
III. Statutes/laws
IV. Legislative history
V. Treaties and international materials
VI. Publications and communications by governmental agencies, and
VII. Commonly cited commercial publications

Note that, for the convenience of filing parties, some of the citation formats in this Appendix are less formal than those used in the published cases of the Board of Immigration Appeals. Once a source has been cited in full, the objective is brevity without compromising clarity.

This Appendix concerns the citation of legal authority. For guidance on citing to the record and other sources, see Chapter 3.3(e) (Source materials) and Chapter 4.18(d) (Citation).

As a practice, the Immigration Court prefers italics in case names and publication titles, but underlining is an acceptable alternative.

* This appendix is substantially based on Appendix J (Citation Guidelines) in the Board of Immigration Appeals Practice Manual. The Office of the Chief Immigration Judge wishes to acknowledge the efforts of all those involved in the preparation of that appendix.
I. Decisions, Briefs, and Exhibits

General guidance: Abbreviations in case names. As a general rule, well-known agency abbreviations (e.g., DHS, INS, FBI, Dep't of Justice) may be used in a case name, but without periods. If an agency name includes reference to the "United States," it is acceptable to abbreviate it to “U.S.” However, when the “United States” is named as a party in the case, do not abbreviate “United States.” For example:

DHS v. Smith ..... not D.H.S. v. Smith

U.S. Dep’t of Justice v. Smith ..... not United States Department of Justice v. Smith

United States v. Smith ..... not U.S. v. Smith

Short form of case names. After a case has been cited in full, a shortened form of the name may be used thereafter. For example:

short: Phinpathya, 464 U.S. at 185

short: Nolasco, 22 I&N Dec. at 635

Citations to a specific point. Citations to a specific point should include the precise page number(s) on which the point appears. For example:

Matter of Artigas, 23 I&N Dec. 99, 100 (BIA 2001)

Citations to a dissent or concurrence. If citing to a dissent or concurrence, this should be indicated in a parenthetical notation. For example:


Board decisions: Published decisions. Precedent decisions by the Board of Immigration Appeals (“Board”) are binding on the Immigration Court, unless modified or overruled by the Attorney General or a federal court. All precedent Board decisions are available on the Executive Office for Immigration Review website at www.justice.gov/eoir. Precedent decisions should be cited in the “I&N Dec.” form illustrated below. The citation must identify the adjudicator (BIA, A.G., etc.) and the year of the decision. Note that there are no spaces in “I&N" and that only “Dec." has a period.

updates: www.justice.gov/eoir
For example:


*Unpublished decisions.* Citation to unpublished decisions is discouraged because these decisions are not binding on the Immigration Court in other cases. When reference to an unpublished case is necessary, a copy of the decision should be provided, and the citation should include the alien’s full name, the alien registration number, the adjudicator, and the precise date of the decision. Italics, underlining, and “Matter of” should not be used. For example:

Jane Smith, A 012 345 678 (BIA July 1, 1999)

“In Interim Decision.” In the past, the Board issued precedent decisions in slip opinion or “Interim Decision” form. Because all published cases are now available in final form (as “I&N Decisions”), citations to “Interim Decisions” are no longer appropriate and are disfavored.

“All Matter of,” not “In re.” All precedent decisions should be cited as “Matter of.” The use of “In re” is disfavored. For example: *Matter of Yanez*, not *In re Yanez*.

For a detailed description of the Board’s publication process, see Board Practice Manual, which is available on the Executive Office for Immigration Review website at www.justice.gov/eoir.

**IJ decisions:**

If referring to an earlier decision in the case by the Immigration Judge, the decision should be cited. This applies whether the decision was issued orally or in writing. Citations to decisions of Immigration Judges should state the nature of the proceedings, the page number, and the date. For example:

IJ Bond Proceedings Decision at 5 (Dec. 12, 2008)

**AG decisions:**

Precedent decisions by the Attorney General are binding on the Immigration Court, and should be cited in accordance with the rules for precedent decisions by the Board of Immigration Appeals. All precedent decisions by the Attorney General are available on the Executive Office for Immigration Review website at www.justice.gov/eoir.

DHS decisions: Precedent decisions by the Department of Homeland Security and the former Immigration and Naturalization Service should be cited in accordance with the rules for precedent decisions by the Board of Immigration Appeals.

Federal & state courts: Generally, federal and state court decisions should generally be cited according to the standard legal convention, as set out in the latest edition of *A Uniform System of Citation* (also known as the “Blue Book”). For example:

- Saakian v. INS, 252 F.3d 21 (1st Cir. 2001)
- McDaniel v. United States, 142 F. Supp. 2d 219 (D. Conn. 2001)

U.S. Supreme Court. The Supreme Court Reporter citation (“S.Ct.”) should be used only when the case has not yet been published in the United States Reports (“U.S.”).

Unpublished cases. Citation to unpublished state and federal court cases is discouraged. When citation to an unpublished decision is necessary, a copy of the decision should be provided, and the citation should include the docket number, court, and precise date. Parties are also encouraged to provide the LexisNexis or Westlaw number. For example:


Precedent cases not yet published. When citing to recent precedent cases that have not yet been published in the Federal Reporter or other print format, parties should provide the docket number, court, and year. Parties are also encouraged to provide the LexisNexis or Westlaw number. For example:

- Grullon v. Mukasey, __ F.3d __, No. 05-4622, 2007 U.S. App. LEXIS 27325 (2d Cir. 2007)

Briefs & exhibits: If referring to text from a brief, the brief should be cited. The citation should state the filing party’s identity, the nature of proceedings, the page number, and the date. For example:

- Respondent's Bond Appeal Brief at 5 (Dec. 12, 2008)
Exhibits. Exhibits designated during a hearing should be cited as they were designated by the Immigration Judge. For example:

Exh. 3

Exhibits accompanying a brief should be cited by alphabetic tab or page number. For example:

Respondent’s Pre-Hearing Brief, Tab A
II. Regulations

General guidance: Regulations generally. There are two kinds of postings in the Federal Register: those that are simply informative in nature (such as “notices” of public meetings) and those that are regulatory in nature (referred to as “rules”). There are different types of “rules,” including “proposed,” “interim,” and “final.” The type of rule will determine whether or not (and for how long) the regulatory language contained in that rule will be in effect. Generally speaking, proposed rules are not law and do not have any effect on any case, while interim and final rules do have the force of law and, depending on timing, may affect a given case.


C.F.R.: For the Code of Federal Regulations, always identify the volume, the section number, and the year. The year need not be given after the first citation, unless a subsequent citation refers to a regulation published in a different year. Always use periods in the abbreviation “C.F.R.” For example:

short: 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1

Fed. Reg.: Citations to regulatory material in the Federal Register should be used only when:

- the citation is to information that will never appear in the C.F.R., such as a public notice or announcement
- the rule contains regulatory language that will be, but is not yet, in the C.F.R.
- the citation is to information associated with the rule, but which will not appear in the C.F.R. (e.g., a preamble or introduction to a rule)
- the rule contains proposed or past language of a regulation that is pertinent in some way to the filing or argument

The first citation to the Federal Register should always include (i) the volume, (ii) the abbreviated form “Fed. Reg.”, (iii) the page number, (iv) the date, and (v) important identifying information such as “proposed rule,” “interim rule,” “supplementary information,” or the citation where the rule will appear. For example:

**full:** 67 Fed. Reg. 52627 (Aug. 13, 2002) (proposed rule)

**full:** 67 Fed. Reg. 38341 (June 4, 2002) (to be codified at 8 C.F.R. §§ 100, 103, 236, 245a, 274a, and 299)


Since the Federal Register does not use commas in its page numbers, do not use a comma in page numbers. Use abbreviations for the month.

When citing the preamble to a rule, identify it exactly as it is titled in the Federal Register, e.g., 67 Fed. Reg. 54878 (Aug. 26, 2002) (supplementary information).
III. Statutes / Laws

General guidance: Full citations. Whenever citing a statute for the first time, be certain to include all the pertinent information, including the name of the statute, its public law number, statutory cite, and a parenthetical identifying where the statute was codified (if applicable). The only exception is the Immigration and Nationality Act, which is illustrated below.

Short citations. The use of short citations is encouraged, but only after the full citation has been used.


Special rule for the INA. Given the regularity with which the Immigration and Nationality Act is cited before the Immigration Court, there is generally no need to provide the Public Law Number, the Stat. citation, or U.S.C. citation. The Immigration Court will presume INA citations refer to the current language of the Act unless the year is provided.

State statutes. State statutes should be cited as provided in A Uniform System of Citation (also known as the “Blue Book”).

Sections of law. Full citations are often lengthy, and filing parties are sometimes uncertain where to put the section number in the citation. For the sake of simplicity, use the word “section” and give the section number in front of the full citation to the statute. Once a full citation has been given, use the short citation form with a section symbol “§.” This practice applies whether the citation is used in a sentence or after it. For example:

The definition of the term “alien” in section 101(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act applies to persons who are not citizens or nationals of the United States. The term “national of the United States” is expressly defined in INA § 101(a)(22), but the term “citizen” is more complex. See INA §§ 301-309, 316, 320.
Citations to the United States Code, always identify the volume, the section number, and the year. The year need not be given after the first citation, unless a subsequent citation refers to a section published in a different year. Always use periods in the abbreviation “U.S.C.” For example:

**USC:**

- short: 18 U.S.C. § 16

**INA:**

- full: section xxx of Immigration and Nationality Act
- short: INA § xxx

**USA PATRIOT:**

- short: USA PATRIOT Act § xxx

**LIFE:**

- short: LIFE Act § xxx

**CCA:**

- short: CCA § xxx

**NACARA:**

- short: NACARA § xxx

_update: [www.justice.gov/eoir]_
**IIRIRA:**
 short: IIRIRA § xxx

**AEDPA:**
 short: AEDPA § xxx

**INTCA:**
 short: INTCA § xxx

**MTINA:**
 short: MTINA § xxx

**IMMECT90:**
 short: IMMECT90 § xxx

**ADAA:**
 short: ADAA § xxx

**IMFA:**
 short: IMFA § xxx

updates: www.justice.gov/eoir
short: IRCA § xxx

short: IRFA § xxx
IV. Legislative History

General guidance: Difficult to locate. Because sources of legislative history are often difficult to locate, err on the side of providing more information, rather than less. If a source is difficult to locate, include a copy of the source with your filing (or an Internet address for it) and make clear reference to that source in your filing.

Sources. To locate legislative history, try the Library of Congress website (www.thomas.loc.gov) or commercial services. Citation to common electronic sources is encouraged.

Bills: Provide the following information the first time a bill is cited: (i) the bill number, (ii) the number of the Congress, (iii) the session of that Congress, (iv) the section number of the bill, if you are referring to a specific section, (v) the Congressional Record volume, (vi) the Congressional Record page or pages, (vii) the date of that Congressional Record, and (viii) the edition of the Congressional Record, if known. For example:


short: 134 Cong. Rec. at 2218

Reports: Provide the following information the first time a report is cited: (i) whether it is a Senate or House report, (ii) the report number, (iii) the year, and (iv) where it is reprinted (a reference to where the document is available electronically is acceptable). The short form may refer either to the page numbers of the report or the page numbers where the report is reprinted. For example:


Many committee reports are available on-line through the Library of Congress web site (www.thomas.loc.gov) or commercial services. Copies of the U.S. Code Congressional & Administrative News (U.S.C.C.A.N.), which compiles many legislative documents, are available in some public libraries.
Hearings: Provide the following information the first time a hearing is cited: (i) name of the hearing, (ii) the committee or subcommittee that held it, (iii) the number of the Congress, (iv) the session of that Congress, (v) the page or pages of the hearing, (vi) the date or year of the hearing, and (vii) information about what is being cited (such as the identity of the person testifying and context for the testimony). For example:

V. Treaties and International Materials

CAT:


short: Convention Against Torture, art. 3

UNHCR Handbook:


short: UNHCR Handbook ¶ xxx
[use paragraph symbol “¶” or abbreviation “para.”]

U.N. Protocol on Refugees:


short: U.N. Refugee Protocol, art. xxx
VI. Publications and Communications by Governmental Agencies

General guidance: *No universal citation form.* In immigration proceedings, parties cite to a wide variety of administrative agency publications and communications, and there is no one format that fits all such documents. For that reason, use common sense when citing agency documents, and err on the side of more information, rather than less.

*Difficult to locate material.* If the document may be difficult for the Immigration Court to locate, include a copy of the document with your filing.

*Internet material.* If a document is posted on the Internet, identify the website where the document can be found or include a copy of the document with a legible Internet address.

Practice Manual: The Immigration Court Practice Manual is not legal authority. However, if there is reason to cite it, the preferred form is to identify the specific provision by chapter and section along with the date at the bottom of the page on which the cited section appears. For example:

full: Immigration Court Practice Manual, Chapter 8.5(a)(iii) (January xx, xxxx)

short: Practice Manual, Chap. 8.5(a)(iii)

Forms: Forms should first be cited according to their full name and number. A short citation form may be used thereafter. See Appendix E (Forms) for a list of common immigration forms. For example:

full: Notice of Appeal from a Decision of an Immigration Judge (Form EOIR-26)

short: Notice of Appeal or Form EOIR-26

If a form does not have a name, use the form number as the citation.

Country reports: State Department country reports appear both as compilations in Congressional committee prints and as separate reports and profiles. Citations to country reports should always contain the publication date and the specific page numbers (if available). Provide an Internet address when available. The first citation to any country report should contain all identifying information.

information, and a short citation form may be used thereafter. For example:


**short:** 2001 *Nigeria Country Reports*


**short:** 1994 *Country Reports* at page xxx


**short:** 1995 *Philippines Profile* at page xxx

**Visa Bulletin:** Citations to the State Department’s Visa Bulletin should include the volume, number, month, and year of the specific issue being cited. For example:

**full:** U.S. Dep’t of State Visa Bulletin, Vol. VIII, No. 55 (March 2003)

**short:** Visa Bulletin (March 2003)

**Internal documents:** A citation to an internal government document, such as a memo or cable, should contain as much identifying information as possible. Be sure to include any identifying heading (e.g., the “re” line in a memo) and the precise date of the document being cited. Include a copy of the document with the filing or indicate where it has been reprinted publicly. For example:

Dep’t of State cable (no. 97-State-174342) (Sept. 17, 1997) (copy attached)

Office of the General Counsel, INS, U.S. Dep’t of Justice, Compliance with Article 3 of the Convention Against Torture in cases of removable aliens (May 14, 1997), reprinted in 75 *Interpreter Releases* 375 (Mar. 16, 1998)
Religious Freedom Reports: The International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (IRFA) mandates that the Department of State issue an Annual Report on International Religious Freedom (State Department Report). IRFA further authorizes Immigration Judges to use the State Department Report as a resource in asylum adjudications. The State Department Report should be cited as follows:


IRFA also mandates the issuance of an Annual Report by the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF Report). The USCIRF is a government body that is independent of the executive branch. Citations to the USCIRF Report should be distinguishable from citations to the Department of State report:


short: 2007 USCIRF Annual Report at page xxx
VII. Commonly Cited Commercial Publications

General guidance: No universal citation form. In immigration proceedings, parties cite to a wide variety of commercial texts and publications. Use common sense when citing these documents. If a document is difficult to locate, include a copy of the document with your filing (or an Internet address for it) and make clear reference to that document in your filing.

No endorsements or disparagements. The following list contains citations to specific publications that are frequently cited in filings before the Immigration Court. Their inclusion in the list is not an endorsement of the publication, nor is omission from this list a disparagement of any other publication.

Use of quotation marks, italics or underlining, and first initials. For all filings, parties should use a single format for all publications – quotation marks around any article title (whether in a book, law review, or periodical), italics or underlining for the name of any publication (whether a book, treatise, or periodical), and reference to authors’ last names only (although use of first initials is appropriate where there are multiple authors with the same last name).

Shortened names. Many publications have long titles. It is acceptable to use a shortened form of the title after the full title has been used. Be certain to use a short form that clearly refers back to the full citation. Page and/or section numbers should always be used, whether the publication is cited in full or in shortened form.

Articles in Books: Articles in books should identify the author (by last name only), title of the article, and the publication that contains that article (including the editor and year). For example:


short: Massimino at 469
Bender’s: Bender’s Immigration Bulletin should be cited by author (last name only), article, volume, publication, month, and year. For example:


short: Sullivan at 3

Immigration Briefings: This publication should be cited by author (last name only), article, volume, publication, month, and year. For example:


short: Elliot at 18

Immigration Law and Procedure: Citations to treatises require particular attention because their pagination is often complex. The first citation to this treatise must be in full and contain the volume number, the section number, the page number, the edition, and year. For example:


short: 2 Immigration Law and Procedure § 51.01(1)(a), at 51-3

Interpreter Releases: Citations should state the volume, title, page number(s), and precise date. Provide a parenthetical explanation for the citation when appropriate. For example:

full: 75 Interpreter Releases 275-76 (Feb. 23, 1998) (regarding INS guidelines on when to consent to reopening of proceedings)

short: 75 Interpreter Releases at 276

updates: www.justice.gov/eoir
If an article has a title and named author, provide that information. For example:

full: Wettstein, “Lawful Domicile for Purposes of INA § 212(c): Can It Begin with Temporary Residence,” in 71 Interpreter Releases 1273 (Sept. 26, 1994)

short: Wettstein at 1274

Law Reviews: Law review articles should identify the author (by last name) and the title of the article, followed by the volume, name, page number(s), and year of the publication. For example:


short: Hurwitz, 20 San Diego L. Rev. at 80

Sutherland: Citations to this treatise should include the volume number, author, name of the publication, section number, page number(s), and edition. For example:

full: 2A Singer, Sutherland Statutory Construction § 47.11, at 144 (4th ed. 1984)

short: 2A Sutherland § 47.11, at 144
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• Rosina Stambaugh, Esq., The Law Office of Christopher A. Ferro, LLC (2009).
• Shelley Wittevrongel, Esq. (2009).
• Siobhan Waldron, Esq., formerly at Immigration Center for Women and Children (Los Angeles, CA), currently at Centro Legal de la Raza (Oakland, California) (2016).
• Susan Compernolle, Esq. (2009).
• Toni Maschler, Esq., Bromberg, Kohler Maya & Maschler, PLLC (2009).
I. ADVICE FOR PRACTITIONERS –
Suggested Litigation Strategies & Best Practices

Of the following strategies from stakeholders, some are direct quotes and some have been paraphrased. Some practitioner comments, as labeled in the footnotes, are from 2009 and some are from 2016. Please note that the practitioner comments are provided for general litigation strategies, and specific facts about the application process may have changed since 2009.

Alternative Remedy: 212(h) & Aggravated Felonies

- The INA §212(h) waiver is a very important waiver for LPR Cancellation of Removal applicants because it is an additional provision by which an applicant may avoid removal from the U.S. If an applicant in removal proceedings is granted an INA §212(h) waiver, s/he will no longer be in removal proceedings and won't need to apply for LPR Cancellation. However, the applicant may apply for both LPR Cancellation and an INA §212(h) waiver simultaneously to increase chances of avoiding removal.

