

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

MEZA-DOMINGUEZ, JOB

DHS/ICE Office of Chief Counsel - CHI 525 West Van Buren Street Chicago, IL 60607

Name: MEZA-DOMINGUEZ, JOB

A 200-141-892

Donne Carr

Date of this notice: 8/5/2019

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,

Donna Carr Chief Clerk

Enclosure

Panel Members: Adkins-Blanch, Charles K.

Userteam: Docket

For more unpublished decisions, visit www.irac.net/unpublished/index



Falls Church, Virginia 22041

File: A200-141-892 - Chicago, IL

Date:

AUS 0 5 2019

In re: Job MEZA-DOMINGUEZ a.k.a. Jorge Mendoza a.k.a. Juan Gonzales

IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS

INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Pro se

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Elizabeth Bayly

Assistant Chief Counsel

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has filed an interlocutory appeal from the Immigration Judge's February 20, 2019, decision placing the respondent's case on the status docket and scheduling the next hearing for February 28, 2019. 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 placed this matter on the court's status docket does not present a jurisdictional question of broader significance about the administration of the immigration laws. Nor has the DHS demonstrated that it involves a recurring problem in Immigration Judges' handling of cases. Thus, the issue 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 shall be returned to the Immigration Court with no further action.

FOR THE BOARD