



#### U.S. Department of Justice

**Executive Office for Immigration Review** 

Board of Immigration Appeals Office of the Clerk

5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 2000 Falls Church, Virginia 22041

Bove, Kevin A., Esq. Law Office 117 North Broadway Escondido, CA 92025-2713 DHS/ICE Office of Chief Counsel - SND 880 Front St., Room 1234 San Diego, CA 92101-8834

Name: PACHECO GARCIA, DOMINGO A 205-062-933

Date of this notice: 8/29/2013

Enclosed is a copy of the Board's decision and order in the above-referenced case.

Sincerely,

Donna Carr Chief Clerk

**Enclosure** 

Panel Members: Holmes, David B.

lucasd

onne Carr

Userteam: <u>Docket</u>



Immigrant & Refugee Appellate Center | www.irac.net

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

File: A205 062 933 - San Diego, CA

Date:

AUG 29 2013

In re: DOMINGO PACHECO GARCIA

IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS

APPEAL AND MOTION

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Kevin A. Bove, Esquire

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Kori LaPoint

**Assistant Chief Counsel** 

APPLICATION: Reopening

#### ORDER:

The respondent has filed a motion to continue these immigration proceedings while he pursues an application for U nonimmigrant status. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has stated its non-opposition to the motion, which we construe as a motion to administratively close the proceedings. The motion is granted and the proceedings are administratively closed.

If either party to this case wishes to reinstate the proceedings, a written request to reinstate the proceedings may be made to the Board. The Board will take no further action in the case unless a request is received from one of the parties. The request must be submitted directly to the Clerk's Office, without fee, but with certification of service on the opposing party.

FOR THE BOARD

# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION COURT SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

File: A205-062-933		March 7, 2013
In the Matter of		
DOMINGO PACHECO GARCIA RESPONDENT	) ) )	IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS

CHARGES: Section 212(a)(6)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

APPLICATIONS: Voluntary departure at conclusion of proceedings.

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: PETER JAMES MUSSER, Esquire 110 South Citrus Avenue, Suite E Vista. California 92084

ON BEHALF OF DHS: KORI LAPOINT, Esquire
Assistant Chief Counsel
Department of Homeland Security
San Diego, California

### ORAL DECISION OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE

The Court has jurisdiction in this matter by the Government's filing of a Notice to Appear dated June 11, 2012, which was personally served on the respondent. Service of the Notice to Appear is not at issue.

At the hearing on September 18, 2012, respondent appeared with current counsel and, through counsel, denied all the allegations and charge. The case was

thereafter continued for the respondent to file his motion to terminate and to suppress Government Form I-213, which was at that time marked as Exhibit 2 for identification purposes.

On December 14, 2012, respondent filed a motion to terminate and within the motion sought to suppress the Government's document.

The Court finds that the respondent's motion failed to support termination or suppression of Government witnesses. Under the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 codified at INA Section 287(d), a Federal, state or local law enforcement official who arrested an alien for a violation of any law relating to controlled substances shall promptly notify the Service, which is now the Department of Homeland Security, to determine whether or not to issue an Immigration detainer. In this case, the respondent, through counsel, apparently misinterpreted that Section to mean that an Immigration detainer may be issued only if an alien was arrested for a controlled substance violation.

By issuing a detainer, the Department of Homeland Security requests that a law enforcement agency notify the Department of Homeland Security before releasing an alien and detain-retain custody of the subject for a period not to exceed 48 hours, excluding Saturdays, Sundays and holidays, in order to allow the Department of Homeland Security to assume custody. This request, came from both from 8 C.F.R. Section 287.7, which arises from the Department of Homeland Security's Secretary Power under Section 103(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to issue "regulations...necessary to carry out [her] authority" under the Act, and from the Department of Homeland Security's general authority to detain individuals who are subject to removal or removal proceedings. Section 287(d) of the Act merely requires law enforcement officials to notify the Department of Homeland Security to make a

A205-062-933 2 March 7, 2013

determination on whether to issue an Immigration detainer. It does not limit the Department of Homeland Security's authority to issue such a detainer.

Based upon the foregoing, the Court finds that the motion failed to present any support to terminate or even to merely suppress the Government's documents, in this case, a Form I-213. Therefore, that document was admitted into the record for evidentiary purposes as Exhibit No. 2 in this case.

On March 7, 2013, respondent appeared with counsel and, through counsel, pled by admitting to all the allegations and conceding to the charge in the Notice to Appear.

Counsel advised the Court that removability at this time is no longer at issue.

Initially-Thereafter, the respondent sought a continuance in order to obtain conviction records relating to respondent's two conviction for driving without a license. Government counsel advised the Court that the Government would not oppose the request for voluntary departure merely based on those convictions. Therefore, the Court could-did not find good cause in continuing this case for that purpose and denied the motion for a continuance.

Respondent was the only witness to testify In in support of his request for voluntary departure, respondent was the only witness to testify for that request. Based upon the evidence of record, the Court finds that the respondent has established both statutory and discretionary eligibility for voluntary departure. Counsel advised the Court that he had discussed with the respondent for both voluntary departure prior to conclusion and at conclusion of proceedings. Respondent apparently decided to only seek voluntary departure at conclusion of proceedings. The Government has not raised any issue that would affect the Court's determination.

Based on the foregoing, the following orders shall, therefore, be entered:

A205-062-933 March 7, 2013

## **ORDER**

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the respondent be granted voluntary departure in lieu of an order of removal, such departure to take place without expense to the United States Government on or before May 6, 2013.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the respondent shall pay a \$500 voluntary departure bond to the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Field Office Director within five business days of today's date.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the respondent shall present to the Department of Homeland Security on or before April 8, 2013, all necessary travel documents for voluntary departure.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that should the respondent fail to abide by any of the foregoing orders or should he withdraw his request for voluntary departure, then these voluntary departure orders shall without further notice or proceedings vacate and the alternate order of removal shall become effective the following day: the respondent shall be removed from the United States to Mexico on the charge contained in the Notice to Appear.

THIS TRANSCRIPT OF THE ORAL DECISION WAS REVIEWED ON JUNE 4, 2013, WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS.

Please see the next page for electronic

signature

PHILIP S. LAW Immigration Judge

A205-062-933 4 March 7, 2013

//s//

Immigration Judge PHILIP S. LAW lawp on June 4, 2013 at 2:44 PM GMT