

CALIFORNIA BOARD OF LEGAL SPECIALIZATION
OF THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA



180 HOWARD STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105-1639
TELEPHONE: (415) 538-2120



**IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY LAW
CERTIFICATION EXAM**

Date	Sunday, August 12, 2007 9:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Registration deadline	Friday, June 29, 2007
Exam sites	Marriott San Jose Radisson at Los Angeles Airport
Fee	\$300 writing (\$350 if using a laptop PC) <i>fee includes a box lunch</i>
Exam format	<p>The exam is divided into two sessions – the three hour and 15 minute morning session includes 75 multiple-choice questions and two essay questions; the three hour afternoon session includes six essay questions. There are no optional questions; each examinee is expected to answer all questions on the exam.</p> <p>The 75 multiple-choice questions are designed to be answered in approximately 135 minutes. Each essay question is designed to be answered in approximately 30 minutes.</p>
Scoring	The maximum number of points available is 600. A passing score is 420 points, or 70%. Exams with scores between 65-70% are re-read by a Committee of Reappraisers. The decision of the Committee is final, pursuant to section 8.3 of the Rules Governing the State Bar of California Program for Certifying Legal Specialists. Results are mailed only after all reappraisals have been completed.
Reference materials	Examinees may use the following reference materials during the exam: <i>Code of Federal Regulations</i> and <i>Immigration & Nationality Act</i> . Publications must be unannotated and free of any stray marks. Handwritten notations (other than underlining or highlighting) will not be allowed. The use of Post-It type tabs to mark specific book sections is acceptable, but the tabs must not have writing on them.
Testing accommodations	Available at both sites. Contact ivonne.dossantosmorte@calbar.ca.gov or (415) 538-2145 for more information.
Study resources	See attached standards for certification, exam specifications, and sample exam questions.

For more information, visit www.californiaspecialist.org

The Standards must be read in conjunction with the Rules Governing the State Bar of California Program for Certifying Legal Specialists, which govern the Program requirements.

THE STANDARDS FOR CERTIFICATION AND RECERTIFICATION IN IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY LAW

1.0 DEFINITION

Immigration and nationality law is the practice of law dealing with matters arising under and related to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended (Title 8 U.S. Code), and other laws and regulations dealing with immigration and naturalization.

2.0 TASK REQUIREMENT FOR CERTIFICATION

An applicant must demonstrate that within the five (5) years immediately preceding the initial application he or she has been substantially involved in the practice of immigration and nationality law. A prima facie showing of substantial involvement in the area of immigration and nationality law is made by performance of the following activities:

- 2.1 Participated as principal attorney in one-hundred fifty (150) cases in the following two categories, with not less than twenty-five (25) cases in each category:
 - 2.1.1 Application for immigrant and nonimmigrant status, and
 - 2.1.2 Removal, deportation, or exclusion hearings before immigration judges. Not less than three (3) cases in this category must be contested proceedings; and
- 2.2 Participated as principal attorney in six (6) of the following thirteen (13) procedures and at least three (3) cases in each of the six (6) procedures
 - 2.2.1 Naturalization or Nationality cases,
 - 2.2.2 Administrative Appellate Practice,
 - 2.2.3 Judicial review of immigration proceedings in the federal courts (includes but is not limited to: Petition for Review, Habeas Corpus, Petition for Declaration of Judgment, Writ of Mandamus);
 - 2.2.4 Labor certifications,
 - 2.2.5 Contested removal, deportation or exclusion hearings or rescission proceedings before immigration judges,

- 2.2.6 Motions, writs or pleas in criminal cases relating to collateral immigration consequences in federal or state courts,
- 2.2.7 Bond or custody proceedings,
- 2.2.8 Refugee or asylum applications,
- 2.2.9 State Department or Consular Practice,
- 2.2.10 Immigrant visa petitions, applications, or immigrant waivers,
- 2.2.11 Immigration consequences of mergers, reorganizations, downsizing and other business or employment changes,
- 2.2.12 Non-immigrant visa petitions or applications, or non-immigrant waivers (includes, but not limited to ancillary applications such as labor condition applications),
- 2.2.13 If the above categories do not apply, any other subject matter category may be used, such as, but not limited to, immigration related enforcement proceedings other than immigration court. The applicant must submit descriptions of each category.

Principal attorney is the attorney who spends a majority of the time on a case in the activities of preparation, review, filing and representing a client at an interview or hearing. There can be only one principal attorney per case.