At Initial Client Intake

Bond: Advising Clients Whether or Not to Post Bond

- We find that we can get an LPR Cancellation of Removal done in custody within about three months whereas if they are non-detained, the non-detained docket is significantly longer. During that time, our clients may go MIA, and they may pick up new convictions that may make them ineligible.

---

194 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h) (2016); INA § 212(h).
195 Siobhan Waldron, Esq., formerly at Immigration Center for Women and Children (Los Angeles, CA), currently at Centro Legal de la Raza (Oakland, California) (2016). While her experience is specific to clients who have mental health issues, her expertise is very relevant to all LPR Cancellation of Removal cases, particular for cases with complex criminal records. Ms. Waldron is federally appointed counsel for individuals in removal proceedings and have been found mentally incompetent to represent themselves. She is federally appointed under Franco-Gonzales v. Holder, No. CV 10-02211 DMG (DTBx), 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 139148 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 2, 2011).
Almost all of my clients agree to stay in custody to get the case over quickly, because having deportation hanging over their heads for years and years in a non-detained docket can actually aggravate their mental health issue. The long deportation process is another source of discomfort and it can trigger paranoid ideations and other issues.

Generally, my legal advice to my clients is to do their case in custody if they can handle detention. I never try to force my clients to stay in custody. I would never not pursue bond vigorously because of what I think the best overall strategy for the merits case is. Detention is very difficult for many clients, and some decompensate dramatically. But I make it very clear to them that we can get a Cancellation case done within about three months, and know that the detained-docket judges of the Los Angeles area often grant these very challenging cases. If we get the clients released and into the non-detained docket, we believe judges may be less likely to grant because they are not used to these mental health issues and criminal records.

Sometimes we ask that a client be released because of his or her mental incompetency as a safeguard under Matter of M-A-M. The mere fact that they are in detention is interfering with their ability to get due process in these proceedings because detention is aggravating their mental health such that we can’t prepare for hearings.” Matter of M-A-M- allows the client to get due process safeguards. For example, we had a client who had assumed another persona. He had a visceral, negative reaction when called by his legal name. As a safeguard, the court allowed him to be addressed by his alias and not by his legal name - the name on the NTA. That is a very creative accommodation to allow your client to participate in the proceedings in a meaningful way.

196 Siobhan Waldron, Esq., formerly at Immigration Center for Women and Children (Los Angeles, CA), currently at Centro Legal de la Raza (Oakland, California) (2016).
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**NTA has been issued**

- Make sure the NTA is charged correctly, and do not let your client admit removability until his/her LPR status has been terminated, or otherwise termination is rolled into the rest of the case.
- When taking on LPR Cancellation cases, always try to challenge underlying removability first. This can potentially shorten a case and avoid an unnecessary application for Cancellation of Removal.

**NTA has not been issued**

- If I have clients who qualify for LPR Cancellation of Removal and are likely to be placed in proceedings but have not yet been placed in proceedings, I will have them apply for citizenship to trigger the NTA because DHS will catch up to them in the end. LPRs will get tagged into removal proceedings if 1) they have been convicted and they go to renew their green card, 2) they have traveled and are stopped at re-entry, 3) during the criminal proceedings.
- If the client is still in criminal proceedings and has the LPR card, work with the criminal defense attorney to work out a deal that will prevent deportation proceedings from starting or a deal that has minimum deportation implications. Come to a deal that would qualify the client for LPR cancellation of removal.

**Obtaining the Client’s A-file/Criminal Record (in California)**

- In the 9th Circuit, we have Dent v. Holder that requires that OCC, upon request, turn over specific documents from an A file. For the most past, when DHS detains and files an NTA against a noncitizen, DHS has already checked the criminal records and has the FBI criminal results or their California Department of Justice results. I immediately email OCC and ask for the records.
- I look at their FBI prints and see if there are any possible aggravated felonies. If so, I get their Superior Court records to confirm LPR Cancellation eligibility. Then,

---
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207 Siobhan Waldron, Esq., formerly at Immigration Center for Women and Children (Los Angeles, CA), currently at Centro Legal de la Raza (Oakland, California) (2016).
I fill out the application. I file the application at the soonest Master Calendar hearing once removability is established. I always deny factual allegations and charges based on criminal record, and will likely have the prepared application with me to file that day if the matter is not set over for a contested hearing. Once removability is established by the Immigration Judge, I submit the application at the first master calendar and ask for the earliest merits.

• 208 If OCC does not give me the A file, I have leverage in court to say, “That is very interesting that OCC is submitting that because I specifically requested that document and they said they didn’t have it.” I can then get continuances or show bad faith on OCC’s part, as appropriate.

Preparation the Application
• 209 You must put in a good faith effort to fill out the application. In practice, the local immigration judge’s baseline is to grant a Cancellation of Removal unless the client has an intense criminal record or other significant negative factors. With that premise, for the work history portion of my client’s application I often write, “I suffer from severe mental health issues. I have difficulty remembering these dates. My attorney is working on gathering this information.” I don’t waste time laboring trying to piece together this history because it ultimately doesn’t make or break the case. Of course, presenting evidence of past work history is important and relevant, but exact dates and addresses of all employers isn’t.

Release Plan
• 210 Attorneys at ICWC develop a release plan with the client according to our clients’ goals and desires, but it does also have to reflect what we know the immigration judges want to see to exercise positive discretion. The main purpose is to keep clients from doing what they were doing before getting into removal proceedings. We establish where they are going to live, what supportive services they are going to receive to treat the mental health or substance abuse issues, and the other issues (e.g. anger management). For example, we see whether it is more appropriate to live in a board and care facility and receive in-patient services or that they return to the family and receive outpatient treatment.

---
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At the Hearing

• Before the merits hearing you should narrow the issues. When I file my LPR Cancellation of Removal application, I see what OCC says on statutory eligibility. Usually the immigration judge initiates the conversation by asking OCC, “Do you see any issues of statutory eligibility here?” If OCC says no, do not focus on trying to prove those statutory requirements. I always ask OCC straight up, “Do you see any issues of statutory eligibility?” If they say no, I don’t submit a brief on those issues or stress over finding continuous residence documentation for seven years before my client’s clock stopped.

At the Master Calendar Hearing

• I ask for a sooner hearing if my clients are particularly prejudiced by prolonged detention because of their mental health. Judges have asked me, “You think your client deserves to jump the line if there are people here who have been waiting for months?” I say, “Yes, I do believe my client deserves to go before that person because...” and I give all of the mental health reasons.

Cite to Your Evidence

• Know what evidence you are submitting to the core and be ready to flip through it as you are moving through the hearing. If you are talking about the client’s child be ready to point to evidence about the child. Sometimes I will read out from the affidavit.

Direct and Cross Examination

• I look at the LPR Cancellation of Removal trials as confessions. These are cases in which the client should be candid. The best way to bring candor from clients is to ask them the questions on direct examination. By the time of cross-examination the IJ would have heard the answers, so it is better for to ask them the hard questions instead of them hearing the questions from the prosecutor or IJ.

211 Siobhan Waldron, Esq., formerly at Immigration Center for Women and Children (Los Angeles, CA), currently at Centro Legal de la Raza (Oakland, California) (2016).
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• 216 In the course of many client meetings, ask every question, multiple times, and in different ways. Your client has been convicted, so the conviction that put the immigration status in jeopardy is on the NTA and DHS probably submitted evidence of it. But it is important to ask whether the respondent has ever been in jail, ticketed, cited by a police officer, if someone ever called the cops on them, if they ever had to call the cops, if they were arrested but the charges were dismissed, or were taken to full trial but were found innocent.

• 217 Ask questions, including: what did you do, who were you with, have you ever done “this,” have you ever done “that”? Ask about the issue that placed them in removal proceedings. When a client makes admissions about the crime, they are not necessarily prevented from qualifying for cancellation because the conviction will be on the record already.

• 218 My direct exam averages 10 pages. After the merits hearing gets set, I type up my proposed direct exam and practice with the client. Sometimes I’ll hear an answer and know that I will not ask the question again. Sometimes they’ll say an amazing answer so I’ll build on that amazing answer and cut another section. We practice a second time with my revised questions and that is usually the end of it. But, if the second practice doesn’t go well, then we will do a third practice. When the Immigration Judge tells me to start my direct, I may ask – I have a 45 min to 1 hour direct prepared, are there specific issues the Court and OCC would like me to focus on? That can help you understand what you are up against, and also not bore or annoy the court. But at the same time, it is important to make your record. So if you are relying on testimony for facts not already in evidence, make sure to get them in.

• 219 Direct exam is sometimes very limited. For example, I had a client who refused my visits during bipolar depressive phases and he was very ill. I was not able to prepare him for anything, so I told the judge, “On direct exam I am really going to focus on his family ties to the United States and when he came to this country. I haven’t been able to prepare him for any other such testimony.” The IJ was totally fine with the limited scope and the OCC agreed.

218 Siobhan Waldron, Esq., formerly at Immigration Center for Women and Children (Los Angeles, CA), currently at Centro Legal de la Raza (Oakland, California) (2016).
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• For cross exam, I put myself in OCC’s shoes and I type up a sample cross. I explain to the client that the purpose of cross examination is to make them look bad, to pull out bad information. Remember – OCC is trying to take away the client’s green card and deport them. I explain that OCC might ask them questions that seem really mean or embarrassing, but that is why it is important to practice. Finally, I explain that I don’t want them to be offended or think that I am not on their side. I also inform them of my theory of the case and what we need to convince the immigration judge about to get a grant, e.g. that client will not drink and drive again; that client will not hit his wife when he feels angry again. I assure them that I will have a chance to ask them questions again and clear up any confusion.

• DHS may keep some information until the final hearing to try to prove that your respondent is not credible, or is a liar, or has something to hide. Be prepared that questions can come up in the final hearing about “any time” the respondent has had contact with law enforcement.

**Family Presence**

• In the York Immigration Court it is very helpful to have family members attend the final hearing. Reintegration into society and family ties are really huge for this evaluation. I can’t think of a case that was denied when there was significant family attendance in a hearing. And I can think of several cases that were denied where no family members showed up and the judge had questions or concerns about that.

**At Conclusion of Case**

• If the LPR was granted Cancellation, then they really would not be barred from naturalization. I bring them in for a talk about when they can apply for naturalization. If the client is on probation when Cancellation is done, we wait

---
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the five years and then have them naturalize. But if the client can naturalize, we get them to naturalize right away.

Biometrics

- When an individual who is detained applies for LPR Cancellation, his or her biometrics and fingerprinting will be handled by the facility in which s/he is detained. The individual will not go through the same process as a non-detained applicant in order to complete the biometrics requirement.

Briefs and Forms

Forms

- If there is something that has not been declared by the 3rd Circuit or the Supreme Court as an Aggravated Felony, challenge the government.

Do Brief

- You don’t want to hide from any of that stuff, get out ahead of it and make it part of your overall picture. In my first brief I did not focus on my client’s criminal convictions because A) they had already been proven because that is why the person was in proceedings and B) my job as an advocate was to present a good side of the information. My strategy was to focus on the positive because the trial attorney and immigration were going to focus on the bad. In retrospect, I had not rigorously considered the bad things and how they fit into the picture, and there were things that came up at the final hearing that took me and the client by surprise. The case turned out okay, but it could have been easier.

- An attorney should note the importance of making sure that s/he uses the most current version of all forms when filing an application for LPR Cancellation (Form EOIR-42A, Form G-325A, and Form EOIR-28). These forms are updated frequently and it is easy to locate and use an outdated form by mistake.

---
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I. ADVICE FOR PRACTITIONERS - Suggested Litigation Strategies & Best Practices

• It is more important to fill out the LPR Cancellation application forms perfectly than to file a brief with the application. This is because a brief often includes far more information than is helpful to the applicant, considering that opposing counsel will look for discrepancies in the applicant's story. An attorney should spend time with his or her client and make sure that every entry of the application is filled in properly.

Usually Do Not Brief

• I usually do not brief. LPR Cancellation eligibility is very straightforward, so unless there is a clock stopping issue or I have to argue that a conviction isn’t an aggravated felony, I haven’t seen a need to brief. There is one case that I submitted a brief because at the end of the merits hearing, which was really intense, the judge asked us to submit written closing arguments about why the client deserved a favorable exercise of discretion.

• Although I usually do not brief, I always, no matter what, have A) a narrative, a theory of my case explaining and putting all of the past criminal activity into context. For example, I explain that substance abuse was a direct result of the mental illness that was untreated. And, B) I present a plan that explains how my client’s life will be different in the future.

Criminal Defense Attorney Cooperation

• The client’s cooperation is huge. It’s cooperation or deportation. The client can go to trial or try to figure something out before. For the issue of cooperation, we work out a deportation-safe plea before having the client render a guilty-plea. Make a detailed memorandum that goes through the person’s immigration situation, what they are charged with, what they are facing, and what are good pleas.

• If the cooperation does not work out, we go from there. We do a lot of work when it comes to vacating the conviction with criminal council after they pled guilty.

230 Siobhan Waldron, Esq., formerly at Immigration Center for Women and Children (Los Angeles, CA), currently at Centro Legal de la Raza (Oakland, California) (2016).
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Employment Authorization Document

- Applicants who are pending under section 240A of the Act, are eligible for EADS; it does not matter whether it is LPR or non-LPR cancellation of removal.

Evidence

- I go with the volume approach. The perfect letter is written to follow the legal standard and is notarized. But in detention world, there are many gradations below that which you can still use. My proof that an affidavit is genuine has been to submit to the court the original affidavit that may be hand written, in blue ink, on lined paper, and the stamped envelope in which it came. It is usually good enough although it is not perfect. The relaxed rules of evidence in immigration court help you a little bit.
- Include evidence from as early in the client’s life as possible. If evidence is from, for example, 25 years ago, include it. Proof of family ties, proof of their status, and proof of ongoing, caring, loving relationship between the family members and client is important.
- Add pictures of gifts that the client has given the individual who is writing the affidavit. If the client has a child, add anything about the relationship, information about the child, and how well the child is doing in the U.S, including medical records such as the client’s attendance at health classes for their child.
- For our clients we view the mental illness as a positive discretionary factor, not as a negative, especially with the hardship one might suffer if removed.

Addendum and Index

- An attorney should submit an addendum package with the application for all supporting documents. The documents should be listed in an index.

---
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PART 2 (REDACTED)(CONFIDENTIAL)

I. ADVICE FOR PRACTITIONERS-
Suggested Litigation Strategies & Best Practices

• 241 An attorney should be creative and obtain as many supporting documents as possible. These documents might include letters in support of the applicant from family, friends, community members, and employers. These documents should be notarized.

Affidavit of Others

• 242 Do a family tree and get detailed affidavits from family members. IJs want substance. It is better to sit down with a couple of people and write the affidavit with them.
• 243 The more you can put on the other side of the scale the better; I definitely take a volume approach. A letter from a neighbor who has only known the person for five years may not carry a lot of weight but ten such letters would carry a lot of weight.
• 244 Providing the ID is most important for family members so that the judge can see that they are definitely members of that the family. But if the affidavit is from neighbors or bosses, it’s not a huge concern to submit it without a copy of their ID.
• 245 A lot of my clients are fully estranged from their families and it is not possible to get family members’ affidavits. But I always get declarations from family members when possible. I ask family members who might be writing a letter of support to also provide any correspondence between my client and them, including birthday cards, Valentine’s Day cards, letters for Mother’s day. I always think of appeal and want to fill the record up if there is going to be an appeal.

Affidavits from Respondent: Yes File

• 246 I do file an affidavit as long as you are confident that what is in the affidavit is true. It is not a good strategy to hide information in a Cancellation case. There are times when we did not have time to so we did not submit it, and it not required.
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Through an affidavit, present a picture of the person so that the judge has a little bit of a sense of the person before going into the final hearing because otherwise the respondent is just a person on a paper with immigration charges and criminal convictions.

An attorney should focus on obtaining supporting documentation in the form of affidavits from the applicant and any other person who can speak on his or her behalf. The use of affidavits is a very important part of the application process, particularly for the sake of showing that an applicant with a criminal record has rehabilitated. Affidavits explaining that an applicant has made efforts to rehabilitate by attending classes during detention or immediately after detention will be useful. Such affidavits will represent a positive factor that an IJ may consider when addressing the discretionary component of LPR Cancellation.

Submit the affidavit if you have to leave a certain part out, leave that part out to discuss it before the immigration court rather than put it in there.

Submit changes the day of the hearing as an updated affidavit or the same affidavit with cross-outs and initials making the corrections there.

The affidavit is the multiple pages. It covers from the date the person was born to the day the person is sitting in jail. In as much detail as possible describe what the client did, what the offense was, how the client got into it. The client’s apologies are very important and the reasons for why the client deserves a second chance too.

You can turn to the affidavit during the hearing if your client has responded differently. You can ask, “in your affidavit you state this, what do you mean?” You try to work through the testimony instead of having the prosecutor throw the response back at your client.

---
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Affidavits from Respondent: No, Do Not File

- 253 I do not like affidavits of respondents because they become an impeachment trap for clients in that ICE can use them during cross examination if the client testifies inconsistently with the affidavit.

- 254 I do not like affidavits of respondents and I never submit them. The IJs in Chicago require something called a “pre-hearing statement.” This asks for a witness list and affidavits. So far as I know, most lawyers do not submit an affidavit from the respondent. I do, however, put the respondent on the witness list, and with bullet points set out what s/he will testify to, but in general terms, usually tracking the statute. For example, respondent will testify about his efforts towards rehabilitation, his work history, etc. In non-LPR Cancellation, Respondent will testify about the health condition of his U.S. citizen child; his relationship with his U.S. citizen children, etc. I keep this non-detailed and I don’t have the respondent sign it. I agree that detailed affidavits can be used for impeachment.

- 255 I definitely do not file my client’s Affidavit. It has been no issue with OCC or the judge; they have never asked, “Where is the declaration?” If we were to include affidavits, they only increase likelihood of inconsistencies or confusion, given our clients’ mental health issues. Affidavits are unnecessary in my experience. We get grants without them.

Country Conditions

- 256 An attorney should include country condition reports if an applicant will face persecution when deported to a certain country.

Psychological Evaluations

- 257 Sometimes even though we have built great rapport, and interviewed over and over again, it is a different environment for a respondent to be evaluated by a mental health professional. In one case, A) I wouldn’t have been able to get the information of the abuse the client suffered and B) If I had presented that information to the IJ, I don’t think I would have been as convincing. The judge

255 Siobhan Waldron, Esq., formerly at Immigration Center for Women and Children (Los Angeles, CA), currently at Centro Legal de la Raza (Oakland, California) (2016).
thanked me for providing the facts in the context of a psychological evaluation which identified any symptoms that the person might have, underlying causes, what the potential remedies are, what the possibilities are for rehabilitation, and the need for continued treatment.

- **258** Sit with the mental health professional or email describing the case and the purpose of the evaluation. You can do that without coaching them. You are not telling them “I hope the evaluation will find ‘this’ or ‘this’.” You are giving them some legal education.” You can, for example, say, “my client is applying for Cancellation which requires a balancing of the equities and I am concerned there is a substance abuse issue and that may be related to why she is coming in contact with law enforcement so much.” That is open ended and tells the evaluator A) what is the goal of the legal representation and what the attorney is looking for, and B) what are some basic issues that are going to come up in the interview.

