



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

VALLE-LOPEZ, ALDA CRISTELIA

DHS/ICE Office of Chief Counsel - CHL 5701 Executive Ctr Dr., Ste 300 Charlotte, NC 28212

Name: VALLE-LOPEZ, ALDA CRISTELIA A 205-732-563

Date of this notice: 1/12/2018

Enclosed is a copy of the Board's decision in the above-referenced case. If the attached decision orders that you be removed from the United States or affirms an Immigration Judge's decision ordering that you be removed, any petition for review of the attached decision must be filed with and received by the appropriate court of appeals within 30 days of the date of this decision.

Sincerely,

Donne Carr

Donna Carr Chief Clerk

Enclosure

Panel Members: Liebowitz, Ellen C

Userteam: Docket

For more unpublished decisions, visit www.irac.net/unpublished/index



mmigrant & Kefugee Appellate Center, LLC | www.irac.net

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

File: A205 732 563 - Charlotte, NC

Date:

JAN 1 2 2018

In re: Alda Cristelia VALLE-LOPEZ

IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS

INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Pro se

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Melissa Lanning

Assistant Chief Counsel

APPLICATION: Administrative closure

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has filed an interlocutory appeal from the Immigration Judge's October 30, 2017, decision to administratively close the respondent's removal proceedings based on her pending Petition for U Nonimmigrant Status (Form I-918). To avoid piecemeal review of the multiple queries that may arise during the course of removal proceedings, ordinarily the Board does not entertain interlocutory appeals. See Matter of M-D-, 24 I&N Dec. 138, 139 (BIA 2007), and cases cited therein. We have on occasion accepted interlocutory appeals to address significant jurisdictional questions about the administration of the immigration laws, or to correct recurring problems in the handling of cases by Immigration Judges. See, e.g., Matter of Guevara, 20 I&N Dec. 238 (BIA 1990, 1991); Matter of Dobere, 20 I&N Dec. 188 (BIA 1990). The issue of whether the Immigration Judge properly administratively closed the respondent's removal proceedings does not present a significant jurisdictional question about the administration of the immigration laws. Nor does it involve a recurring problem in Immigration Judges' handling of cases. Thus, the question raised in this interlocutory appeal does not fall within the limited ambit of cases where we deem it appropriate to exercise our jurisdiction. Accordingly, the following order will be entered.

ORDER: The record is returned to the Immigration Court with no further action.

FOR THE BOARD