3.0 EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR CERTIFICATION

An applicant must show that within the three (3) years immediately preceding the application for certification, he or she has completed not less than forty-five (45) hours of educational activities specifically approved for immigration and nationality law, as follows:

- 3.1 Immigrant Visas (minimum of 15 hours required) - immediate relatives; relative preference categories; special immigrants; labor certification; grounds for exclusion and waivers; adjustment of status; legalization; registry and consular procedures;

- 3.2 Non-Immigrant Visas (minimum of 8 hours required) - change of non-immigrant status and all categories of non-immigrant visas;
- 3.3 Removal/Deportation/Exclusion Procedures (minimum of 12 hours required) - arrest and custody procedures; removal/deportation/exclusion grounds and waivers; defenses; immigration and administrative law court procedures and rules; employer sanctions; anti-discrimination procedures and defenses;
- 3.4 Administrative and Judicial Review (minimum of 6 hours required) - appeals to an appellate body of the Department of Justice, Department of State, Department of Labor; motions to reopen; motions for reconsideration. The subject matter of Judicial Review may include: appeals to the Court of Appeals, *habeas corpus* proceedings, and other district court actions; and
- 3.5 Citizenship and Naturalization (minimum of 4 hours required) - naturalization; derivation; acquisition and loss of citizenship.

4.0 TASK REQUIREMENT FOR RECERTIFICATION

An applicant for recertification must show that, during the current five (5) year certification period, he or she has had direct and substantial participation in the practice of immigration and nationality law. The Commission will accept the following activities as compliance with the task requirement:

- 4.1 Participation as principal attorney in one-hundred fifty (150) cases; and
- 4.2 Participation as principal attorney in six (6) of the thirteen (13) procedures listed under section 2.2 above, with at least three (3) cases in each of the six (6) procedures.

5.0 EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR RECERTIFICATION

An applicant for recertification must show that, during the current five (5) year certification period, he or she has completed not less than sixty (60) hours of educational activities specifically approved for immigration and nationality law specialists, not less than forty-five (45) of which must be shown in the same manner as in section 3.0.

Specifications For State Bar of California

Immigration and Nationality Law Certification Examination

Purpose of the Examination: The Immigration & Nationality Law Examination consists of a combination of essay and multiple-choice questions. It is designed to verify the applicant's knowledge of and proficiency in the usual legal procedures and substantive law that should be common to specialists in the field as represented by the skills listed below. We recognize that these skills are interrelated, which may require that you apply several skills in responding to a single exam question. Also, the order of the skills does not reflect their relative importance, nor does the skill sequence represent an implied order of their application in practice.

Your answers to the exam questions should reflect your ability to identify and resolve issues, apply the law to the facts given, and show knowledge and understanding of the pertinent principles and theories of law, their relationship to each other, and their qualifications and limitations. Of primary importance for the essay questions will be the quality of your analysis and explanation.

Knowledge of the following fundamental lawyering skills may be assessed:

Skill 1: Professional Responsibility

- 1.1 Duties to clients, opposing counsel and the Court
- 1.2 Bases for attorney's fees
- 1.3 Bases for sanctions
- 1.4 Fee agreements
- 1.5 Arbitration/mediation and dual representation
- 1.6 Conduct resulting in malpractice/discipline

Skill 2: Classifications

- 2.1 Non-immigrant visa categories
- 2.2 Immigrant preference categories
- 2.3 Immediate relatives
- 2.4 Rule of chargability
- 2.5 Preconceived intent
- 2.6 Inadmissibility grounds
- 2.7 Consular discretion
- 2.8 Waiver grounds and exemptions
- 2.9 Marriage fraud
- 2.10 Conditional resident status
- 2.11 Joint petition waivers
- 2.12 Self-petition categories
- 2.13 Labor attestations
- 2.14 Labor certifications
- 2.15 National interest waivers
- 2.16 Priority workers
- 2.17 Employer sanctions
- 2.18 Lottery visas
- 2.19 Registry

Skill 3: Immigration Processing & Procedures

- 3.1 Non-immigrant visa application procedures
- 3.2 Immigrant visa application procedures

- 3.3 Consular jurisdiction
- 3.4 Adjustment of status
- 3.5 Waiver processing
- 3.6 Affidavits of support
- 3.7 Advance parole
- 3.8 Reentry permits and travel documents
- 3.9 Employment authorization
- 3.10 Refugee and asylee adjustments

Skill 4: Removal, Inadmissibility, Deportation, Exclusion

- 4.1 Grounds of inadmissibility
- 4.2 Grounds of removability
- 4.3 Grounds of deportation and excludability prior to IIRAIRA
- 4.4 Bond eligibility, re-determinations, conditions
- 4.5 Mandatory detention
- 4.6 Voluntary departure in removal proceedings
- 4.7 Waivers in removal, deportation & exclusion proceedings
- 4.8 Cancellation of removal for lawful permanent residents and §212(c) relief
- 4.9 Cancellation of removal for non-lawful residents and suspension of deportation
- 4.10 Asylum
- 4.11 Restriction of removal and withholding of deportation
- 4.12 Rescission
- 4.13 Termination of conditional resident status
- 4.14 Reinstatement of removal orders
- 4.15 Affirmative defenses (motions to suppress, U.S. citizenship, estoppel, etc.)