- **259** Pose questions to the mental health professional to address in the evaluation. Ideally questions that speak to OCC and the Court’s concerns re: allowing your client to stay in the US. If there is something about a referral question that you asked, and the answer is not especially favorable, it doesn’t have to be included in the psychological evaluation. But you cannot ask the mental health professional to, for example, change the diagnosis. That is unethical for both parties.

- **260** You have to determine whether the psychological evaluation will help your theory of the case. For example, my question to the mental health professional can be, “Please discuss the client’s ability to learn to engage in abstract thinking and learn from his mistakes.” The evaluation may say, “The client does not have the cognitive faculties to learn from his mistake.” That answer does put into context why the client committed the crimes, but it also cuts in another way: the client is going to commit the same mistake it in the future.

- **261** A client was denied LPR Cancellation of Removal because he did not have the capacity to express remorse. He was clearly severely mentally ill and did not have the same faculties as most people to express remorse or understanding. You
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would think that cannot be held against him so I got a psychological evaluation to express that point but it did not persuade the judge.

**Taxes**

- I file the taxes if I have them. I actually haven’t gone to the length of having the person file back taxes if they haven’t done so already. That is because of the accelerated docket for a detained person and because the person is in detention. So if they don’t have an archive at home, I try to supplement that with other information. In general terms, if I had twelve years of tax returns I would file all twelve with immigration court.

- Learn what your immigration court wants in terms of taxes. For example, the Philadelphia immigration court wants tax transcripts while the York immigration court does not care if it is the transcript or tax return.

**Immigration Judges**

- Know who your audience is. It is important to know which IJ will be deciding your LPR client’s case.

- Different IJs have different approaches to these types of cases. The outcome will depend on the Judge. Be familiar with the particular IJ that is deciding your client's case.

- Whenever the IJs on the detained docket in the Los Angeles area see a person is LPR Cancellation eligible, they say, “Let’s go.” They recognize they are cases that can be handled and off their docket relatively quickly. The LPR Cancellation merits hearings are usually shorter than other hearings and judges usually ask if I can do the case in an hour and I agree. If a judge thinks the case can get done in an hour that is a good sign.

---
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I. ADVICE FOR PRACTITIONERS

Suggested Litigation Strategies & Best Practices

Standard of Proof

- There is a lower standard of proof for LPR Cancellation of Removal than non-LPR Cancellation of Removal cases because applicants for LPR Cancellation do not have to prove that removal would result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to their U.S. citizen or LPR spouse, parent, or child.

Stop-Time Rule

- If a client is served with an NTA, has a hearing, and his or her removal proceeding is terminated, s/he may accrue time toward LPR Cancellation. If the client is put back into removal proceedings, the stop date is that of the new proceedings.

---
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II. APPENDIX – Tools & Sample Documents from Private Attorneys and Non-Governmental Organizations

(a). Intake Form

The intake form is provided by Matthew Lamberti, Esq., the Managing Attorney for Detained Programs at Pennsylvania Immigration Resource Center (PIRC).
PIRC – CASE RECOMMENDATION FORM

Client Name: _______________________________________________ Submitted by: _____________ Date: _____________

Case Source: □ Intake from Docket □ IJ Request □ PIRC Form □ Detainee □ Family □ Other: ________________________________

Type of Case: □ MC □ Bond □ Merits □ Appeal □ Credible/Reasonable Fear □ Final Order
□ Reinstatement □ Custody Review □ Prolonged Detention □ Medical issues □ Habeas: ________________________________

Request to Reopen on: _____________ Reason: ________________________________________________________________

ATTORNEY RECOMMENDATION

□ Intake Only - □ Has attorney □ Will hire Attorney

Reason for closing: ________________________________________________________________

POTENTIAL RELIEF AVAILABLE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waivers</th>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ 209c -waiver of inadmissibility of a Refugee</td>
<td>□ Asylum</td>
<td>□ No Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 212c Waiver</td>
<td>□ Withholding of Removal</td>
<td>□ Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 212g Request for a medical waiver</td>
<td>□ Withholding-Convention Against Torture</td>
<td>□ Motion to Reopen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 212h Waiver of Prior Criminal</td>
<td>□ 245 Adjustment of Status</td>
<td>□ Habeas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 212 I Waiver of Visa Fraud (Admission-Adjust)</td>
<td>□ Registry (entry before 1/1/72)/Amnesty</td>
<td>□ Deferred Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ EOIR42a (240a) LPR C.O.R</td>
<td>□ NACARA</td>
<td>□ Voluntary Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ EOIR42b (240b) 10 YEAR C.O.R</td>
<td>□ TPS</td>
<td>□ Bond Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ T Visa (TIV)</td>
<td>□ Citizenship</td>
<td>□ Other: ________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ U Visa (UIV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ VAWA Self Petition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

□ Provide Workshop(s): □ Bond/VD □ Fear Base □ Waivers □ 10 Year
□ Recommend Pro Bono Referral Case □ Recommend PIRC Direct Representation Case

□ Complicated Legal Issue for Review (see notes)

□ NEEDS ASSESSMENT: □ Medical □ Psychological □ Capacity □ Other ________________________________

Meets Criteria For: □ Financial Eligibility □ DTS □ CPIP □ Other: ________________________________

Notes: _________________________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________________________

MANAGING ATTORNEY RESPONSE:

□ No further Action □ DTS Confirmed

□ Workshop: □ Bond/VD □ Fear Base □ Waivers □ 10 Year □ Other: ________________________________

□ Direct Representation – Funding: □ DTS □ CPIP □ Other: _________ Assigned to: ______________________

□ Pro Bono Referral: □ Bond □ VD □ Fear Base □ Waivers □ 10 Year □ Other ________________________________

Type of case: □ Bond □ VD □ Fear base □ Waivers □ 10 Year □ Other: ________________________________

Dates of Referral Attempts _________________________________________________________________________________

Reopen: ______________________________________________________________________________________________

Additional Notes: _______________________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________________________

Date: ___________________      Managing Attorney Initials: ____________________
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### II. APPENDIX-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DATE FILLED</strong></th>
<th><strong>IMMIGRANT PETITIONS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CASE STATUS</strong></th>
<th><strong>MANNER OF ENTRY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ EWI □ Visa-Type</td>
<td>□ LPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Refugee/Asylee</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CITY OF APPREHENSION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Border/Port of Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ ICE Detainer Following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Criminal Arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Conviction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Workplace Raid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Arrested at Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Probation/Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other: (specify):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DATE OF ICE CUSTODY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(see NTA for date detainee signed NTA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CITY OF APPREHENSION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How Arrested:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Border/Port of Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ ICE Detainer Following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Criminal Arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Conviction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Workplace Raid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Arrested at Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Probation/Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other: (specify):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DATE IN</strong></th>
<th><strong>DATE OUT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>JUDGE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Walter Durling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Andrew Arthur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other: _________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NEXT HEARING</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: ____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: _____ □ AM □ PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type: □ MC # _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Merits □ Other: __________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ICE CUSTODY STATUS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ 236 (a)- bond Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 236 (c)- Mandatory Detention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ ATD- release under supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BOND</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can you pay a bond? □ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ ____________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FAMILY IN U.S.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Mom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Dad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Spouse □ Sign. other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Children-#of Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Siblings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>IMMIGRANT PETITIONS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ No □ Yes—if Yes, complete below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TYPE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Refugee/Asylee adjustment (I-485) □ other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DATE FILED</strong></th>
<th><strong>BY WHOM</strong></th>
<th><strong>RELATIONSHIP</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>STATUS</strong></th>
<th>□ Pending □ Approved □ Denied □ Other: Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>REFUGEE/ASYLEE ADJUSTMENT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If adjustment denied by USCIS, do they have money to pay for medical exam (need $500 in account) □ No □ Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **OTHER DETAILS** |
### Criminal History:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conviction/Charge</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>On NTA</th>
<th>County &amp; state</th>
<th>Plea</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Time Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PHYSICAL/MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES:** □ YES □ NO

Type: ___________________________________________________________________________________

**RECEIVED TREATMENT FOR HEALTH ISSUES:** □ YES □ NO  If Yes, then Date: ________________

**CURRENTLY RECEIVING TREATMENT IN DETENTION** □ YES □ NO

*If yes, then type of treatment:* ___________________________________________________________________________________

**HEALTH PROFESSIONAL BEFORE DETENTION:** □ YES □ NO  If Yes, then name: __________________________

Medication: ___________________________________________________________________________________

□ Evaluation needed: □ Psychological □ Medical □ Other  [mark on recommendation sheet also]

**FEAR OF RETURNING TO COUNTRY:** □ YES □ NO

What part of Country (city) __________________________ Fear who (Name): __________________________
SURVIVOR OF TORTURE: □ YES □ NO
Type of Torture: □ Primary □ Secondary: Who was abused? ________________________________ Relationship to you: __________________________
By who? [Name] ____________________________________________________________
DATE of Torture? ____________________________________________________________
Age when 1st abused/attacked or witness of torture? ____________________________
System of torture: □ Physical □ Threats to use torture
□ Systemic beatings □ Wounding/maiming □ Sexual torture □ Kidnapping/disappearances □ Asphyxiation
□ Severe humiliation □ Burning □ mutilations □ Electrical □ Sensory stress
□ Pharmacological [forced medication] □ Deprivation/exhaustion □ Forced postures [stretching/hanging]
□ Other: ____________________________________________________________

Does the person suffer from prolonged mental harm because of the torture? □ Yes □ No
□ nightmares □ flashbacks □ anxiety □ depression □ no sleep □ Other: ____________________________

EXPLANATION OF FEAR/TORTURE
VICTIM OF CRIME: □ Yes □ No  
 IF YES; Write out explanation on next page

Type of Crime: □ PHYSICAL/SEXUAL □ ROBBERY □ ASSAULT □ TRAFFICKING □ OTHER:________________

Date of Incident:_________________________________

Police Involvement: □ Yes □ No  
 Did you cooperate with police? □ Yes □ No

Name of Police Department:__________________________  
 Phone Number:__________________________

Name of person you worked with:_______________________________________________________________________

Did you go to the Hospital? □ Yes □ No

Type of Harm:__________________________________________  
 Name of Hospital:__________________________

PIRC-IOLTA FINANCIAL ELIGIBILITY GUIDELINE

Employed: □ Primary Caregiver □ No work Authorization-working □ No work Authorization-unemployed
□ Student □ Unemployed, authorized, not seeking □ Employed F/T-authorized
□ Unable to Work

Occupation:__________________________________________  
 Salary:___________________ □ Hourly □ Yearly

Number in Household* (please circle) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Other:__________________________________________

Do you or your family receives Public Benefits: □ Yes □ No

If yes, what type:_________________________________________________________________________________

Pay Child Support: □ Yes □ No  If yes, who:_____________________________________________________________

Salary:___________________ □ Hourly □ Yearly

Meets eligibility requirements: □ Yes □ No □ detained or explanation:________________________________________

*In household includes all those who are domiciled together if they are a 1)Spouse, domestic or civil union partner 2) related family member or 3) non-related dependent
| Have you been able to contact family/friend since being detained: | □ Yes □ No – if No or if yes, but have no $ now, complete below |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Is there a person PIRC can contact for you? Name:______________ Phone#:__________________ |
| Relationship to you: □ Spouse □ Significant Other □ Parent □ Child □ Other:________________________ |
| Purpose of Call – advise person of: | □ location of detainee □ provide A# &/or hotline number □ bond amount/info |
| | □ send pro se materials □ Other (see notes) |
| Complaints: □ Legal-default □ Other:________________________________________________________________________ |
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(b). Evidence Guide

Below are examples of evidence that may be used for the discretionary component of Cancellation of Removal. Please note that this list is not exhaustive and examples of evidence will vary from case to case. The following evidence in support of discretion has been derived from difference sources including:

- Professor Barbara Hines during her time as Co-Director of the university of Texas Law School Immigration Clinic;
- Professor Mary Holper during her time as Associate Professor of Law and Director of the Immigration Law Clinic at the Roger Williams University of Law;
- Anna M. Gallagher, Esq. and Maria Baldini-Potermin, Esq. derived from Immigration Trial Handbook § 6:29 (2009);
- Professor Troy Elder during his time as Clinical Assistant Professor of Law at the Florida International University College of Law (2009);
- Mr. Raymond G. Lahoud, Esq., Baurkot & Baurkot (2016);
- Ms. Julie C. Ferguson, Esq. (2009); and,
- Mr. Jack Herzig, Esq. (2009).

**Examples of Evidence for the Discretionary Component**

**Family ties within the U.S.**

- A copy of the marriage certificate if the noncitizen is married or, if the noncitizen is divorced, then a certified copy of any divorce decrees and, where relevant, maintenance or support orders, child support orders, and visitation orders;
- Copies of daycare records and receipts;
- Proof of child support payments;
- Tax returns showing the child as dependent;
- Copies of evidence of family members in the U.S., including U.S. birth certificates, U.S. passports, certificates of naturalization or citizenship, alien registration cards, employment authorization documents, I-94s, other evidence of authorized presence in the U.S., etc.; family members for whom evidence should be provided include spouse, children, grandparents, aunts, uncles, siblings, and grandchildren;
- School records of children (report cards, rewards, drawings, sports activities, special education issue, letters from teachers);
- Vaccination records of children;
- Evidence of community involvement of children (sports, church, scouts);
- Letters from counselors or teachers regarding children’s progress in school;
- Evidence of community involvement of spouse (employment, church, community relations, education);
- Copies of life insurance policy showing spouse or children as beneficiary;
- Health insurance;
- Car insurance;
- Death decrees, if appropriate;
- Affidavits from family members establishing their relationship with the applicant and existence (or lack thereof) of family in the country designated for removal;
- Photographs (family photos, school photos, photos of current living arrangements as compared to living arrangements in country of removal);
- School records such as report cards or transcripts;
- Bank records;
- Driver's license;
- Pay stubs;
- Credit card receipts;
- Tax payment records and income tax returns;
- Dated receipts from purchases;
- Prior mail received with postmarks;
- Social security records;
- Telephone or other utility bills;
- Affidavits from friends or acquaintances

**Evidence of hardship to the applicant and family if deportation occurs**
- Affidavits attesting to the hardship from family members, religious organization members, religious leaders, employer, neighbors, etc.;
- If the hardship is connected to a family member's medical condition, medical records attesting to that condition and statements from medical providers;
- Documentation of psychiatric or social problems such as letters from psychologists, psychiatrists, therapists, licensed counselors, social worker, copies of treatment records;
- Evidence of educational or behavioral problems with children such as letters from teachers, principals, counselors, other experts or health professionals;
- Documentation related to country conditions, including unemployment, economic growth, political conditions, social conditions, human rights, crime and violence, educational opportunities, language(s) spoken in country designated for removal, availability of medical care and location of medical facilities, and attitudes toward U.S. citizens if U.S. citizen family members were to move to the country upon removal of the noncitizen from the U.S.;
- Affidavit from doctor detailing all medical conditions, including minor medical conditions, which may worsen due to inadequate medical care in home country;
- Medical records;
- Prescriptions
Service in Armed Forces
- If the noncitizen has served in the military, submit a copy of his discharge papers; for male noncitizens, evidence of selective service registration can be obtained at http://www.sss.gov.

History of employment
- Copies of pay stubs;
- Social security records;
- Letters or affidavits from current and former employers verifying dates of employment, position, and salary or wage;
- Copies of federal income tax returns, Forms W-2 and/or 1099, and any schedules filed; where payment of taxes is owed, evidence of a payment plan agreed to between the noncitizen and the IRS should be submitted to the immigration court along with proof of payments made

Existence of property or business ties
- A copy of the titles(s) of any motor vehicles owned by the noncitizen and/or his spouse;
- Property title if the noncitizen or his spouse owns a home or other real estate in the U.S.;
- If the noncitizen runs his own business, copies of the company's income tax returns, a copy of the business license, and other documentation to demonstrate that the company is in compliance with federal and state laws;
- If the noncitizen is a member of local, state, or national business organizations, a letter from each organization verifying membership and any leadership roles of the noncitizen;
- Letter(s) from bank(s) regarding account(s) held by the noncitizen, whether the accounts are joint accounts and with whom, and whether the accounts are in good standing

Existence of value and service to the community
- Affidavits and letters from neighbors and community members attesting to the noncitizen's good character and the effect of his removal on family, friends, and the community;
- Evidence of any community service or volunteer awards or honors;
- Newsletters or other documents that mention the noncitizen's community or volunteer work;
- Letters from any religious organizations and members of the organization regarding his membership and/or attendance at services and activities;
- Letters from community organizations in which the noncitizen is involved
Proof of genuine rehabilitation if a criminal record exists

- A certified copy of the noncitizen’s criminal record, arrest report, information or indictment, disposition, probation records, community service;
- Statement of the victim (if the case concerns domestic violence, a statement by the family member is suggested);
- Evidence of completion of any prison or jail term(s), community or public service hours, Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) or Narcotics Anonymous (NA) attendance, rehabilitation classes, probation/ supervision/conditional discharge/parole, payment of fines and court costs, etc.;
- Successful drug testing;
- Where a noncitizen has reported to a probation officer, a letter from that officer and certificates of completion for classes (i.e., anger management, career development, life skills training) and steps in the AA or NA programs;
- If relevant, prison records attesting to the noncitizen's participation in rehabilitative activities, including affidavits from counselors, case managers, or prison supervisors;
- A letter from a prison counselor or chaplain;
- Declaration from applicant stating how long he/she has been clean, the length of his/her rehab, level of remorse, and acceptance of responsibility;
- Declaration from family stating how long applicant has been clean, the length of applicant's rehab and his/her level of remorse;
- Psychological evaluation, including violence risk assessment or other tests to measure recidivism

In addition, an attorney representing an applicant for LPR cancellation of removal may prepare documents relating to the education background of the applicant.

Such documents may include:

- Grade school, high school, or GED certificate and college, technical, or vocational school and graduate diplomas if completed;
- Where a noncitizen has not completed a program, transcripts of courses completed;
- Certificates for any courses completed related to employment
1. **Continuous Presence for seven years**

   To meet the first requirement you need to show the judge that you have been living in the U.S. continuously for at least 7 years. You should gather as much evidence as possible to show that you have been here for that length of time.

   You need to find documents to prove your presence in this country every year. For each year of the seven-year period, try to get as much proof as you can.

