



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

Rodriguez, Jennifer J., Esq. Wilens & Baker, P.C. 450 Seventh Avenue, 12th Floor New York, NY 10123-0000 DHS/ICE Office of Chief Counsel - NYC 26 Federal Plaza, Room 1130 New York, NY 10278

Name: FILPO DE VASQUEZ, ALTAGRACIA CARMEN

A300-317-878

Date of this notice: 11/15/2011

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

Sincerely,

Donna Carr

Donna Carr Chief Clerk

Enclosure

Panel Members:

Guendelsberger, John



mmigrant & Refugee Appellate Center | www.irac.net

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

File: A300 317 878 - New York, NY

Date:

NOV 15 2011

In re: ALTAGRACIA DEL CARMEN FILPO DE VASQUEZ a.k.a.

Altagracia Del Carmen Filpo Filpo

IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS

APPEAL

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Jennifer J. Rodriguez, Esquire

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Francisco Prieto

Assistant Chief Counsel

CHARGE:

Notice: Sec. 212(a)(6)(A)(i), I&N Act [8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i)] -

Present without being admitted or paroled

Sec. 212(a)(6)(C)(i), I&N Act [8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i)] -

Fraud or willful misrepresentation of a material fact

The Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") appeals the decision of the Immigration Judge dated April 28, 2010, terminating these removal proceedings. The record will be remanded.

We review Immigration Judges' findings of fact for clear error, but questions of law, discretion, and judgment, and all other issues in appeals, de novo. 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.1(d)(3)(i), (ii).

We are not persuaded that the Immigration Judge's decision to decline to find that the respondent is removable as charged in the Notice to Appear should be disturbed. The respondent, a native and citizen of the Dominican Republic, testified that she entered the United States at John F. Kennedy International Airport and was permitted to enter the United States after presenting travel documents to an immigration officer. This testimony supports a finding that she is an alien who has been admitted to the United States, and, therefore, subject to removal on the grounds of removability set forth in section 237 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1227, as opposed to the grounds inadmissibility set forth in section 212 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182. See Matter of Quilantan, 25 I&N Dec. 285 (BIA 2010). The DHS's arguments on appeal do not persuade us that the Immigration Judge's decision to credit the respondent's testimony as credible is clearly erroneous. See section 240(c)(4)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(4)(C) (stating that, in the absence of an explicit credibility determination, a witness shall have a rebuttable presumption of credibility on appeal). As such, we affirm the Immigration Judge's decision to not find the respondent removable as charged.

Nonetheless, the respondent appears to be an alien who is present in the United States in violation of the immigration laws of this country. Accordingly, we deem it appropriate to remand this matter to the Immigration Judge to provide the DHS the opportunity to lodge additionally factual allegations and charges of deportability under section 237 of the Act. See 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.30, 1240.10(e). If removability is established, the Immigration Judge should determine if the respondent is eligible for any form of relief from removal. Accordingly, the following order is entered.

ORDER: The record is remanded to the Immigration Court for further proceedings consistent with the foregoing opinion and for the entry of a new decision.

OR THE BOARD

IMMIGRATION COURT 26 FEDERAL PLZ 12TH FL.,RM1237 NEW YORK, NY 10278

In the Matter of

Case No.: A300-317-878

FILPO DE VELASQUEZ, ALTAGRACIA DEL CARME Respondent

IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS

	ORDER OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE
	An /2 = 2010
This	is a summary of the oral decision entered on $\frac{100}{100}$
This	memorandum is solely for the convenience of the parties. If the
	edings should be appealed or reopened, the oral decision will become
the o	fficial opinion in the case.
[]]	
1	or in the alternative to .
[]]	
\	respondent was ordered removed to or in the
	alternative to .
[1]	
	upon posting a bond in the amount of \$
	with an alternate order of removal to .
	ndent's application for:
	Asylum was ()granted ()denied()withdrawn.
[]]	
	A Waiver under Section was ()granted ()denied ()withdrawn.
[]]	
_ •	()withdrawn.
_ =	ndent's application for:
[1]	
- 1	() withdrawn. If granted, it is ordered that the respondent be issued
	all appropriate documents necessary to give effect to this order.
[]]	
ĺ	() withdrawn. If granted it is ordered that the respondent be issued
. .	all appropriated documents necessary to give effect to this order.
[]]	
į.	() withdrawn. If granted it is ordered that the respondent be issued
	all appropriated documents necessary to give effect to this order.
[]]	
- 1	removal under Article III of the Convention Against Torture was
.1.	() granted () denied () withdrawn.
[]	Respondent's status was rescinded under section 246.
1/ 1	Respondent is admitted to the United States as a until
9]	As a condition of admission, respondent is to post a \$bond.
4 1	Respondent knowingly filed a frivolous asylum application after proper
1,	notice.
[•]	Respondent was advised of the limitation on discretionary relief for
~/·	failure to appear as ordered in the Immigration Judge's oral decision.
171	Proceedings were terminated.
1]	Other:
	Date: Apr 28, 2010
	VÍVIENNE GORDON-URUAKPA
	Immigration Judge
	Appeal Waived Reserved Appeal Due By:
	by by Maurice
	2) May 28, 2010