Skill 5: Motions and Procedural Issues

- 5.1 Notice and proper service
- 5.2 In-absentia hearings and orders
- 5.3 Motions to reopen
- 5.4 Motions to reconsider
- 5.5 Special rule motions (in absentia, NACARA, etc.)
- 5.6 Administrative appeals
- 5.7 Judicial review of administrative actions and orders
- 5.8 Federal District Court actions
- 5.9 Federal Court of Appeals review

Skill 6: Naturalization and Citizenship

- 6.1 Good moral character
- 6.2 Physical presence
- 6.3 Abandonment of lawful permanent resident status
- 6.4 Special rules categories
- 6.5 Naturalization procedural issues
- 6.6 Acquisition
- 6.7 Derivation
- 6.8 Revocation
- 6.9 Administrative naturalization

**STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA IMMIGRATION AND
NATIONALITY LAW CERTIFICATION EXAM**

SAMPLE QUESTIONS

Sample Question #1

Edward, a native and citizen of Malaysia, has a consultation with you. He is presently lawfully in the United States under valid H-1B visa status. Edward first entered the United States in August, 1993, with an F-1 visa issued by the American Embassy in Malaysia. He graduated from U.C.L.A. in June 1997 with a bachelor's degree in aerospace engineering. He was granted a one-year period of practical training upon graduation. His H-1B visa petition was approved in June 1998 to work as a procurement engineer for S.A. Enterprises, Inc., a United States company engaged in exporting aircraft and related items. Shortly after his I-129 was approved, Edward traveled to a U.S. Consulate in Mexico and was issued an H-1B visa valid for three years. He was granted an extension of his H-1B status in May 2001 valid until June 2004. Again, Edward went to a U.S. Consulate in Mexico to apply for another H-1B visa, which was issued for another three years.

S.A. Enterprises, Inc. filed an application for alien labor certification on behalf of Edward with the California Employment Development Department on April 30, 2001. It is still pending. S.A. Enterprises, Inc. is owned by Edward's uncle, who closed the company last month and returned to Malaysia due to an F.B.I. investigation of his activities.

Edward has been offered employment as a design engineer by another company which manufactures airplane parts. The company is willing to petition for his new H-1B and his permanent residence.

- A. When can Edward begin working for his new employer? Discuss.**
- B. Edward would like to travel next month to Germany. Does he need to apply for another visa and, if so, can he apply in Mexico again? Discuss.**
- C. Is Edward eligible for another extension of his H-1B status if his labor certification is not approved by the H-1B expiration date? Discuss.**
- D. When the labor certification is approved, what are the next steps to take to obtain permanent residency? Discuss.**

Sample Question #2

Miguel, a native and citizen of Mexico, came to the United States with his parents on February 21, 1986 with a Border Crossing Card, when he was 15 years old. On May 9, 1987, he was arrested with two of his friends for shoplifting. Because his Lawful Permanent Resident (LPR) parents were afraid that he would be deported for this crime, and because they felt that distance from bad influence would prevent more serious incidents, Miguel was sent back to Mexico two weeks later in the care of his grandfather. On October 11, 1987, he returned to the U.S. accompanied by his uncle, who traveled by car and stated to the DHS inspectors at the port of entry that both he and Miguel were "U.S. citizens."

Miguel adjusted status on August 5, 1991. On April 28, 1994, he was arrested for possession with intent to sell cocaine, a controlled substance, in violation of the California Health and Safety Code. He pled guilty and was convicted of the offense on March 1, 1996; he was sentenced to three years in state prison and three years probation.

On September 10, 2001, Miguel left the United States for 10 days to attend his grandfather's funeral in Mexico. On his way back to the United States, he realized that he didn't have his green card with him. To the inspector at port of entry, he stated that he misplaced his green card. A routine identification check verified that Miguel was indeed a Lawful Permanent Resident but uncovered his record of arrest and conviction for the controlled substance violation. The immigration officer took Miguel into custody as an "arriving alien" and made no recommendation for bail.