   You can help your case by gathering proof that you were living in the United States. For example, proof can include:

   * ☐ Passports (current and expired)
   * ☐ school records, transcripts – anything and everything.
   * ☐ certificates of achievement/rehabilitation/education
   * ☐ medical or dental records
   * ☐ social security records
   * ☐ payroll records and income tax records for each year. If you were on someone else’s taxes, please provide those tax records.
   * ☐ notarized letters from a:
     * ☐ landlord
     * ☐ employer
     * ☐ co-worker
     * ☐ neighbor
     * ☐ friend or religious leader
   * ☐ utility bills, rent receipts – the more the better.
   * ☐ children’s birth certificates
   * ☐ children’s school records
   * ☐ children’s immunization records
   * ☐ marriage certificate
   * ☐ I.D.’s issued during that time – all – the more the better.
   * ☐ bank statements and records – as much as possible.
   * ☐ proof of child support payments
   * ☐ tax records
   * ☐ deeds to property

2. **Good Moral Character**

   To meet the second requirement you need to show the judge that you have been a person of good moral character during the last 7 years. Remember, there is no limit as to the amount of information you can submit to prove your good moral character. The more relevant information, the better.
Document Checklist for Good Moral Character

To document good moral character you should try to get detailed, notarized letters with identification of the letter writer attached, from:

- family members
- work or volunteer supervisors
- co-workers
- teachers
- neighbors
- religious leaders
- any people who benefit from your activities in your community

TIPS:

Remember, the more letters, the better. The letters should be dated, notarized and signed. THE LETTERS SHOULD BE DETAILED—not simple, form letters. They must be personalized. Also, the letters should include the following information:

- how you are related to the person writing the letter
- the name of that person, the address of that person and phone number.
- What that person's status is in the United States.
- how long they have known you
- why they have a good opinion of you (they should try to give examples of your good behavior)
- they should also talk about your criminal history if they are familiar with it and say how you have changed and why they think that you won't make the same mistakes again

Also, you should try to get copies of:

- photographs of you and your family
- photographs of your children
- tax records
- employment pay stubs

In getting documents together you should also include any awards you have received at work or in your community.

3. Other Relevant Documents

*To show hardship, which is important part of “discretion,” you should gather the following proof:

- bills or letters showing your address
- school or work records
- birth certificates
- marriage certificate
- proof of child support payments
- letters from your family members
- bills for your family's expenses (water, electricity, medical care, etc.)
- proof of insurance for family members

*If you or and of your family members are currently sick (physically or mentally) or have been sick in the past, it is important for the Judge and Immigration to learn about it. It is very helpful to
submit evidence of their medical history such as a letter from a doctor, copies of medical records and prescriptions. These documents include:

- doctor's letter
- copies of medical records
- copies of prescriptions
- letter from a psychologist, social worker or psychiatrist
- copies of treatment records
### (c). Sample Legal Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>241</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>Siobhan Waldron, Esq. (Immigration Center for Women and Children (ICWC))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Terms</td>
<td>Discretionary Component; disability; Alcoholics Anonymous; rehabilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic/Importance</td>
<td>This brief highlights the discretionary factors of a client who has extensive criminal history, but who also has extensive family ties to the U.S.. This brief is important because it demonstrates the significance of emphasizing family ties and hardship of the family should the Respondent be removed. The brief also emphasizes Respondent’s ties and involvement to his Alcoholics Anonymous group and his rehabilitative efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural History/Outcome</td>
<td>This document is in response to DHS’ closing argument. This case is currently pending review before the Board. Please note that the Respondent in this brief and the Respondent in the next brief by Siobhan Waldron is the same person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>247</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>Siobhan Waldron, Esq. (Immigration Center for Women and Children (ICWC))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Terms</td>
<td>Discretionary Component; mental health; country conditions; family ties; disability; Alcoholics Anonymous; rehabilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic/Importance</td>
<td>This brief highlights the discretionary factors of a client who has extensive criminal history, but who also has significant equities. This brief is important because it demonstrates the significance of emphasizing mental health and hardship should the Respondent be removed. Here, the Respondent may suffer further persecution should he be removed due to his mental health conditions. Further, this brief demonstrates that multiple avenues for relief may be available for each client.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural History/Outcome</td>
<td>This document is Respondent’s closing argument in support of applications for Cancellation of Removal and for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture. This case is currently pending review before the Board. Please note that the Respondent in this brief and the Respondent in the previous brief by Siobhan Waldron is the same person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This brief is about an applicant for Cancellation of Removal who may be subject to the aggravated felony bar for relief. Here, the Practitioner is arguing that the state arson statute is not a categorical match with federal crime because the state arson statute lacks the federal jurisdictional element. This brief demonstrates the importance of challenging the grounds for removability, including aggravated felony grounds.

This document is Respondent’s Response to DHS Motion to Reconsider. At this stage of the litigation, Respondent is asking for the Immigration Court to deny DHS’ motion to reconsider the ruling on aggravated felony. Later, this case was successfully argued in front of the Third Circuit.²⁷⁰

This memorandum is about evidence which supports the discretionary component of LPR Cancellation. Here, the attorney argues that medical treatment for the respondent would not be readily available in Respondent’s country of origin; therefore, should the Respondent be removed from the U.S. he would suffer extreme hardship.

This document is Memorandum In Support of Respondent’s Application For Cancellation Of Removal.

This memorandum is about evidence which supports the discretionary component of the LPR Cancellation Application. This brief is important because the brief emphasizes the importance of family unity and the

### Page 290

**Practitioner**
Tamara Shehadeh-Cope, *pro bono counsel* (Pennsylvania Immigration Resource Center)

**Key Terms**
Hardship to child with learning disabilities; hardship to spouse; inpatient treatment and rehabilitation.

**Topic/Importance**
This memorandum is about evidence which supports the discretionary component of LPR Cancellation. Here, the attorney argues that the respondent’s child would suffer medical complication if the parent were removed and argues that the respondent’s spouse would suffer hardship should respondent be removed. The attorney also argues that respondent’s long history of employment weighs in respondent’s favor. Finally, the attorney argues that respondent recognizes the issues with alcohol abuse and presents evidence of the respondent’s medical treatment.

### Page 301

**Practitioner**
Raymond G. Lahoud, Esq. (Baurkot & Baurkot)

**Key Terms**
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This motion is to request the IJ to proceed with the LPR Cancellation of Removal Hearing. The Respondent is charged with the aggravated felony charge of Conspiracy under section 101(a)(43)(M)(i) and (U), for fraud or deceit in which the actual or potential loss to the victim or victims exceeds $10,000. Here, the attorney argues that the Respondent has not been convicted of an aggravated felony. Therefore, the Respondent should be allowed a hearing. The attorney argues that the Respondent’s crime only meets two of the three elements required to by the *In re S-I-K-*, 24 I. & N. Dec.324 (BIA 2007) test for aggravated felony Conspiracy to commit fraud or deceit; therefore, the Respondent was not statutorily barred from apply for Cancellation of Removal.
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RESPONDENT'S REPLY TO DHS’ CLOSING ARGUMENTS
Respondent X, by and through undersigned counsel, is applying for cancellation of removal for certain lawful permanent residents under INA § 240A (“LPR Cancellation”), asylum pursuant to INA § 208, withholding of removal pursuant to INA § 243(h), and relief under the Convention against Torture (“CAT”).

I. RESPONDENT DESERVES A FAVORABLE EXERCISE OF DISCRETION AND A GRANT OF CANCELLATION OF REMOVAL

The Department improperly asserts that Respondent’s positive equities are minimal. DHS Closing at 7. Respondent acknowledges his lengthy and serious criminal record, and previously submitted closing arguments address in detail why his criminal record does not call for a negative exercise of discretion and denial of his application for cancellation of removal. Respondent’s equities are great, and in a proper balance of all factors, outweigh his criminal record. Respondent wishes to address certain points raised by the Department in its mischaracterization of the record and improper weight given to Respondent’s positive equities.

The Department’s assertion that “his family has been forced to fend for themselves for decades as the respondent has been in and out of jail” and that he is not a provider for his family is fully without merit. DHS Closing at 7. The evidence in the record establishes that he has provided for his family. Respondent’s son-in-law XX explained that Respondent has worked side jobs for him and X, “always paid him and he [Respondent] would make me stop at the grocery store to spend his earnings on his family’s weekly groceries and to buy money orders for his rent and utility bills.” Exh 7 at 14. Letters from his wife and children also describe him as supportive, despite his incarcerations. See e.g. Exh. 7 at 11 (Letter from XXX, stating, “My father was always a provider to us making sure we had all our necessities met”). A fellow churchgoer also describes him as a provider for his family. Id. at 74. Further, Respondent has been receiving Supplemental Security Income for about 15 years, thus he has income to help
support his family. There is absolutely nothing negative about receiving Social Security benefits based on a disability that renders him incapable of gainful employment. To argue that a person who has been found permanently disabled and unable to sustain gainful employment for that reason and thus entitled to income supports on that basis is not a provider for his family or not worthy of a favorable exercise of discretion shows a prejudice against individuals with disability. This Court should give no weight to such an argument.

The Department argues that “there is no evidence that the respondent has done any kind of community service, or given back to the community in any meaningful way.” DHS Closing at 7. Again, this argument is without merit. Respondent is an active, contributing member of his Alcoholics Anonymous groups. See Exh. 7 at 54-58. XX explains that Respondent “was a great asset to the group” and that he “shared and interacted with the group every chance an opportunity was given.” Exh. 7 at 54. Being an active member of an Alcoholics Anonymous group that helps all participants find and maintain sobriety is of great value to the community. Additionally, letters from fellow churchgoers show that he is an asset to the church – a bedrock community institution in American society. See Exh. 7 at 69-74. Lastly, helping raise his six children and 13 grandchildren is of great value to society. The family unit is another bedrock institution of American society. Respondent has six children in the United States who love him dearly and would be devastated by his deportation. His daughters [4 NAMES] wrote detailed, heartfelt letters about the unwavering support Respondent provided them in great times of need, including teen pregnancy and the death of his daughter XX’s baby after being born after only 26 weeks of gestation. See Exh. 7 at 19. Respondent’s eldest granddaughter XX describes how Respondent helped raise her because her mother was a teenager when she was born. Id. at 17. Respondent
taught her how to play soccer and baseball. *Id.* He attended nearly all of her softball games from the age of 4 years old through high school. *Id.*

Finally, contrary to DHS’ argument, there is credible evidence that Respondent is willing and able to rehabilitate and stay sober. DHS Closing at 7. Respondent will live in an inpatient alcohol rehabilitation center that is based upon Christian principles. Exh. 7 at 77-80.

Respondent testified and submitted evidence regarding his devotion to Christianity and his desire to further pursue religious studies upon his release. Thus, he is very likely to be engaged and stay committed to his rehabilitation program. Also, Respondent has never received any kind of inpatient rehabilitation for his alcohol abuse before. Such treatment will be a monumental step in achieving and maintaining sobriety, in conjunction with the amply demonstrated support of his family. Respondent facing deportation for the first time has caused both Respondent and his family to appreciate the grave nature of his disease and continue his sobriety. He has been sober since his last DUI arrest in March 2013, but for having something to drink once in January 2015. Becoming and maintaining sobriety after many years of alcohol abuse is a process, and Respondent has demonstrated his commitment to that process, as evidenced by his sobriety and attendance and active participation in Alcoholics Anonymous programs. Drinking on one occasion since March 2013 does not cast doubt on his ability to maintain sobriety, but rather his admission to having a drink shows that he is aware of his disease and can take responsibility for his actions. Thus, Respondent’s clearly stated dedication to maintaining sobriety is credible.

The evidence submitted at Exhibit 10, if admitted, has little probative value and relevance to Respondent’s applications for relief. The Department has argued that if Respondent drives drunk, he will kill someone. DHS Closing at 6. While Respondent is not in any way suggesting that driving drunk is acceptable or does not pose a risk of harm, it is imperative to point out that
the evidence submitted by the Department does not support their argument. The studies at Tabs C and D start with an extremely rare occurrence – a traffic fatality. Then, looking at the rare occurrence of a fatality, it is determined that alcohol impaired drivers are involved in 31% of those crashes. This 31% value cannot be used to approximate the percentage of risk that a drunk driver might cause a fatality. Tabs A and B discuss recidivism, but the record already establishes that he is a recidivist. That is not at issue, instead, the relevant evidence is that Respondent has been sober since March 2013, drinking once in January 2015 and not driving, and has repeatedly stated that he will not drive. Respondent will not drive drunk again.

In summary, Respondent’s significant equities outweigh his serious criminal record. He has shown rehabilitation and is committed to treating his mental health issues and alcohol abuse. Respondent has lived in the United States for over 37 years and been a Lawful Permanent Resident since 1989. His large, supportive, extended family is located here in the United States. An account of his mental illness he would be persecuted and tortured if forcibly returned to Mexico. Respondent respectfully requests that the Court exercise favorable discretion and approve his application for cancellation of removal and give him a second chance to remain in the United States with his family and receive the humane, intensive treatment he needs and deserves.

IV. CONCLUSION

For all the reasons stated above and contained in previous closing arguments, Respondent’s request for Cancellation of Removal for Certain Lawful Permanent Residents should be granted. Alternatively, asylum, withholding of removal, or relief under the Convention Against Torture should be granted. Additionally, the Department’s late-filed submission at Exhibit 10 should not be admitted into evidence.
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RESPONDENT’S CLOSING ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF APPLICATIONS FOR CANCELLATION OF REMOVAL AND FOR ASYLUM, WITHHOLDING OF REMOVAL, AND RELIEF UNDER THE CONVENTION AGAINST TORTURE
Respondent X, by and through undersigned counsel, is applying for cancellation of removal for certain lawful permanent residents under INA § 240A (“LPR Cancellation”), asylum pursuant to INA § 208, withholding of removal pursuant to INA § 243(h), and relief under the Convention against Torture (“CAT”).

I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Respondent is a long-time lawful permanent resident of the United States and suffers from severe and persistent mental illness and neurocognitive disorder. Mexico has a deplorable history of persecuting and torturing individuals like Respondent. Persons with mental illness and cognitive disorders like Respondent are frequently held involuntarily in inhumane facilities, physically restrained for long periods of time, and even subjected to horrific surgical procedures. Accordingly, pursuant to the humanitarian provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) as interpreted in accordance with constitutional and international principles, Respondent is entitled to asylum, or in the alternative, withholding of removal or relief under CAT.

This inhumane treatment of individuals like Respondent also calls for the granting of his LPR Cancellation application. Respondent has a lengthy and serious criminal record, but unusual and outstanding equities, including his long-undiagnosed mental health issues, the persecution and torture he faces on account of his severe and persistent mental health issues, his record of rehabilitation, extensive and close family ties to the United States, and residence in the United States since age 19 call for a positive exercise of discretion.

A. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Respondent was first served with a Notice to Appear on March 1, 2015, charging him as removable under INA § 212(a)(2)(B)(i). See Exh. 1, Notice to Appear. Respondent
demonstrated indicia of incompetency, and after a judicial competency inquiry, the Immigration Judge determined that Respondent was incompetent to represent himself.  *See Order for Provision of Qualified Representative, April 23, 2015.*  Pursuant to *Franco-Gonzalez v. Holder,* CV 10-021-DMG (C.D. Cal. April 23, 2013), counsel was appointed to assist Respondent. Through counsel, Respondent contested removability. The Immigration Judge found Respondent removable as charged. Respondent filed Forms EOIR-42A and Form I-589 seeking LPR Cancellation and asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention against Torture (“CAT”) on or about August 14, 2015. *See Exhs. 4-6.*

On December 22, 2015, the Department of Homeland Security (“the Department”) filed documents for consideration by the court. The filing deadline set by the Court was December 15, 2015, and no motion to accept the untimely filing was made by the Department. A merits hearing was held on January 5, 2016. Respondent’s counsel objected to the admission of the late-filed evidence by the Department. The Court marked the submission as Exhibit 10 for identification purposes only. The Department of Homeland Security agreed that Respondent is statutorily eligible for LPR Cancellation, but contested a grant of LPR Cancellation on discretionary grounds. Respondent’s testimony was taken at the merits hearing. The Court asked Respondent’s counsel to file closing arguments addressing Respondent’s eligibility for removal for both LPR Cancellation and asylum, withholding, and relief under CAT, and any objections and counterevidence to the Department’s late filed evidence marked as Exh. 10 for identification purposes only.

**B. FACTS**

Respondent began living in the United States in about 1979, when he was 19 years old. Exh. 5 at 2. He became a lawful permanent residence on December 1, 1989. *Id.* at 1. He is now
50 years old and has extensive family ties to the United States. He has been married since 1977 and his wife lives in Oxnard, California. Id. at 2. All six of his children live in the United States, three of whom are United States citizens. Id. at 4 (Part 6 of LPR Cancellation application). Additionally, he has 13 United States citizen grandchildren. His father is a United States citizen, and his mother was a lawful permanent resident before her death. Exh. 7 at 7; see also Exh. 5 at 4. Additionally, he has two United States citizen sisters and a lawful permanent resident brother. Exh. 7 at 31, 42; Exh. 5 at 4 (Part 6 of LPR Cancellation application). Various aunts, uncles, and cousins of Respondent live in the United States and have immigration status, including his uncle X and his wife. Exh. 7 at 36.

Respondent is very close with his family, as documented in the “Family Ties” section of Exh. 7 at 7-53. Respondent submitted ten letters of support from the family members mentioned above. Id. Respondent’s eldest granddaughter X describes how Respondent helped raise her because her mother was a teenager when she was born. Id. at 17. Respondent taught her how to play soccer and baseball. Id. He attended nearly all of her softball games from the age of 4 years old through high school. Id. Naomi is the first person in their family to attend a university, and she is currently a full-time student at the University of California, Santa Barbara. Respondent’s deportation would “tear [her] family apart” and she “can’t see how [she] can keep on without [her] grandpa.” Id.

Respondent suffers from severe and persistent mental illness. A recent psychological evaluation diagnoses Respondent with Psychotic Disorder due to Traumatic Brain Injury with Hallucinations; Mild Neurocognitive Disorder due to Traumatic Brain Injury, with Behavioral Disturbance; Persistent Depressive Disorder with Anxious Distress, Moderate; Alcohol Use Disorder, Severe, In Early Remission, In a Controlled Environment. Exh. 7 at 94. Respondent
testified that he began experiencing auditory hallucinations and intense headaches about 20 years ago, but was not diagnosed with schizophrenia until about seven years ago. Additional mental health records from April 2011 and May 2014 indicate that Respondent sought treatment for audio and visual hallucinations, depression, and his alcohol abuse. Id. at 104-129. Current records from treatment while in custody of the Department also indicate that he suffers from psychosis, depression, and is seeking alcohol rehabilitation services. Id. at 130-136. Because of his disabilities, he has been unable to work for many years – since approximately the early 2000s. He relies on Supplemental Security Income to support himself. Id. at 81-85.

The psychological evaluation was conducted in Adelanto by a licensed clinic and forensic psychologist Dr. Elba Campos. During the evaluation, Respondent indicated that he is compliant with his medication regimen, but still experiences depression, anxiety, and hallucinations. Id. at 91. He reports that medication helps his symptoms, but when off medications he becomes more isolative, fearful, and his experience of auditory hallucinations intensifies significantly. Id. His severe and chronic disorder requires treatment and he would be at risk for harm and further psychiatric decompensation if he were to stop receiving treatment. Id. at 95. Dr. Campos opines that Respondent is psychiatrically fragile and unstable. If he were to be placed in a community where he does not have access to support, medication, and services for his mental illness, he would likely be at increased risk for symptom relapse, self-harm, and substance abuse. Id. Additionally, due to his mental illness, Dr. Campos notes that “it is possible that a stressful event such as deportation to an environment he identifies as ‘dangerous’ and subsequent separation from his family could increase his risk for further psychiatric decompensation and harm.” Id.

The psychological evaluation also details Respondent’s considerable cognitive deficits. Respondent was administered the Comprehensive Test of Nonverbal Intelligence to assess his
intellectual abilities. Id. at 92. He scored “below average” to “very poor” in every category, and scored less than the 1% of an age-matched normative sample. Id. at 92-3. Thus, his intellectual ability falls in the “severely impaired” range. Id. at 93. His test results indicate that he has significant difficulty with abstract reasoning and common sense abilities. Id.

