



**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



**DHS/ICE Office of Chief Counsel - ATL**  
**180 Ted Turner Dr., SW, Ste 332**  
**Atlanta, GA 30303**

**Name: CASAS, MARCO ANTONIO**

**A 216-302-114**

**Date of this notice: 2/23/2018**

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,

Donna Carr  
Chief Clerk

Enclosure

Panel Members:  
Kendall Clark, Molly

Userteam: Docket

For more unpublished decisions, visit  
[www.irac.net/unpublished/index](http://www.irac.net/unpublished/index)

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

---

File: A216 302 114 – Atlanta, GA

Date: **FEB 23 2018**

In re: Marco Antonio CASAS a.k.a. Marco Antonio Casas Laoma

IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS

INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Pro se

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Antonio E. Veal  
Assistant Chief Counsel

The Department of Homeland Security has filed an interlocutory appeal from the Immigration Judge's October 19, 2017, decision to administratively close the respondent's removal proceedings to allow him to pursue a Form I-601A, Application for Provisional Unlawful Presence Waiver.

To avoid piecemeal review of the questions which may arise in the course of proceedings, this Board does not ordinarily entertain interlocutory appeals. *See Matter of Ruiz-Campuzano*, 17 I&N Dec. 108 (BIA 1979); *Matter of Ku*, 15 I&N Dec. 712 (BIA 1976); *Matter of Sacco*, 15 I&N Dec. 109 (BIA 1974). We have, however, on occasion ruled on the merits of interlocutory appeals where we deemed it necessary to address important jurisdictional questions regarding 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), and cases cited therein; *Matter of Dobere*, 20 I&N Dec. 188 (BIA 1990). We are not persuaded that this appeal has been shown to present a significant jurisdictional question about the administration of the immigration laws or 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