- A. What procedural steps should be taken to attempt to obtain Miguel's release from DHS custody? Why is he considered an "arriving alien" if DHS knows that he is a green card holder? What factors will be considered in making the custody determination? Discuss.**
- B. In removal proceedings, does Miguel meet the statutory requirements for cancellation? Discuss.**
- C. Is Miguel eligible for any other form of relief from removal? Discuss. Does the fact that, at the time of his plea for the controlled substance violation, Miguel was a permanent resident for less than five years determine eligibility for the relief? Discuss.**

Sample Question #3

Yoshi, a native and citizen of Argentina, has been employed in Los Angeles since July of 1996 as an import/export wholesaler by Sturdy, Inc., a U.S. subsidiary of a Japanese auto parts firm. Yoshi has a high school education and previously worked for one year selling restaurant equipment. He has an outgoing personality and is fluent in English, Spanish and Japanese, assets which make him a valuable employee at Sturdy. In his job, he is responsible for selling and arranging shipment of auto parts manufactured by Sturdy's parent firm to customers in the United States and Latin America. His hard work, his language skills and his pleasant approach have boosted Sturdy's sales in Latin America to record levels.

When Yoshi was hired, he filled out the top of an I-9 form showing that he was a citizen or national of the United States. He also showed Sturdy's personnel manager a valid California driver license and an unrestricted Social Security card.

During the past few months, Sturdy has been asking Yoshi to travel to Mexico to help promote the firm's business there. This week, Yoshi finally admitted to his boss that he can't travel abroad because he and his wife were actually admitted to the U.S. for three months in 1995 via the visa waiver program and overstayed. Yoshi explained further that his elderly U.S. citizen father filed a family preference petition for him immediately after the father's naturalization in March of 2001, but the waiting time to immigrate through that petition will be very long.

- A. If Sturdy decides to continue to employ Yoshi and sponsor him for labor certification, what issues does it face in preparing the description of duties and requirements of the job offer? Discuss.**

- B. What risks do Sturdy and Yoshi face if the company decides to continue Yoshi's employment while it sponsors him for permanent residence? Discuss.**

- C. Assuming that Sturdy is successful in obtaining approval of a labor certification for Yoshi, how should he and his wife complete the process to become U.S. permanent residents? Discuss.**

Sample Question #4

Sofee is a 64-year-old woman and a citizen of Lintoli. Sofee was an artist in her country and was quite famous. However, she was frustrated with the lack of democratic freedom in Lintoli. In 1991, Sofee joined an underground organization called Artistic Revolutionary Front (ARF). ARF's goal was to seek an end to the ruling regime through non-violent acts of civil

disobedience. Unknown to Sofee, ARF received money and supplies from the Communist Party in the neighboring country of Norak.

On the night of February 1, 1992, while placing a poster over a monument dedicated to the president of the country, Sofee was caught by the police. She was taken to jail and imprisoned. She was never given a trial. Sofee had no further contact with ARF after her arrest and imprisonment. While in prison, Sofee was tortured by the police. In 1995, Sofee escaped. She fled to Italy where she sought medical treatment for the injuries she suffered while in jail. While she was in Italy, she illegally used small amounts of marijuana to ease the physical pain she was experiencing as a result of the torture.

Sofee applied for refugee status at the American Embassy in Rome. She disclosed her marijuana use during her interview at the embassy and received a waiver based on humanitarian grounds. She was admitted to the United States on February 1, 1996 as a refugee. On February 1, 1998, her application for adjustment of status to that of a permanent resident was approved. She has never left the United States since her arrival.

Sofee wants to apply for U.S. citizenship and wants to take the exam in her native language. She has difficulty concentrating and remembering and often experiences lapses of memory. She frequently experiences headaches, occasional black outs and extreme pain in her joints. She takes prescription medication for her impairments, which has the negative side effect of making her drowsy. She has a scrawled note written by her doctor who confirms her physical impairments and her prescription medication, and writes that Sofee experiences flashbacks from her time in prison and may suffer from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. He states that her impairments are permanent and have already lasted more than 12 months. The doctor concludes in the note that the combination of Sofee's physical and mental impairments make it impossible for her to learn English and American history and civics.

- A. Is Sofee eligible to naturalize? Discuss the obstacles, if any, she faces in naturalizing. What steps may she take, if any, to resolve them?**

- B. Assume Sofee applies for naturalization, goes to her interview, but then never receives a decision. Eight months later, Sofee calls you and wants you to do something about obtaining a decision in her case. What statutory and/or regulatory procedures are available to Sofee? Discuss.**

- C. Assume Sofee applied for naturalization, went to her interview, and was unable to pass the history and civics exam. May she try again? If so, when?**

D. Assume Sofee's application for naturalization was denied. What avenues of review, if any, are available to her? Discuss.