Respondent has a lengthy and serious criminal record, closely related to his over 20 years of alcohol abuse. He has eight convictions for driving under the influence (“DUI”). See Exh. 8. His most recent DUI conviction is from April 23, 2013. For that offense, he was sentenced to state prison for two years. Id. at 185-193. He served approximately one year of the sentence and was released on parole in about March 2014. Testimony of Respondent. On April 6, 2005, he was convicted of possession of a controlled substance and is deportable for that offense. See Exhs. 1, 3. Respondent also has a 1993 misdemeanor battery conviction, a 2008 misdemeanor theft conviction, a 2003 possession of controlled substance conviction, and numerous convictions for driving without a license or driving with a suspended license. See Exh. 8.

Respondent openly admits to his alcohol abuse and recognizes that he put others’ lives and security in danger when he drove drunk so many times. Exh. 7 at 1-2. He testified that he has been committed to sobriety since his last DUI arrest in 2013, and that he only had one relapse in about January 2015 when he had something to drink. Other than that, he has maintained sobriety and been dedicated to turning his life around. Before his arrest by the Department in connection with the instant removal proceedings, Respondent was attending Alcoholics Anonymous meetings approximately four times a week. Exh. 7 at 1; see also Exh. 7 at 54-58 (letters from fellow attendees of Alcoholics Anonymous). X describes Respondent as “very expressive and cooperative with the group” and that he “shared and interacted with the group every chance an opportunity [sic] was given.” Exh. 7 at 54. XX confirms that he attended
Alcoholics Anonymous groups with Respondent three to four times a week for about six months before Respondent was arrested by the Department. Id. at 56. Mr. X notes that Respondent has “changed his life substantially” and that he will “do anything necessary to help him in order for him to continue participating in alcoholic programs and on anything else he need [sic]” Id.

Upon potential release from custody, Respondent will obtain in-patient alcohol abuse rehabilitation services at the Los Angeles Mission. Exh. 7 at 79. The Los Angeles Mission also has a psychiatrist on site. Id. at 78. Additionally, he will have access to additional wraparound mental health services at a nearby clinic that he can easily access by public transportation. Exh. 7 at 78. Respondent has sought comfort and strength in religion, and he will continue his religious and biblical studies at the Los Angeles Mission upon release. Exh 7 at 1-2, 59-74.

II. RESPONDENT DESERVES CANCELLATION OF REMOVAL IN A FAVORABLE EXERCISE OF DISCRETION BY THE COURT BECAUSE HIS LONG-TERM PERMANENT RESIDENCE, FAMILY TIES, SEVERE AND PERSISTENT MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES, AND HIGH LIKELIHOOD OF PERSECUTION AND TORTURE UPON REMOVAL TO MEXICO BASED ON HIS MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES, OUTWEIGHT HIS CRIMINAL RECORD

An applicant for relief under INA § 240A(a) must establish that he warrants such relief as a matter of discretion. The Board has held that the general standards developed for the exercise of discretion under former INA § 212(c) are also applicable to the exercise of discretion under INA § 240A(a). Matter of C-V-T-, 22 I. & N. Dec. 7, 10 (BIA 1998). Overall, the Court must consider the record as a whole and “balance the adverse factors evidencing the alien’s undesirability as a permanent resident with the social and humane considerations presented in his behalf to determine whether a grant of relief would be in the best interest of this country.” Matter of C-V-T-, 22 I. & N. Dec. at 11 (quoting Matter of Marin, 16 I. & N. Dec. at 585).
The Board has also found that the factors relevant to the exercise of discretion under section former INA § 212(c) are also applicable to the exercise of discretion under section INA § 240A(a). Positive factors include: (1) family ties within the United States; (2) residence of long duration in this country (particularly when the inception of residence occurred at a young age); (3) evidence of hardship to the respondent and his family if deportation occurs; (4) service in the United States armed forces; (5) history of employment; (6) the existence of property or business ties; (7) evidence of value and service to the community; (8) proof of genuine rehabilitation if a criminal record exists; (9) and other evidence attesting to a respondent's good character. Id.

Adverse factors to be weighed against the positive factors are: (1) the nature and underlying circumstances of the grounds of removal that are at issue; (2) the presence of additional significant violations of this country's immigration laws; (3) the existence of a criminal record and, if so, its nature, recency, and seriousness; (4) and the presence of other evidence indicative of a respondent's bad character or undesirability as a permanent resident of this country. Id. As the negative factors grow more serious, the applicant must submit additional offsetting favorable evidence, which in some cases may have to involve unusual or outstanding equities. Id. at 12. With respect to the issue of rehabilitation, an applicant who has a criminal record will ordinarily be required to present evidence of rehabilitation before relief is granted as a matter of discretion. Id. (citing Matter of Marin at 588; see also Matter of Buscemi, 19 I. & N. Dec. 628 (BIA 1988)). Nonetheless, it is still paramount to decide every application on a case-by-case basis, with rehabilitation as only one factor to be considered in the exercise of discretion. Id. (citing Matter of Edwards, 20 I. & N. Dec 191, 195-96 (BIA 1990). A showing of rehabilitation is not an absolute prerequisite in every case involving an applicant with a criminal record. Id. (citing Matter of Buscemi at 196).
Many of the positive factors are present in Respondent’s case and should be accorded substantial weight. All of Respondent’s immediate family is in the United States, including his wife of over 35 years, six children, United States citizen father, his 13 United States citizen grandchildren, two United States citizen sisters, and lawful permanent resident brother. Additionally, he has many other family members in the United States, including a United States uncle X, and cousins who served in the United States armed forces. Exh. 7 at 36. Ten of these family members submitted letters in support of his application for LPR Cancellation.

Respondent has lived in the United States since he was 19 years old and he has been a lawful permanent resident for 26 years. His entire life and support network is here in the United States. He helped raise his granddaughter XX and she speaks very fondly of him, describing how he taught her how to play sports and went to almost all of her softball games for over 10 years. Exh. 7 at 17. His family would suffer hardship upon his deportation, constantly worried about his wellbeing and whether he is suffering alone in Mexico. See Exh. 7 at 9, 14 (Letters from his father and his son-in-law XXX).

Despite his struggles with his mental health and alcoholism, he has always been a pillar of the family. He has a son who suffers from schizophrenia, a sister who is legally blind, and a sister who suffers from mental retardation, who look to him for support. Also, in her letter of support, his daughter X details how he supported her when she became pregnant at age 16, and helped her cope with the loss of her baby. Id. at 19. He helped calm her during panic attacks and always made sure she ate. Id. His daughter XXX describes how he has “been an amazing grandfather and “always there for [her] and [her ] 3 littles ones.” Id. at 26.

Unquestionably, Respondent’s lengthy criminal record is a serious adverse factor. He is removable for a 2005 controlled substance possession conviction. Perhaps the most significant
aspect of his criminal record is that he has eight DUI convictions spanning 1992 to 2013, and numerous convictions for driving without a license or driving on a suspended license. Clearly, he has shown disregard for traffic laws and public safety. Respondent’s criminal history cannot be minimized, but context is important.

Respondent testified that he began experiencing auditory hallucinations and intense headaches about 20 years ago, but was not diagnosed with schizophrenia until about seven years ago. For many years, he was self-medicating with alcohol. Drinking alcohol made the voices go away and helped him escape. He didn’t seek treatment for his symptoms because he didn’t want to admit that he was having mental health issues. His formal diagnoses indicate that he has a psychotic disorder and also suffers from cognitive deficiencies. Specifically, his test results indicate that he has significant difficulty with abstract reasoning and common sense abilities. As such, his repeated mistakes and patent difficulties in learning from his mistakes and seeking a solution must be viewed in light of his mental health. Respondent simply does not have the same ability as most rational decision makers to avoid repeating his mistakes. It has been a long, difficult road for him to finally receive a diagnosis that puts his problems in context and allows for mental health and substance abuse counselors to support him in his sobriety.

Respondent can establish rehabilitation. Since his last DUI arrest in early 2013, he has only drunk on one occasion, in January 2015. He was released from state prison in about March 2014 and picked up by the Department on March 1, 2015. Thus, for nearly a year, he only drank on one occasion. Prior to that, he drank heavily on a daily basis. As such, he can show rehabilitation. Fellow attendees of Alcoholics Anonymous groups have attested to his attendance, involvement and participation in the program, and his personal growth. Respondent testified to his desire to maintain sobriety and has a plan in place to continue his sobriety. He
will live in an inpatient alcohol rehabilitation program that also has a religious component. Respondent has found strength in his Christian faith and plans to continue his religious studies to maintain sobriety and continue his personal development. His participation on Alcoholics Anonymous also demonstrates his service and value to the community in helping others cope with and overcome their alcohol addiction.

Lastly, he has unusual and outstanding equities. Respondent was a victim of a brutal assault in about 1980 that left him in a coma. He cooperated with law enforcement in the investigation and prosecution of the crime. See Exh. 7 at 76 (Criminal Subpoena issued to Respondent in connection with the prosecution of the crime). He suffered traumatic brain injury that has led to a psychotic disorder and cognitive deficiencies that require lifelong, intensive services for him to be able to contract for his own wellbeing and care. Additionally, it is the onset of auditory hallucinations that contributed to Respondent’s years of extreme alcohol abuse. He drank to make the voices go away, and found himself addicted to alcohol.

Most importantly, Respondent’s psychotic disorder and cognitive deficiencies must be viewed equities as opposed to negative factors. As discussed infra, his severe and persistent mental health issues make his removal to Mexico life-threatening. The persecution and torture that he would face in Mexico as an individual with psychotic disorder with hallucinations and depression qualify him for humanitarian relief through Form I-589. Such a risk of persecution and torture upon removal is outstanding and unusual, and call for positive discretion to be exercised in the adjudication of Respondent’s LPR Cancellation application. Here in the United States he can receive appropriate treatment and has the love and support of his family and friends, as detailed in their letters of support.

III. CONCLUSION
For all the reasons stated above, Respondent’s request for LPR Cancellation should be granted. Alternatively, asylum, withholding of removal, or relief under the CAT should be granted. Additionally, the Department’s late-filed submission at Exhibit 10 should not be admitted into evidence.

Dated: January 19, 2016

Respectfully Submitted,

Siobhan Waldron
Attorney for Respondent
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RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE TO DHS MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Undersigned Counsel, on behalf of the Respondent, Robert Bautista requests that this Honorable Court deny the Department of Homeland Security's (the "DHS") Motion to Reconsider the June 11, 2010 denial by this Honorable Court of DHS' Motion to Pretermit the Respondent's application for Cancellation of Removal and a 212(h) waiver. For the reasons set forth in this Response, Respondent respectfully requests that this Honorable Court deny DHS' Motion.

According to DHS' Motion, Respondent was convicted of Attempted Arson in the Third Degree, violating New York Penal Law §§ 110 and 150.10. As noted in DHS' Motion, New York Penal Law § 110 states, in part, that a "person is guilty of attempt to commit a crime, when, with the intent to commit a crime, he engages in conduct which tends to effect the commission of such crime." New York Penal Law § 150.10 states that an individual is guilty if
arson in the third degree “when he intentionally damages a building or motor vehicle by starting a fire or causing an explosion.”

Respondent concedes that a state crime can, at times, be deemed an aggravated felony for removal purposes. See 8 U.S.C. § 1101(43). For a state crime to be deemed an “aggravated felony,” the Court must “compare the elements of the statute under which the person was convicted to the definition of aggravated felony in 8 U.S.C. § 1101(43).” Taylor v. United States, 495 U.S. 575 (1990). In its June 15, 2010 Motion, DHS erroneously argues that the New York Penal Laws under which Respondent are aggravated felonies pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1101(43)(E)(i).

Title 8, Section 1101(43)(E) of the United States Code holds that any crime “described in section 842(h) or (i) of Title 18, or section 844(d), (e), (f), (g), (h), or (i) of that title (relating to explosive devices) . . . .” DHS improperly contends that the New York Penal Laws under which Respondent was charged are “described in” 18 U.S.C. §§ 844(f)(1) and 844(i). 18 U.S.C. § 844(f)(1) states that “[w]hoever maliciously damages or destroys, or attempts to damage or destroy, by means of fire or an explosive, any building, vehicle, or other personal or real property in whole or in part owned or possessed by, or leased to, the United States, or any department or agency thereof, or any institution or organization receiving Federal financial assistance, shall be imprisoned for not less than 5 years and not more than 20 years, fined under this title, or both.”

18 U.S.C. § 844(i) states, in part, that any person who “maliciously damages or destroys, or attempts to damage or destroy, by means of fire or an explosive, any building, vehicle, or other real or personal property used in interstate or foreign commerce or in any activity affecting interstate or foreign commerce shall be imprisoned for not less than 5 years and not more than 20 years, fined under this title, or both . . . .”
18 U.S.C. §§ 844(f)(1)

As noted above, a person is guilty under 18 U.S.C. § 844(f)(1) when that person "maliciously damages or destroys, or attempts to damage or destroy, by means of fire or an explosive, any building, vehicle, or other personal or real property in whole or in part owned or possessed by, or leased to, the United States, or any department or agency thereof, or any institution or organization receiving Federal financial assistance . . . ." DHS argues that the New York Penal Laws that Respondent was found guilty of should be considered an aggravated felony pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1101(43). DHS is wrong.

When compared with the New York Penal Laws Respondent was found guilty of, pursuant to Taylor, 495 U.S. 575, it is quite obvious that New York Penal Law §§ 110 and 150.10 are completely different in that 18 U.S.C. § 844(f)(1) requires that the property in question be "in whole or in part owned or possessed by, or leased to, the United States, or any department or agency thereof, or any institution or organization receiving Federal financial assistance . . . ." New York Penal Law §§ 110 and 150.10 do not require a proving of this essential element. Nonetheless, DHS is asking this Court to dismiss any reference to the requirement that the property in question be "in whole or in part owned or possessed by, or leased to, the United States, or any department or agency thereof, or any institution or organization receiving Federal financial assistance . . . ." 18 U.S.C. § 844(f)(1). DHS fails to cite any case law, legislative history, treatises or any type of precedential material that would permit this Honorable Court to completely dismiss an essential element of 18 U.S.C. § 844(f)(1)—that the property "in whole or in part owned or possessed by, or leased to, the United States, or any department or agency thereof, or any institution or organization receiving Federal financial assistance . . . ."
financial assistance . . .” DHS’ reason for not including any precedential materials is that such materials do not exists.


Government relation to the property in question is an essential element of 18 U.S.C. § 844(f)(1) and DHS’ flawed contention that the government relationship can be dropped because it is simply “jurisdictional” in nature disregards the intent of Congress and any and all
precedential materials that have applied the statute to properties that have some government relationship.

Simply put, 18 U.S.C. § 844(f)(1) plainly, unambiguously and clearly requires a finding that the property that was destroyed or damaged was “in whole or in part owned or possessed by, or leased to, the United States, or any department or agency thereof, or any institution or organization receiving Federal financial assistance . . . .” New York Penal Law §§ 110 and 150.10 do not require this essential element. Thus, when compared as required by Taylor, 495 U.S. 575, New York Penal Law §§ 110 and 150.10 and 18 U.S.C. § 844(f)(1) are distinct from each other: a comparison of the elements of the federal and New York statutes indicates that the federal statute has an additional element—a requirement that the property in question have some link or nexus with the United States Government, while the New York statutes do not include this element. Absent this element, there cannot be a finding that the New York statutes in question are aggravated felonies.

18 U.S.C. § 844(f)

As discussed earlier, 18 U.S.C. § 844(i) states, in part, that any person who “maliciously damages or destroys, or attempts to damage or destroy, by means of fire or an explosive, any building, vehicle, or other real or personal property used in interstate or foreign commerce or in any activity affecting interstate or foreign commerce shall be imprisoned for not less than 5 years and not more than 20 years, fined under this title, or both . . . .”

In its Motion, DHS, like it did with respect to 18 U.S.C. § 844(f)(1), argues that the latter half of the statute, requiring that the property in question be property that is “used in interstate or foreign commerce or in any activity affecting interstate or foreign commerce” be dropped—that
it simply be ignored, rather than compared, as a whole, with New York Penal Law §§ 110 and 150.10 as required by Taylor, 495 U.S. at 575.

As the DHS' own Motion correctly notes, there are no Third Circuit cases on point with the argument that the latter half of the statute be dropped. In fact, there are no cases that support DHS' argument regarding 18 U.S.C. § 844(i). Rather, DHS attempts to substantiate its argument by erroneously linking a separate and distinct statute cited in 8 U.S.C. § 1101(43) to 18 U.S.C. § 844(i).

Pursuant to Taylor, 495 U.S. at 575, the elements of the statutes have to be compared. In doing so, one will recognize that 18 U.S.C. § 844(i) the presence of a nexus between the property and interstate commerce. This nexus is an essential element of the statute, and should not be dismissed for the mere reason of ensuring that a certain state statute and 18 U.S.C. § 844(i) are comparable enough to make the state statute an aggravated felony.

In Jones v. United States, 529 U.S. 848 (2000), the Supreme Court analyzed 18 U.S.C. § 844(i) and held that an essential "element" of the statute, as enacted by Congress, "require[s] that the damaged or destroyed property must itself have been used in commerce or in an activity affecting commerce." The Court stated that this element is "key" to the statute and that by "its terms § 844(i) applies only to property that is used in an activity that affects commerce." (internal citations omitted). DHS' argument that the interstate commerce clause of the statute can be dismissed incorrect and is contrary to the Supreme Court's holding in Jones. The interstate commerce provision is necessary, otherwise, according to the Court, absent the provision, "hardly a building in the land would fall outside the statute's domain .... Practically every building in our cities, towns[] and rural areas" would be covered by the statute. Id. Citing United States v. Munholland, 607 F.2d 1311, 1316 (10th Cir. 1979), the Court held that when
enacting § 844(i), Congress gave no indication that the statute was to include everybody and everything. Further, the Court held, “words [that] describe an element of a criminal offense,” such as the interstate commerce provision in § 844(i), should not be treated as “surplusage,” as DHS argues, and should not be dropped, ignored or put aside for any purpose, including an attempt by DHS to create an aggravated felony out of a crime that, at a minimum, may be a crime of moral turpitude. Courts, such as this Court, should “hesitate to treat statutory terms in any setting [as surplusage], and resistance [to do so] should be heightened when the words, [such as the interstate commerce provision in § 844(i)], describe an element of a criminal offense.” (internal citations omitted).

Given that the interstate commerce provision in § 844(i) is an element of the criminal offense, it cannot be ignored when conducting a comparison between it and a state statute for purposes of determining whether or not the state statute is “described in” § 844(i). New York Penal Law §§ 110 and 150.10 does not contain an interstate commerce provision as an element like § 844(i). Given this lack of an essential element, New York Penal Law §§ 110 and 150.10 cannot be deemed an “aggravated felony” as defined by 8 U.S.C. § 1101(43)(E)(i).

