



**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*

**Yanez, Jessica L.  
Yanez Immigration Law  
2007 Boulevard Street  
Suite C  
Greensboro, NC 27407**

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

**Name: GALDAMEZ, LILIAN DEL CARM...      A 088-966-361**

**Date of this notice: 2/9/2018**

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:  
Guendelsberger, John

Userteam: Docket

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

---

File: A088 966 361 – Charlotte, NC

Date: FEB - 9 2018

In re: Lilian Del Carmen GALDAMEZ a.k.a. Lilian Del Carmen Galdamez Escalante

IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS

INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Jessica L. Yanez, Esquire

ON BEHALF OF DHS: James A. Jones  
Assistant Chief Counsel

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has filed an interlocutory appeal from the Immigration Judge's November 13, 2017, decision to administratively close the respondent's removal proceedings to allow her to pursue an Application for Provisional Unlawful Presence Waiver (Form I-601A), based on the approval of a Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). 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