



**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

**Johnson, Breanne P  
Stern & Curray, LLC  
650 South Cherry Street, Suite 900  
Denver, CO 80246**

**DHS/ICE - Office of Chief Counsel  
12445 East Caley Avenue  
Centennial, CO 80111-5663**

**Name: CRESPO-QUIROZ, FERNANDO**

**A 200-581-901**

**Date of this notice: 3/19/2018**

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:  
Kendall Clark, Molly

clerk  
User team: Docket

For more unpublished decisions, visit  
[www.irac.net/unpublished/index](http://www.irac.net/unpublished/index)



Falls Church, Virginia 22041

---

File: A200 581 901 – Denver, CO

Date:

**MAR 19 2018**

In re: Fernando CRESPO-QUIROZ

IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS

INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Breanne P. Johnson, Esquire

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Christine Longo  
Assistant Chief Counsel

The Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) has filed an interlocutory appeal from the Immigration Judge’s December 1, 2017, decision administratively closing the respondent’s removal proceedings over the DHS’s objection to allow him to pursue an Application for a Provisional Unlawful Presence Waiver (Form I-601A) with U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (“USCIS”). 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 this case 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 shall be returned to the Immigration Court with no further action.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
FOR THE BOARD