Overlooking the Supreme Court’s holding in Jones that the interstate commerce provision is an essential element to § 844(i) that cannot be ignored or simply dropped, DHS cites to a 2002 BIA decision: In re Vasquez-Muniz, 23 I&N Dec. 209, (BIA 2002) in an effort to create an aggravated felony out of the New York crimes Respondent was convicted of, notwithstanding the fact that the very same crimes have ever only been considered to be, at a minimum crimes of moral turpitude, let alone aggravated felonies.

In Re Vasquez dealt with wholly different federal and state statutes that outlawed completely different types of conduct from the federal and state statute before this Court.
Notwithstanding this fact, DHS believes that there is no distinction between the question before this Court and the question before the BIA in In Re Vasquez. DHS is clearly incorrect in this assertion and asks that this Honorable Court take what the Supreme Court has deemed an "element" of 8 U.S.C. § 844(i)—the interstate commerce provision—out of the statute. Jones, 529 U.S. at 848. Put simply, DHS' is not following its own argument that only elements of offenses must be compared to determine if a state offense is to be considered an aggravated felony.

In Re Vasquez asked whether Section 12021(a)(1) of the California Penal Code was described in 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1), which, if found in the affirmative, would make Section 12021(a)(1) of the California Penal Code an aggravated felony pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(43).

Section 12021(a)(1) of the California Penal Code reads, in relevant part that "[a]ny person who has been convicted of a felony under the laws of the United States, of the State of California, or any other state, government, or country, or of any offense enumerated in subdivision (a), (b), or (d) of Section 12001.6 . . . who owns or has in his or her possession or under his or her custody or control any firearm is guilty of a felony.

18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) state that it is unlawful for any person "who has been convicted in any court of, a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year . . . to ship or transport in interstate or foreign commerce, or possess in or affecting commerce, any firearm or ammunition . . . ."

The BIA held that 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(43)(E) may encompass state crimes. No where does the BIA indicate that all state crimes are aggravated felonies, simply because they have some relationship with respect to the language of the offenses enumerated in Subsection (E). The BIA and all the Circuit Courts cited in DHS' Motion have never held that the BIA's In Re
Vasquez holding in anyway applies to 8 U.S.C. § 844(i). By its own admission, the BIA acknowledges this fact and, quite accurately, notes that not even the Third Circuit Court of Appeals has recognized the BIA’s In Re Vasquez ruling as correct, let alone applied it to other provisions in 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(43)(E). This Honorable Court is not bound by any precedent at all, for no precedent exists that requires that the BIA’s In Re Vasquez decision applies to 8 U.S.C. § 844(i).

There is a clear distinction between 8 U.S.C. § 844(i) and the statutes compared by the BIA. As the BIA stated, when “engaging in statutory interpretation, our first and most critical inquiry must be the plain meaning of the statute. In making this inquiry, it is important that we examine the language within the context and design of the statute as a whole.” Id. (citing K-Mart Corp. v. Cartier, Inc., 486 U.S. 281, 291 (1988)).

18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) states that it is unlawful for a person convicted in any court . . . to ship or transport in interstate or foreign commerce, or possess in or affecting commerce . . . .” As the BIA noted, Section 922(g)(1), by the very nature of the presence of a comma between “foreign commerce” and “or possess,” makes it unlawful under federal law to knowingly possess the firearm, regardless of whether or not it is used in interstate commerce. The comma, quite simply, creates a crime in and of itself in the mere possession of the firearm. Given this, the BIA’s In Re Vasquez holding is presumptively following the plain language of the statute and the intent of Congress that mere possession, regardless of interstate commerce questions, is unlawful if other elements are met (i.e., conviction of a certain crime). Thus, the BIA’s decision to “drop” or “ignore” any interstate commerce provision that exists in Section 922(g)(1) is, arguably, within the plain meaning of the statute as used in the decision itself—knowing possession without more is an offense contained in Section 922(g)(1). Given that the California
statute the BIA was comparing to Section 922(g)(1), made knowing possession by a convicted felon unlawful, it was not unreasonable for the BIA to find that the California statute was "described in" Section 922(g)(1). Thus, the interstate commerce clause, when dealing with the possession offense of 922(g)(1) is not necessarily an element for purposes of conviction under the felon-in-possession offense. The Circuit Court decision DHS cites in its Motion only address the felon-in-possession offense of Section 922(g)(1) and nothing more—a fact that only strengthens Respondent’s argument that the interstate commerce provision in Section 922(g)(1) is not necessarily an "element" of the felon-in-possession offense contained in the Section. Unlike Section 822(i), which makes the interstate commerce clause an element of the offense, the felon-in-possession offense contained in Section 922(g)(1), given it's statutory construction and when plainly read does not necessarily include an interstate commerce connection as an element in proving that offense. See Jones, 529 U.S. at 848. This is not to say, however, that the other offenses contained in Section 922(g)(1), let alone all offense contained in 8 U.S.C. § 1101(43), including Section 844(i), do not make an interstate commerce connection an essential element to the respective offenses.

An essential element of Section 844(i) is the interstate commerce element. Id. Given that New York Penal Law §§ 110 and 150.10 do not contain this element, Section 844(i) cannot be said to describe New York Penal Law §§ 110 and 150.10, or vice versa. No court in the nation has held that Section 844(i)’s interstate commerce requirement should be disregarded in any context, including when determining whether a state statute constitutes an aggravated felony for deportation purposes.
For the foregoing reasons, Respondent requests that DHS' Motion to Pretermitt be

Denied.
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MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT'S APPLICATION FOR CANCELLATION OF REMOVAL

I. MR. [REDACT] HAS BEEN A LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENT FOR MORE THAN FIVE YEARS.

For an alien to be eligible for cancellation of removal, he must have been “lawfully admitted for permanent residence” for five years. INA § 240A(a). Mr. [REDACT] was granted LPR status on June 14, 1987. Mr. [REDACT] entered the United States more than twenty years ago and therefore meets this requirement. See Tab A.

II. MR. [REDACT] HAS LAWFULLY RESIDED IN THE UNITED STATES CONTINUOUSLY FOR MORE THAN SEVEN YEARS.

For an alien to be eligible for relief pursuant to INA § 240A(a), he must have maintained continuous residence in the United States, in any status, for seven years. Mr. [REDACT] meets this requirement because he was admitted to the United States as a lawful permanent resident on June 14, 1987, and he has only left the country two times since, for a period of about one month each visit.

III. MR. [REDACT] HAS NOT BEEN CONVICTED OF AN AGGRAVATED FELONY.

Mr. [REDACT] has not been convicted of an aggravated felony.
IV. MANY POSITIVE CONSIDERATIONS OUTWEIGH MR. JEUDI'S PRIOR CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS.

The positive factors the court may consider when determining whether to grant an application for cancellation of removal include: (1) the respondent’s family ties within the United States; (2) the length of the respondent’s residency in the United States; (3) evidence of hardship to the respondent and family if deportation occurs; (4) the respondent’s employment history; (5) evidence attesting to the respondent’s good character. See Matter of Marin, 16 I&N Dec. 581 (BIA 1978); Matter of Watud, 19 I&N Dec. 182 (BIA 1984); Matter of C-V-T-, 22 I&N Dec. 7 (BIA 1998). The Immigration Judge should also consider the likelihood of persecution in determining hardship. See Bastanipour v. INS, 980 F.2d 1129 (7th Cir. 1992). Applying these factors in Mr. Jeudi's case, the Court should grant him cancellation of removal.


Mr. Jeudi has resided lawfully in the United States since June 14, 1987, or for more than 23 years. This fact in itself weighs strongly in favor of granting his application for relief. See Marin, 16 I&N Dec. 581.

b. Mr. Jeudi Has Strong Family and Community Ties in the United States.

In the twenty-plus years he has resided lawfully in the United States, Mr. Jeudi has formed family and community ties that counsel towards granting his cancellation of removal application. All of Mr. Jeudi’s family is located in the United States. More specifically, his siblings and mother reside in Philadelphia. He has no immediate family members left in Haiti.

c. Mr. Jeudi Would Suffer Extreme Hardship if he were to Relocate to Haiti.

Mr. Jeudi would suffer extreme hardship because of his medical conditions. He is HIV positive, has anemia, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and chronic kidney disease. See Tab U; Tab C at 52. In addition, there is a high suspicion that Mr. Jeudi has prostate cancer. See Tab U.

i. Mr. Jeudi would not have adequate medical care.

Mr. Jeudi would not have adequate medical care in Haiti because medical facilities are extremely limited. See Tab D; Tab E. Not only will Mr. Jeudi face challenges in obtaining traditional healthcare, treatment for his HIV will be even more difficult to obtain. Id. After the 2010 earthquake, most people who were on life prolonging anti-retroviral drugs before the quake were traced and put back on treatment, but the country's HIV programs remain unstable. See Tab F. Before the disaster struck, about 26,000 people in Haiti were receiving anti-retroviral drugs for HIV and AIDS.
According to a 2010 UNAIDS report, however, the country’s Ministry of Health estimated that fewer than 40 percent had access to treatment following the earthquake. See Tab G. “Despite progress, Haiti continues to face repeated challenges. Health services are stretched and the cholera epidemic has further hindered the country’s ability to deliver HIV services.” See Tab H.

Not only will Mr. _____ face challenges to treat his HIV, he faces the possibility of contracting cholera. As of June 2011, the Ministry of Health in Haiti (MSPP) reported 363,117 cases of cholera and 5,506 deaths. The World Health Organization continues to identify localized spikes of outbreaks. See Tab I; Tab J.

ii. Mr. _____ would be detained upon deportation and subject to torture.

If Mr. _____ were to return to Haiti, it is likely that he would be imprisoned for being a criminal deportee. See Tab K. Since the 2010 earthquake in Haiti, prison conditions have become inhuman, and many suffer from chronic and severe overcrowding. See Tab L; Tab M; Tab R. These criminal deportees are detained with NO food, NO drinking water, and NO medical or mental health care (even when the Haitian government is aware of the severity of the person’s medical or mental health condition via observation or the medical file transferred to the Haitian police by the US government at the time of deportation.) They are not afforded any due process or attorney representation. Criminal Deportees with no family or source of food are NOT provided any nourishment while in detention See Tab K.

Furthermore, not only will Mr. _____ face horrific prison conditions in Haiti, he risks contracting cholera, malaria, and/or tuberculosis while in prison. See Tab R. Although the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) continues to participate in the prevention and fight against cholera, to date, 405 inmates contracted cholera and 58 deaths were reported. See Tab N; Tab O. Among one of those deaths was a criminal deportee from the United States. See Tab P. Moreover, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention concurs in general terms that unclean food and water, unsanitary conditions and rampant tuberculosis found in developing countries are dangerous to HIV-positive individuals. The CDC publishes a guide, Preventing Infections During Travel: A Guide for People with HIV Infection, which warns, “Travel, especially to developing countries, can increase your risk of getting opportunistic infections . . . . Food and water in developing countries may not be as clean as they are at home. These items might contain bacteria, viruses, or parasites that could make you sick . . . . Tuberculosis, or ‘TB,’ is very common worldwide, and can be severe in people with HIV.” See Tab Q. Given the prison conditions in Haiti, Mr. _____ status as HIV positive, and information available on the spread of opportunistic infections, Mr. _____ would, “more likely than not,” contract an infection which would lead to severe pain and suffering far beyond that likely to be suffered by healthy criminal deportees in Haitian prisons.

Not only are the prison conditions inhumane, the treatment of the prison guards are as well. In J-E-, the Board noted a 2001 Country Report on Human Rights Practices from the U.S. Department of State which reads, in part:
“Police mistreatment of suspects at the time of arrest and during detention remains common in all parts of the country. Beating with fists, sticks, and belts is the most common form of abuse. However, in previous years, international organizations have documented other forms of mistreatment, such as burning with cigarettes, choking, hooding, and "kalot marassa" (severe boxing of the ears, which can result in eardrum damage). Persons who reported such abuse often had visible injuries consistent with the alleged maltreatment. There were also isolated allegations of torture by electric shock. Mistreatment also takes the form of withholding medical treatment from injured jail inmates. Police almost never are prosecuted for the abuse of detainees.”

23 I&N Dec. 291, 301-02 (BIA 2002).

Furthermore, the 2010 Country Report on Human Rights Practice from the U.S. Department of State states that “prisoners reported physical abuse by correctional officers; prisons also suffered from corruption and neglect. Due to insufficient staffing, equipment, and security officers avoided some cellblocks. At times officials used lethal force against prisoners to quell inmate uprisings.” See Tab R. This clearly shows that conditions in Haitian prisons are not getting better.

While prison conditions in Haiti are inhuman for everyone, they are especially bad for HIV-positive individuals and will more likely than not precipitate a painful death for Mr. [REDACTED]. Because Mr. [REDACTED] is HIV-positive, the combination of intentional guard abuse, starvation, overcrowding, indefinite detention, lack of medical care, unsanitary living conditions, including confinement with those who have communicable diseases, and lack of clean water, would surely subject Mr. [REDACTED] to a greater risk of mistreatment or torture in a Haitian prison.

e. The Foregoing Positive Considerations Strongly Outweigh Mr. [REDACTED] Criminal Convictions.

Balancing any adverse factors against the social and humane considerations present in this case, the Court should, in its discretion, grant Mr. [REDACTED] the opportunity to continue to live in the United States.

In considering Mr. [REDACTED] criminal history, the Court should take into consideration its nature and severity. While any transgression of the law is a serious matter, Mr. [REDACTED] has been convicted only of a nonviolent offense, which does not indicate an intention on his part to cause serious harm to any person or entity. Moreover, Mr. [REDACTED] has complied with court ordered penalties and terms of probation. Mr. [REDACTED] is committed to reforming his behavior. On July 12, 2010, Mr. [REDACTED] entered into the Ralph Moses House to maintain a better life style. While residing in this house, Mr. [REDACTED] complied with programs such as Healthy Relations, Alternative Solutions-Out of Poverty life skills and budgeting curriculum, and three phases of the Philadelphia Treatment Court Program. See Tab S. Moreover, Mr. [REDACTED] demonstrated proficiency in activities of daily living such as cooking, cleaning, compliance to his medication regime and
embracing recovery as a lifelong event. Id. Along with the Ralph Moses House, the AIDS Care Group (ACG) in Chester, PA has been working close to support Mr. in his medical as well as his social needs. See Tab T. Regina Ubaldi-Rosen, the clinical director of AIDS Care group, saw Mr. regularly from April 30, 2010 until March 3, 2011 and considered him a model client of ACG while under her care. See Tab U.

Furthermore, the Court should note, that Mr. has been paying taxes and contributing to the United States’ economy. See Tab B.

V. CONCLUSION

Weighing heavily towards favorable exercise of discretion is the hardship Mr. removal from the United States would cause to him and his family. This hardship strongly outweighs any adverse factors the Court may find. For the foregoing reasons, Counsel respectfully requests that the Court grant Mr. cancellation of removal.

Respectfully submitted, this 11th day of August 2011,
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MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT'S APPLICATION FOR CANCELLATION OF REMOVAL

I. MS. [REDACTED] HAS BEEN A LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENT FOR MORE THAN FIVE YEARS.

For an alien to be eligible for cancellation of removal, she must have been “lawfully admitted for permanent residence” for five years. INA § 240A(a). Ms. [REDACTED] has been a lawful permanent resident since January 9, 1984.

II. MS. [REDACTED] HAS LAWFULLY RESIDED IN THE UNITED STATES CONTINUOUSLY FOR MORE THAN SEVEN YEARS.

For an alien to be eligible for relief pursuant to INA § 240A(a), she must have maintained continuous residence in the United States, in any status, for seven years. Ms. [REDACTED] was admitted to the United States as a refugee on November 22, 1982, and she has not resided outside the United States since then. See Exhibits A, B, C and J.
III. MS. has not been convicted of an aggravated felony.

Ms. has not been convicted of an aggravated felony.

A. POSITIVE CONSIDERATIONS OUTWEIGH MS. ’S PRIOR CONVICTIONS

The positive factors a court may consider in its exercise of discretion in a cancellation case include, but are not limited to: family ties in the United States; residence of long duration in the country; evidence of hardship to the non-citizen and her family in the case of a removal; employment history; and other evidence attesting to the applicant’s good moral character. See Matter of C-V-T-, 22 I&N Dec. at 11 (BIA 1998); Matter of Edwards, 20 I&N Dec. at 196 (BIA 1990); Matter of Marin, 16 I&N Dec. at 584-585 (BIA 1978).

a. Ms. Has Resided in the United States for More Than Thirty Years

Ms. establishes long residency in the United States. This fact in itself weighs strongly in favor of a grant of cancellation of removal. See Marin, 16 I&N Dec. 581. Ms. was quite young—seven years old—when she moved to the United States with her father. While Ms. and her father lived in Germany before coming to the United States as refugees, she has not resided in Poland or Germany since that time, and no longer has any family connections there. Her life and her family are all in the United States and have been for over thirty years.

b. Respondent Ms. has Strong Family and Community Ties in the United States

In her thirty-one years in this country, Ms. has formed family and community ties that argue for cancellation of removal. Ms. has two United States Citizen sons. See Exhibits A and B. She is the provider and caregiver for her youngest son. See Exhibits A and C (while has an apartment with his fiancée, Ms. helps support them financially and emotionally). In addition, Ms. has a brother, who
also lives in the United States, and she has a network of friends in the community who she has helped over the years. *See Exhibits C-I.*

Ms. [REDACTED] also owns her own business and has been working as an independent researcher since 2011. Furthermore, she works closely with local animal shelters and is actively involved in rescuing, fostering, and adopting animals, specifically animals that suffer from medical conditions. *See Exhibits A and I.*

c. **Removal to Poland Would Cause Ms. [REDACTED]’s U.S. Citizen Son and Sibling Extreme Hardship**

Ms. [REDACTED] is responsible for the care of her family and provides immeasurable value to them. As noted before, Ms. [REDACTED] provides not only economical support for her son [REDACTED], but also physical and emotional support. If Ms. [REDACTED] were deported to Poland, her son would not relocate with her because his life and ties are in the United States. In addition, he may not be able to get status in Poland because he is a United States’ citizen. Therefore, Ms. [REDACTED] would be permanently separated from her son, and her son would no longer have the support he receives from her.

Deportation would not only cause her family to be torn apart, but have significant immigration consequences for her brother. In addition to suffering emotionally, Mr. [REDACTED]’s status in the United States would be in jeopardy because he is in the process of obtaining lawful status through Ms. [REDACTED]. If Ms. [REDACTED] were deported, he would no longer be eligible to remain in the United States.

d. **Respondent Ms. [REDACTED] Would Suffer Extreme Hardship if She Were to Relocate to Poland.**

Ms. [REDACTED] left Poland at a very young age, along with the rest of her family, and they no longer have ties in Poland. Ms. [REDACTED] suffers from anxiety, depression, and severe migraines,
which all require medication. See Exhibits K-T. Given that she has not been to Poland since leaving as a young child and no longer speaks the language, gaining access to medication and finding a job will be extremely difficult.

   Furthermore, Ms. [redacted] is currently in remission from cancer. Right now, her body is strong enough to fight the cancer, but the stress induced from deportation and the permanent separation from her family and friends may change this.

e. The Positive Considerations Strongly Outweigh Respondent Ms. [redacted]’s Criminal Convictions

   Balancing adverse factors against the humanitarian interests in this case, the Court should grant Ms. [redacted] the opportunity to stay in the United States with her family and friends. Ms. [redacted] understands the nature of her crimes and has expressed remorse for her actions. See Exhibit A.

   In considering Ms. [redacted]’s criminal history, the Court should take into account its nature and severity. Any transgression of the law is a serious matter. Ms. [redacted]’s crimes, however, have been of a non-violent nature. Ms. [redacted] admits guilt and is complying with the criminal sanctions placed upon her. See Exhibit A and N-T (there is some evidence that the prescription drugs she was on at the time may have contributed to her actions). Ms. [redacted] is dedicated to reforming her life and has the support of her family to do so. See Exhibits A.

   Ms. [redacted] works to support herself and her son and contributes to society. See Exhibit J. Because of her compassion for animals, she also dedicates a large portion of her time and money to assist animals, specifically with medical issues. Her compassion has helped rescue several animals that would have otherwise been left without a home or family. See Exhibit I.

   Weighing heavily toward a favorable exercise of discretion is the obvious hardship Ms. [redacted]’s removal would cause to her, her U.S. citizen son, and her brother. This hardship and the unity of their family, outweigh any adverse factors the Court may find.
V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, undersigned counsel respectfully requests that the Court grant Respondent cancellation of removal.

Respectfully submitted,

______________________________________ _______________________
Rosina Stambaugh, Esq.          Date
The Law Office of Christopher A. Ferro, LLC
160 E. Market St.
York, PA 17401
717-668-8159
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MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT'S APPLICATION FOR CANCELLATION OF REMOVAL

I. MR. [REDACTED] HAS BEEN A LEGAL PERMANENT RESIDENT FOR MORE THAN FIVE YEARS

For a non-citizen to be eligible for cancellation of removal, he must have been “lawfully admitted for permanent residence” for at least five years. INA § 240A(a). Mr. [REDACTED] meets this requirement, having adjusted his status to that of Lawful Permanent Resident on January 12, 2000 (See Notice to Appear, Tab H). Respondent therefore meets the requirement of five years legal permanent residency.

II. MR. [REDACTED] HAS LAWFULLY RESIDED IN THE UNITED STATES CONTINUOUSLY FOR MORE THAN SEVEN YEARS

For an alien to be eligible for relief pursuant to INA §240(A)(a), he must have maintained continuous residence in the United States, in any lawful status, for seven years. Mr. [REDACTED] entered the United States on February 25, 1998 (See NTA, Tab H). He became a lawful permanent resident on January 12, 2000 (See Id.).
III. MR. [REDACTED] HAS NOT BEEN CONVICTED OF AN AGGRAVATED FELONY

Conviction of an aggravated felony would render a lawful permanent resident ineligible for cancellation of removal relief pursuant to INA § 240(A)(a). The Department of Homeland Security has not alleged that Mr. [REDACTED] has ever committed or been convicted of an aggravated felony.

IV. MR. [REDACTED] MERITS A FAVORABLE EXERCISE OF DISCRETION FOR HIS APPLICATION OF CANCELLATION OF REMOVAL

In addition to satisfying the three statutory eligibility requirements under INA §240(A)(a), it must be shown that a lawful permanent resident warrants relief as a matter of discretion. The court must balance the adverse factors evidencing the individual’s undesirability as a permanent resident with the social and humane considerations presented in his or her behalf to determine whether the granting of relief appears in the best interest of the United States. Matter of Marin, 16 I&N Dec. 581 (BIA 1978). The positive factors a court may consider in its exercise of discretion in a cancellation case include: family ties within the U.S.; residency of long duration in the U.S.; evidence of hardship to the respondent and family if deportation occurs; service in the Armed Forces; history of employment; existence of property or business ties; existence of value and service to the community; proof of genuine rehabilitation if a criminal record exists; evidence attesting to a respondent’s good character. See Matter of C-V-T, 22 I&N Dec. at 11 (BIA) 1998; Matter of Edwards, 20 I&N Dec. at 196 (BIA 1990); Matter of Marin, 16 I&N Dec. at 584-585 (BIA 1978).
A. Mr. [REDACTED] has been a lawful permanent resident of the United States for over 15 years, and has resided in the United States continuously since 1998.

Mr. [REDACTED] establishes long residency in the United States, having first entered the United States in 1992 to attend college at the young age of 17, and returning to continue his studies and reside permanently in 1998. This fact weighs strongly in favor of a grant of cancellation of removal. Although his mother remains in Namibia, Mr. [REDACTED] now has a son and a family of his own here in the United States.

B. Mr. [REDACTED] has strong family ties in the U.S. to his son [REDACTED], who is a U.S. citizen.

In his 15 years in the United States, Mr. [REDACTED] has formed strong family ties that argue for cancellation of removal. He has a 9 year old son, [REDACTED], who is autistic. [REDACTED] is a child who is curious, friendly, and is of a happy disposition (see Tab B at 46). He attends [REDACTED] Elementary School, where he is in an Autistic Support Classroom, and is receiving speech and occupational therapy services (see Evaluation, Tab B at 36). [REDACTED] lives with his mother [REDACTED], who is Respondent Mr. [REDACTED]’s former girlfriend of five years (See Tab B at 46). Mr. [REDACTED] and Ms. [REDACTED] share custody in an unofficial arrangement (see EOIR-42A, Tab I at 102). Mr. [REDACTED] supports [REDACTED]’s growth and development through frequent contact with him (see Psychological re-evaluation, Tab B at 46), and provides financial support (see letter from [REDACTED], Tab B at 28).
C. Mr. [REDACTED]'s family would suffer great hardship if he were removed to Namibia.

If Mr. [REDACTED] were to be forced to return to Namibia, his son [REDACTED] would suffer great hardship. According to [REDACTED], [REDACTED] has made great strides through rigorous therapy, and the absence of his father would be a negative impact on his growth and development (See Tab B at 30). [REDACTED]'s psychological re-evaluation taken last year states that the provision of family activities, love, patience, and continued involvement and compliance in treatment are family strengths that “promote resiliency and can be used to develop a strength based treatment plan.” (See Tab B at 46). Mr. [REDACTED] has been able to maintain a good relationship with Ms. [REDACTED] and remain involved in [REDACTED]'s life despite not living in the same home. He visits with [REDACTED] and takes him out and they foot race and exercise together, something that [REDACTED] loves very much (See Letter from [REDACTED], Tab B at 28). He loves his son deeply and his absence would be a detriment to the stability that Mr. [REDACTED] and Ms. [REDACTED] have worked so hard to maintain, as well as to the progress that [REDACTED] has made in his treatment.

In addition to his relationships with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], Mr. [REDACTED] has a fiancé, Ms. [REDACTED], who he has been with for three years. They have lived together for the past two years at a home a short distance away from where [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are residing. Mr. [REDACTED] pays the rent, and assists in the payment of groceries and bills (See Letter from [REDACTED], Tab B at 26; See also Letter from [REDACTED], Tab E at 69). While
Mr. [redacted] has been detained, Ms. [redacted] has had difficulty in paying the bills. Ms. [redacted]'s relationship with Mr. [redacted] is a loving one, a change from at least two bad relationships that she has had in the past. According to Ms. [redacted], if Mr. [redacted] were to be deported, her life “would be turned upside down”. Moving to Namibia would mean leaving the children and grandchildren that she is close to behind. Remaining in the United States would mean a life without her fiancé (See Tab B at 28).

D. Mr. [redacted] has a long and positive history of employment in the United States.

Mr. [redacted] has had a steady and positive history of employment in the United States spanning at least ten years. Most recently, he has been employed at [redacted], as a skilled laborer and backup supervisor since May 22, 2006 (See Letter from [redacted], Tab C at 58). Mr. [redacted] has a Retirement Savings and Pension Plan, as well as an Employee Stock Ownership Plan with [redacted] (Tab C at 60). According to [redacted], VP of the [redacted] Division at [redacted], Respondent Mr. [redacted] “has since then become a valued and trusted member of our company. [redacted] has always showed up for work and has a very positive attitude while here at work” (See Tab C at 58). He has also “always been respectful and highly thought of as a model employee” (Id.). Mr. [redacted]'s good reputation and work ethic is evidenced by the fact that [redacted], the Plant Superintendent, held his position open until May 31, 2015, and offered to make a position available to him if released after that date (See Letter from [redacted], Tab C at 59). Prior to working at [redacted]
Mr. also worked in Mechanical Assembly at , and as a counselor at the  (See EOIR-42A, Tab I at 101).

E. Mr. has successfully completed his Intensive Outpatient and Outpatient Treatment goals, and will continue to participate in rehabilitation programs and classes if he remains in the United States.

Mr. has been dedicated to his rehabilitation and completing his treatment programs. He admits that he has been wrong in the past, and is fully committed to continued treatment. Mr. was successfully discharged from the Roxbury Treatment Center on March 3, 2014 for having completed his Intensive Outpatient and Outpatient Treatment goals (See Letter of Discharge, Tab D at 67). He was also attending Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous meetings (See Tab B, at 69). He was scheduled to attend DUI classes through his probation office starting in June, but was unable to due to his detention. However, Ms. has contacted the Dauphin County Probation Office on his behalf in order to ensure that he will be able to take the class if he is released from detention (See Letter of Enrollment in DUI Classes, Tab D at 68).

F. Mr. is of good character

Mr. is regarded by many of those who know him as a good person and a positive presence in their lives. , his neighbor and landlord of 10 years, states that Mr. “has been a very good tenant”, and that he is a hard worker (tab E at 70-71). Friend of 3 years adds that Mr. “is a very respectful and very intelligent person… he is also a
man that helps provide for a family with children that are not biologically his as well as his own. He is a man that will give you the shirt off his back.” (Tab E at 72).  is ’s son and has worked with Mr., and attests to his work ethic, stating that he never missed a day or was ever late. and Mr. “would work on cars together [and] play with stereo equipment and televisions. There was never a time I needed him that wasn’t there.” (Tab E at 73). Neighbors and praised Mr. as being both respectable and respectful (Tab E at 74-75).

In addition to his positive demeanor, is also known for being handy and assisting others in getting things fixed without hesitation. According to fiancée, researched problems with their van and spent hours fixing it in order to be able to use it for household needs, and in order to travel to work or to meetings (See Tab B, at 26). He also worked on the furnace in the winter, going online to find the best deal, and “he then helped the landlord to order the furnace and also assisted with putting the furnace in” (Tab B at 27).

G. The positive considerations strongly outweigh Respondent Mr.’s Criminal Convictions.

Balancing adverse and positive factors in this case, the court should grant the opportunity to stay in the United States with his family. understands the nature of his crimes and has expressed remorse for his actions, particularly for the separation from his family that his most recent convictions have caused. He has successfully completed treatment and has
expressed interest in receiving continued treatment and support through classes and meetings. He has taken advantage of programs offered to him and will continue to do so if allowed to remain in the United States.

In considering Mr. [redacted]’s criminal history, the court should take into account its nature and severity. Any transgression of the law is a serious matter. Mr. [redacted]’s crimes, however, have primarily been of a non-violent nature. Mr. [redacted] has admitted guilt and has since worked on reforming his life, something that he intends to continue with the support of his family and friends.

Weighing heavily toward a favorable exercise of discretion is the hardship that Mr. [redacted]’s absence will cause to his family here in the United States, particularly to his son [redacted]. Despite his past transgressions, Mr. [redacted] has always worked to remain a positive influence in [redacted]’s life, and would like to remain in the United States and work on his recovery primarily to remain close to his son and aid in his treatment. His absence would not only sever the bond that they share, but it would be especially detrimental to [redacted]’s course of treatment and developmental progress. This hardship outweighs any adverse factors the court may find.

V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, undersigned counsel respectfully requests that the court grant Respondent [redacted] cancellation of removal.
Respectfully submitted,
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Tamara Shehadeh-Cope  
Pro Bono Counsel  
Pennsylvania Immigration Resource Center  
115 Needlewood Dr  
Harrisburg, PA 17112  
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UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW  
UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION COURT  
YORK, PENNSYLVANIA  

IN THE MATTER OF:  

FILE NO.: A-12345678  

IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS  

RESPONDENT’S MOTION TO PERMIT HEARING ON FORM EOIR-42A, APPLICATION FOR CANCELLATION  

Respondent, [Redacted], (“Respondent”), by and through his Counsel, Raymond G. Lahoud, Esquire, of Baurkot & Baurkot, respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter an Order, which permits Respondent to proceed with a hearing on a Form EOIR-42A, Application for Cancellation of Removal, asking that this Court find that Respondent has not been convicted of an aggravated felony and, therefore, is prima facie eligible for said relief. See INA § 240A(a). Alternatively, Respondent requests an evidentiary hearing on this issue alone.  

I. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY  

Respondent is a native and citizen of the Dominican Republic. See Notice to Appear (the “NTA”). He entered the United States on December 21, 1984, as a Lawful Permanent Resident, classified as P-22, an unmarried son or daughter of lawful permanent resident alien (2nd
preference). See NTA.\(^1\) He has remained in the United States continuously since 1984.

On or about March 21, 2012, Respondent was arrested in Berks County, Pennsylvania. He was charged with violating Section 780-113(a)(31)(i), Title 35 of the Pennsylvania Code (the “PA Code”), Simple Possession of a Small Amount of Marijuana (the “Marijuana Charge”). See NTA, Allegation No.: 4; see also Ex. C at 39. Respondent entered a plea of guilty to the Marijuana Charge and was sentenced to a fine and penalties. See Commonwealth v. , CP- (Berks Cty., Penn 2012).

In or about May of 2012, Respondent took a brief trip to the Dominican Republic, returning to the United States on May 20, 2012 at New York City, New York. See Form I-213, Record of Inadmissible Alien (the “213”). When presenting his Form I-551, Lawful Permanent Resident Card, the Department of Homeland Security (the “Department” or “DHS”) found him inadmissible, given the 2010 Marijuana Charge. Respondent was paroled into the United States. Id. The Department issued and served the NTA on August 10, 2012, charging inadmissibility under Section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the “Act” or the “INA”), as an “alien convicted of, or who admits having committed, or who admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of . . . a violation of (or a conspiracy or attempt to violate) any law or regulation of a State, the United States, or a foreign country relating to a controlled substance (as defined in section 802 of title 21).” See id.; INA § 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(II). The NTA was docketed at the Immigration Court in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

\(^1\) Since arriving in the United States, Respondent, born on November 2, 1971, has married and the couple have three United States Citizen children. See Respondent’s Ex. C, p. 41, Presentence Report). The family resides in Reading, Pennsylvania. Id.
On November 30, 2012, Respondent was arrested and charged in the District Court for the Southern District of New York for violating Sections 1343 and 1349, Title 18 of the United States Code ("USC"), Wire Fraud (the "WF Charge") and Conspiracy to Commit Wire Fraud (the "Conspiracy Charge"), respectively. See 213; see also Respondent’s Exhibit A, p. 2 (Indictment, United States v. [REDACTED], No. [REDACTED] (SDNY)). In the two-count indictment, it was alleged as to the Conspiracy Charge that Respondent conspired with others in devising a scheme and intending to devise a "scheme and artifice to defraud" for "obtaining money by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and premises . . . ." Id. at 2-3. The over act alleged was that

[0]n or about October 28, 2012, [Respondent], who was located in or about Reading, Pennsylvania, participated in a telephone call with Witness-1, who was located in or about Queens, New York, during which he made false statements in an effort to collect funds.

Id. at 3. The WF Charge alleged that Respondent "made interstate telephone calls during which he made false statements in order to further a scheme to obtain funds." Id. at 3-4.

In light of these charges, Respondent’s proceedings before the Philadelphia Immigration Court were administratively closed on July 11, 2013. See 213. On January 17, 2014, Respondent entered pleaded guilty to both counts of the Indictment. See Respondent’s Ex. B, at pp. 8-27 (Transcripts of Plea Proceedings). On July 9, 2014, Respondent was sentenced to a term of thirty-six (36) months, concurrent on both counts, not followed by any term of supervised release. See Ex. D, pp. 102-103. No fine was imposed, beyond a $200 special assessment and, further, no restitution was found due or ever ordered. Id.

The instant proceedings were reopened before this Court. On February 24, 2015, the Department filed a Form I-261, Additional Charges of Inadmissibility/Deportability. The Department alleged a violation of Section 237(a)(2)(A)(iii) of the Act as an alien who has been
convicted of an aggravated felony any time after admission. Specifically, the Department charged that Respondent’s federal WF and Conspiracy Charges fell within Sections 101(a)(43)(M)(i) and (U) of the Act. See Form I-261, dated Feb. 24, 2015. Provided that Respondent was paroled into the United States, deportability charges were inapplicable; subsequently, the Department withdrew the Section 237(a) deportability charges. In March of 2015, the Department filed a second Form I-261, alleging inadmissibility pursuant to Section 212(a)(2)(i)(I) of the Act, as an alien who has been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, as a result of the WF and Conspiracy Charges.

Respondent appeared before this Court on several occasions, absent counsel. The Court, graciously, granted Respondent several adjournments to secure immigration counsel; unfortunately, he was unable to do such.² At Respondent’s third master calendar hearing before this Court, Respondent was asked if he pled guilty to the Marijuana Charge and, further, if he was convicted of the WF and Conspiracy Charges. Respondent admitted to these convictions. Moreover, Respondent admitted that he was a citizen and native of the Dominican Republic, he was not a citizen or national of the United States and that he entered the United States on December 21, 1984, as a Lawful Permanent Resident, classified as P-22, an unmarried son or daughter of lawful permanent resident alien. This Court then sustained the Section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) and Section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(II) of the Act inadmissibility charges.

Respondent seeks two forms of relief: (1) Cancellation of Removal for Certain Lawful Permanent Residents (“COR Relief”); and (2) protection under the doctrines of Asylum, Withholding of Removal and Convention against Torture. See INA §§ 208(a), 240A(a), 241(b)(3);
see also UN Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, art. 3, S. Treaty Doe. No. 100-20, 1465 U.N.T.S. 113 (1988).

According to this Court’s audio record of proceedings, at Respondent’s last Master Calendar Hearing, this Court conducted a very preliminary review of Respondent’s eligibility for COR Relief, noting that Respondent may be unable to prove that he has not been convicted of an aggravated felony. The Court was specifically concerned about Respondent ability to prove that he was not convicted of a conspiracy to commit a Section 101(a)(43)(M)(i)—a fraud or deceit crime in which the actual or potential loss to the victim or victims exceeds $10,000—aggravated felony. See INA §§ 101(a)(43)(M)(i) and (U).

The Court’s audio record of proceedings indicates that the Court made a rather preliminary determination that Respondent could not prove he was not convicted of an aggravated felony and, summarily set aside Respondent’s request for COR Relief. Respondent submits that he could indeed prove that he was not convicted of an aggravated felony and, therefore, is prima facie eligible for COR Relief. Respondent now moves this Court seeking an Order permitting him to proceed with COR Relief.

II. ARGUMENT

a. Respondent is Prima Facie Eligible for Cancellation of Removal for Certain Permanent Residents.

Respondent is clearly prima facie eligible for Cancellation of Removal for Certain Permanent Residents. INA § 240A(a). The Act provides that

[t]he Attorney General may cancel removal in the case of an alien who is inadmissible or deportable from the United States if the alien—
1. has been an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence for not less than 5 years;
2. has resided in the United States continuously for 7 years after having been admitted in any status;
   and
3. has not been convicted of any aggravated felony.

Id. Respondent concedes that the burden to establish COR Relief eligibility rests with him. INA § 240(c)(4). Further, for purposes of this Motion, the inquiry is whether Respondent meets the third, no aggravated felony conviction, element. Id.

(i) Respondent Has Not Been Convicted of an Aggravated Felony.

Respondent has not been convicted of an aggravated felony and the Court must permit him to proceed with COR Relief. As noted, the Court’s aggravated felony concern is in Respondent’s Conspiracy Charge and whether the Conspiracy Charge qualifies as a conspiracy to commit a Section 101(a)(43)(M)(i)—fraud and deceit conviction where the loss to the victim or victims is in

---

3 As the NTA indicates, Respondent entered the United States as a Lawful Permanent Resident on December 21, 1984, remaining continuously in lawful permanent resident status since December 21, 1984—a period in excess of two (2) decades. The first and second COR elements, therefore, are sufficiently established for purposes of this Motion. See INA §§ 240A(a), (d) (stating that for COR Relief purposes, “any period of continuous residence or continuous physical presence in the United States shall be deemed to end when the alien is served a notice to appear under [INA] section 239(a) or when the alien has committed an offense referred to in [INA] section 212(a)(2) that renders the alien inadmissible to the United States under [INA] section 212(a)(2) or removable from the United States under [INA] section[s] 237(a)(2) or 237(a)(4), whichever is earliest;” see also Matter of Mendoza-Sandino, 22 I & N Dec. 3426 (BIA 2000) (the Act “clearly states that the continuous physical presence or continuous residence ends upon the occurrence of one of the specified events, whichever is earliest. The title of [the] section . . . further indicates that Congress intended the accrual of qualifying time to terminate, or permanently stop, upon the first occurrence of either of the referenced actions.”).
excess of $10,000—aggravated felony. See INA § 101(a)(43)(M)(i) and (U).

The term “aggravated felony” is defined at length in section 101(a)(43) of the Act and states as follows, in pertinent part:

The term “aggravated felony” means—

(M) an offense that—

(i) involves fraud or deceit in which the loss to the victim or victims exceeds $10,000; [and]

(U) a . . . conspiracy to commit an offense described in this paragraph.

INA §§ 101(a)(43)(M)(i), (U). To fall within this definition of an aggravated felony, a “three-fold” burden exists: (1) the conviction must consist of engaging in a conspiracy; (2) at least one of the unlawful acts that was the object of the conspiracy was an offense involving “fraud or deceit” within the meaning of Section 101(a)(43)(M)(i) of the Act; and (3) the “fraud or deceit offense’ that was the object of the conspiracy resulted in or contemplated a loss to his victims of more than $10,000.” In re S-I-K, 24 I&N Dec. 324, 326 (BIA 2007). Respondent concedes that the Conspiracy Charge for which he was convicted does indeed qualify as engaging in a conspiracy. Moreover, Respondent concedes that the Conspiracy Charge involves “deceit” within the meaning of Section 101(a)(43)(M)(i) of the Act. Id. Thus, the sole question remaining to be decided is whether the circumstances herein is one “in which the loss to the victim or victims exceeds $10,000.” Nijhawan v. Holder, 557 U.S. 29 (2009) (quoting INA § 101(a)(43)(M)(i)) (emphasis in original).

In deciding this third “fold,” the Supreme Court held that the underlined provision—in which the loss to the victim or victims exceeds $10,000—is “consistent with a circumstance-specific approach” as “[t]he words ‘in which’ (which modify ‘offense’) . . . refer[s] to the conduct
involved ‘in’ the commission of the offense of conviction, rather than to the elements of the offense.” Id. (emphasis in original). The Supreme Court noted that federal immigration law provides

that any alien who is convicted of an *aggravated felony* at any time after admission is deportable . . . . A related statute defines ‘aggravated felony’ in terms of a set of listed offenses that includes an offense that . . . involves fraud or deceit *in which the loss to the victim or victims exceeds $10,000*.

The question before us is whether the italicized language refers to an element of the fraud or deceit ‘offense’ as set forth in the particular fraud or deceit statute defining the offense of which the alien was previously convicted.

...  
...
...

We conclude, however, that the italicized language does not refer to an element of the fraud or deceit crime. Rather it refers to the particular circumstances in which an offender committed a (more broadly defined) fraud or deceit crime on a particular occasion.

Id. (internal citations omitted) (emphasis in original). The *italicized* language does not refer to an element of the fraud or deceit crime; rather, the *italicized* language mandates a very fact sensitive inquiry into “the specific way in which an offender committed the crime on a specific occasion.” Id. Simply put, this Court “must look to the facts and circumstances underlying an offender’s conviction” to determine whether the third prong of the three-fold burden presents itself. Id.; see also S-I-K, 24 I&N Dec. at 326. It is imperative that the “deceit” is distinguished from the conduct involved “in” the commission of the offense of conviction. *Nijhawan*, 557 U.S. at 29, 34. It is all about the conduct, the facts and the circumstances of the underlying criminal conviction and whether these conduct, facts and circumstances lead to an actual or potential loss to “victim or
victims” in excess of $10,000. Here, the facts lend to a clear conclusion that there was no actual, intended or potential “loss” in excess of $10,000 to any identifiable “victim or victims.” The victim of the “deceit” offense is not a victim of any loss that “exceeds $10,000.” The “victim or victims” respectively relate to the $10,000. The “victim or victims” could also directly relate to the underlying “deceit” offense. The “victim or victims,” however, need not necessarily directly, or, for that matter, indirectly, relate to the underlying “deceit” offense.

Here, this Court’s concern lies in the $30,000 written in the Presentence Investigation (the “PSI”)—what was thought of as an identifiable “loss” or “potential loss” of $30,000. It is important to note that the PSI did not, however, indicate any identifiable “victim or victims” of any loss or potential loss. A review of the record of the underlying proceedings clearly establishes that there were no victim or victims that were identifiable or, for that matter, relatable to any dollar amount.

The record of the underlying proceedings is extensive in Respondent’s matter and includes extensive evidentiary hearings and specific findings of fact and law by the Court that render judgement on Respondent for the WF and Conspiracy Charges. In the plainest of factual terms, Respondent was a debt collector who lived in Pennsylvania. Person-A stole $30,000 that was being held and delivered by Person-B to Person-C in 2010. Two years later, Person-B hired Respondent to collect the stolen $30,000 from Person-A. Respondent agreed to a $10,000 “collection fee.” Respondent, while physically located in Pennsylvania, called Person-A, who was then physically located in the State of New York, identified himself as Person-C, and demanded that Person-A return the stolen money. The “deceit” was in Respondent’s identification of himself as Person-C, while collecting money for Person-C, which Person-A stole from Person-
C. Person-A was the victim of “deceit” only to the extent of the specific misrepresentation. This specific misrepresentation “scared” Person-A and it is to that extent and that extent alone that Person-A was a “victim.” Further evidencing this point is that Person-A—the victim of the “deceit”—was forced to repay $30,000 as part of his own criminal prosecution. There exists no link between the amount and any identifiable victim (or, potential victim).

The PSI writes:

During the presentence interview, while in the presence of defense counsel, [Respondent] acknowledged his participation in the instant offense. [Respondent] reported that at the time he decided to commit the instant offense, he was experiencing legal problems due to his inability to make child support payments. [Respondent] was eventually approached by his codefendant, [redacted], who offered to pay [Respondent] $10,000 if he agreed to help him collect a sum of money. [redacted] claimed that an individual owed him money, and he was having difficulties collecting payment. As such, he needed [Respondent] to contact this individual. [redacted] instructed [Respondent] to pose as the true owner of the money. [Respondent] ultimately agreed, and he made a series of phone calls during which he demanded payment. [Respondent] accepted responsibility for his criminal actions.

Respondent’s Ex. C (PSI, at p. 36). The Judge presiding over Respondent’s underlying criminal matter made a rather detailed written findings of facts and conclusions of law, following a lengthy post-plea evidentiary hearing. In it, the Honorable Judge Jed Rakoff of the Southern District of New York specifically finds that the only identifiable “victim” is Person-A. As to the question of “victim,” with respect to Respondent only, he is the “victim” of a lie that Respondent told Person-A, in an effort to collect money that Person-A stole. See Respondent’s Ex. D, Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law dated July 8, 2014, p. 56-58, 71-72. Judge Rakoff found that the $30,000 were narcotics proceeds that Person-A stole from Person-B. Person B hired Respondent to try to
collect the stolen money. In exchange for these “collection services, Person-B agreed to pay Respondent $10,000:

Fourth, turning to the other defendant, the Court finds that [Respondent] played a meaningful role, in intimidating and threatening [Person-A], even though his involvement was more limited than [Person-A]'s. [Respondent], on multiple occasions, called and clearly threatened [Person-A] after agreeing with [Person-A] to do so on the belief that [Person-A] would pay [Respondent] $10,000 for these services. For example, on October 28, October 1, and November 3, 2012, [Respondent] spoke with [Person-A] and made statements that quite plainly amounted to threats in an effort to collect the $30,000 that [Person-A] had previously stolen . . . [knowing], at a minimum . . . that his calls to collect the stolen drug proceeds were part of a larger scheme to collect.

Id. at 71-72. Respondent was hired to recover money from Person-A that Person-A stole. Putting aside, albeit temporarily, the fact that the stolen money were narcotics proceeds, Respondent attempted to collect the stolen money from Person-A. He did it in a threatening manner, while identifying himself to Person-A as someone else. The “victim” of the “deceit” is Person-A. Person-A, however, is not a victim of any loss. The record has absolutely no identifiable victim or victims that relates, links or connects to the $30,000, or, for that matter, any identifiable “loss” in excess of $10,000.  

4 Person-A (the only identifiable “victim” to the “deceit”-only) paid $30,000 as a result of a forfeiture proceeding in his own criminal prosecution, provided that it was the proceed of narcotic sales. The Department has submitted hundreds of pages of transcripts to the Court. Review of these transcripts clearly indicates the very same facts detailed herein – Respondent was simply a debt collector, who was hired to collect money that Person-A stole. Person-A’s own testimony is the transcripts. When testifying, Person-A states that he stole “about” $30,000 from Person-B’s duffle bag and concedes his own knowledge that the money was from narcotic sales and that he was unable to repay it. Moreover, Person-A testifies that his own actions led to criminal prosecution and as part of forfeiture proceedings, Person-A had to pay $30,000 to the United States Government, because of the nature of the
Given this, the third prong of the three-fold burden fails. See Nijhawan, 557 U.S. at 29, 34; see also S-I-K, 24 I&N Dec. at 326. Respondent has not been convicted of an aggravated felony and, therefore, is prima facie eligible for COR Relief.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth herein, Respondent, [redacted], respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter an Order, which permits him to proceed with a hearing on a Form EOIR-42A, Application for Cancellation of Removal, or, alternatively, for an evidentiary hearing on this issue alone.

Respectfully Submitted:

BAURKOT & BAURKOT

Dated: ______________

Raymond G. Lahoud, Esquire
227 South Seventh Street
Post Office Box 801
Easton, PA  18044-0801
P:   (484) 544-0022
F:   (201) 604-6791
E:   rgl@bmblawyers.com

money and the manner in which Person-A “gained” access. There really is no realistically identifiable actual or potential loss, as the funds themselves were unlawfully gained by Person-A and those before Person-A.
Rosina Stambaugh, Esq.
The Law Office of Christopher A. Ferro, LLC
160 E. Market St.
York, PA 17401
717-668-8159
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In the Matter of:  

Respondent      

___________________________________

File No. A    

In removal proceedings

Immigration Judge Andrew Arthur       Next Hearing:    at    p.m.

MOTION TO ADVANCE MERITS HEARING
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I served a copy of this Motion to the District Counsel for the Department of Homeland Security at 3400 Concord Road, York, Pennsylvania, by hand delivery.

______________________________________ _______________________
Rosina Stambaugh, Esq.          Date
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UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW
IMMIGRATION COURT
YORK, PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of: )
) File No. A
) )
) Respondent ) In removal proceedings

Immigration Judge Andrew Arthur Next Hearing: at p.m.

MOTION TO ADVANCE MERITS HEARING

Respondent, through undersigned counsel, hereby submits her application for relief for Cancellation of Removal (EOIR 42a) with proof of payment. Respondent requests that the Court accept the application, waive her Master Calendar Hearing scheduled for and schedule the matter for a Merits Hearing at the Court’s earliest availability.

Respondent will provide the Court with her receipt of payment from USCIS as soon as she receives it.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rosina Stambaugh, Esq.
The Law Office of Christopher A. Ferro, LLC
160 E. Market St.
York, PA 17401
717-668-8159
Upon due consideration of the Respondent’s Motion to Accept Untimely Filing, it is HEREBY
ORDERED that the motion be □ GRANTED □ DENIED because:

□  DHS does not oppose the motion.
□  The respondent does not oppose the motion.
□  A response to the motion has not been filed with the court.
□  Good cause has been established for the motion.
□  The court agrees with the reasons stated in the opposition to the motion.
□  The motion is untimely per ____________________.
□  Other:

Deadlines:
□  The application(s) for relief must be filed by ______________________.
□  The respondent must comply with DHS biometrics instructions by_____.

_________________________  ______________________
Date       Immigration Judge

Certificate of Service

This document was served by: [ ] Mail     [ ] Personal Service
To: [ ] Alien  [ ] Alien c/o Custodial Officer    [ ] Alien’s Atty/Rep  [ ] DHS

Date:______________  By: Court Staff______________
In the Matter of: 

Respondent: 

In removal proceedings

Immigration Judge Walter Durling 

Next Hearing: July 15, 2014 at 1:00 p.m.

MOTION TO ACCEPT UNTIMELY FILING
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I served a copy of this Motion to the District Counsel for the Department of Homeland Security at 3400 Concord Road, York, Pennsylvania, by hand delivery.

______________________________________ _______________________
Rosina Stambaugh, Esq.          Date
The Law Office of Christopher A. Ferro, LLC
160 E. Market St.
York, PA 17401
717-668-8159
Rosina Stambaugh, Esq.                     DETAINED
The Law Office of Christopher A. Ferro, LLC
160 E. Market St.
York, PA 17401
717-668-8159

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW
IMMIGRATION COURT
YORK, PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of: ) File No. A
) Respondent
) In removal proceedings

Immigration Judge Walter Durling Next Hearing: July 15, 2014 at 1:00 p.m.

MOTION TO ACCEPT UNTIMELY FILING

The Respondent, through undersigned counsel, respectfully submits the following Motion to accept the untimely filing of his Memorandum in support of his application for relief, his document submission in support thereof, and his Witness list in the above-referenced case. The basis for this request is the following:

1. Mr. was previously represented by Attorney, who withdrew her appearance on June 16, 2014, at which time, Attorney Stambaugh entered her appearance.

2. Attorney failed to send Attorney Stambaugh Mr.’s complete file including evidence that she had collected.

3. Mr. was scheduled for a Merit’s hearing on July 23, 2014 at 1:00 p.m, which was moved to July 15, 2014.

4. The original deadline to file any documents in connection with Mr.’s case was June 8, 2014.

5. Given the fact that Attorney Stambaugh was not hired until June 16, 2014, she had less than a month to prepare for the case.
6. Attorney Stambaugh did not receive all of the evidence in connection with his application until June 9, 2014, which was partly due to prior counsel’s refusal to share the file.

7. A motion to accept an untimely filing must explain the reasons for the late filing and show good cause for acceptance of the filing. *Imm. Ct. Pract. Man. CH. 3(d)(iii).*

8. The Immigration Judge retains the authority to determine how to treat an untimely filing. *Id.*

Wherefore, for the reasons stated above, Respondent, through counsel, respectfully requests that the Court accept Respondent’s untimely filing.

Respectfully Submitted,

______________________________  ________________
Rosina Stambaugh, Esq.      Date
PA # 316072
EOIR: LT946256
The Law Office of Christopher A. Ferro, LLC
160 E. Market St.
York, PA 17404
717-668-8159
Rosina Stambaugh, Esq.
The Law Office of Christopher A. Ferro, LLC
160 E. Market St.
York, PA 17401
717-668-8159

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW
IMMIGRATION COURT
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of: 

Respondent 

File No. A

In removal proceedings

Immigration Judge Rosalind K. Malloy 

Next Hearing: March 12, 2015

WITNESS LIST
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I served a copy of this Witness List to the District Counsel for the Department of Homeland Security at 900 Market Street, Suite 346, Philadelphia, PA 19107, by USPS.

Rosina Stambaugh, Esq.
The Law Office of Christopher A. Ferro, LLC
160 E. Market St.
York, PA 17401
717-668-8159

Date
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW
IMMIGRATION COURT
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of: )
) File No. A
) Respondent
) In removal proceedings

Immigration Judge Rosalind K. Malloy
Next Hearing: March 12, 2015

WITNESS LIST

Respondent, [redacted], would like to have the following people testify at his hearing:

1. [redacted], Respondent’s son (DOB [redacted]) is a United States’ citizen. He will be testifying to Mr. [redacted]’s good moral character, his relationship to his father, and the hardship that his father’s deportation would cause him.

2. [redacted], Respondent’s employer at [redacted]. Mr. [redacted] will be testifying to Respondent’s good moral character, work ethic, and hardship he and his company would face if Respondent were deported.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosina Stambaugh, Esq.
The Law Office of Christopher A. Ferro, LLC
160 E. Market St.
York, PA 17401
717-668-8159

Date
IN THE MATTER OF: 

FILE NO.: A- 

IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS 

RESPONDENT’S INTENT TO OFFER EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO PERMIT HEARING ON FORM EOIR-42A, APPLICATION FOR CANCELLATION

Judge: 

Date of Hearing: 

Individual Hearing
IN THE MATTER OF:  

FILE NO.: A-XXXXXXXXX  
IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS  

RESPONDENT’S INTENT  
TO OFFER EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO PERMIT  
HEARING ON FORM EOIR-42A, APPLICATION FOR CANCELLATION  

Respondent, [REDACTED] (“Respondent”), by and through his Counsel, Raymond G. Lahoud, Esquire, of Baurkot & Baurkot, respectfully submits the following Exhibits, attached hereto and identified as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EX.</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Superseding Information, S3-13-CR-30 (JSR)</td>
<td>01-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Transcripts of Respondent’s Plea Hearing</td>
<td>07-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Presentence Investigation Report (PSI/PSR) (Final Rev.)</td>
<td>28-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Findings/ Conclusions of Fact and Law (Hon. J. Rakoff, USDJ</td>
<td>50-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Transcripts of Respondent’s Sentencing Hearing</td>
<td>80-103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Judgment in Criminal Case (Amended)</td>
<td>104-108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART 2 (REDACTED)(CONFIDENTIAL)  
II. APPENDIX-
Respondent submits the attached with the intent of offering the same into evidence in support of his Motion.

Respectfully Submitted:

BAURKOT & BAURKOT

Dated: ______________

Raymond G. Lahoud, Esquire
227 South Seventh Street
Post Office Box 801
Easton, PA 18044-0801
P: (484) 544-0022
F: (201) 604-6791
E: rgl@bmblawyers.com