Sample Question #5

Juan has come to you for an initial consultation in order to discover what he can do to obtain Resident status for his wife and children. Juan continues to toil as a California farm worker, earning minimum wage, as he has done since the mid seventies. Juan is a native of the Mexican state of Michoacan and has only a sixth grade education. He speaks no English and is marginally literate in Spanish.

Juan was able to legalize via INA §210, and he has been a Legal Permanent Resident since Dec. 1, 1990. He filed an F2A I-130 petition for his wife Maria and their five children on November 15, 1994. The petition was approved by the Service Center on March 8, 1995. Since that time, Juan has been awaiting word from the U.S. government as to how and when to proceed with his family's immigration. Now frustrated, he has come to you for guidance.

Maria and the couple's three youngest children, Jose age 19, Jorge age 15, and Juana age 14, have remained in Mexico and have never been present in the U.S.

Juan's eldest children, Raul now age 28 and Rosa now 27, came to the U.S. together, entering without inspection (EWI) on October 12, 1988. Both were under 21 on November 15, 1994. Raul turned 21 on December 15, 1995 and Rosa turned 21 on August 8, 1996. Raul lives with his father Juan.

Raul, who has a well-paying job as an auto mechanic, has never left the U.S. since his first entry. In 1994, he learned of and visited a "Notario" in Los Angeles who "helps people" in Raul's situation. The Notario informed Raul that he was eligible for a work permit and a green card due to his seven years' continuous residence in the U.S.

For \$5,000, the Notario guaranteed Raul a green card and Raul hired him. The Notario did not inform Raul that his plan was to file an application for political asylum on Raul's behalf. The Notario obtained Raul's signature on a blank Form I-589, then prepared and filed the Form I-589 which included many false statements, claiming that Raul's whole family had been persecuted by government operatives because family members were activists in the opposition party.

When Raul discovered that he had unknowingly applied for asylum, he became fearful and did not attend the Asylum Office interview or the Master Calendar hearing that was later set in Immigration Court. The Order to Show Cause placing Raul in proceedings was dated

November 1, 1995. In accordance with the common procedures at that time, the Immigration Judge administratively closed the case when Raul did not appear.

Rosa lives with the U.S. citizen father of her three U.S. citizen children. They wish to marry but have not done so because Rosa has been told that, by so doing, she would cancel her father's prior petition for her. Rosa has one absence from the U.S. She went to visit her mother and siblings for two weeks in 1996. When she returned on September 15, 1996, she presented her U.S. born cousin's birth certificate to the immigration officer and tried to enter. Her false claim was detected and she was granted Voluntary Departure to Mexico. She successfully EWI'd the following day and has not departed the country again.

- A. Assume the F2A Priority Date recently became current. What advice should you give to Juan regarding the immigration to the U.S. of his wife Maria and his three younger children in Mexico? Discuss in detail the process involved and any other relevant issues that might arise.**
 - B. Assume the F2A Priority date is NOT current. Can Juan, Maria and the three younger children be reunited legally in the U.S. at this time? Discuss.**
 - C. Discuss all possibilities/problems/issues that are relevant concerning Raul's immigration to the U.S.**
 - D. Discuss all possibilities/problems/issues that are relevant concerning Rosa's immigration to the U.S.**
-

Sample Question #6

Aye is a 35 year old native and citizen of Myanmar. He is employed as a merchant seaman, which takes him on long trips out of Myanmar. For the last few decades, Myanmar has been ruled by a repressive military dictatorship. All political dissent is quashed. The government engages in arbitrary arrests, detentions, and various forms of torture. These conditions are well documented in country condition reports such as those issued by the U. S. State Department and Amnesty International.

One evening in January 2001, agents from the Military Intelligence Service (MIS) came to Aye's house and arrested him without a warrant. His house was searched and his wife and child were intimidated. Nothing was discovered as a result of the search, but Aye was taken to a Military Detention Center. There the MIS began an all night session of interrogation during which they beat and kicked Aye. Aye was accused of smuggling anti-government literature during his last entry into Myanmar.

In fact, Aye had not smuggled anything into Myanmar and persisted in denying his complicity. During the course of the beating, Aye denied that he had ever smuggled anti-government literature.

Aye was confined to a jail cell the following day without food or water. He was released with a stern warning that he should not ever mention the interrogation nor should he ever be involved in anti-government activity as his name was now on a watch list. Aye concluded that he had been misidentified and that the MIS was actually looking for another seaman with the same name.

After his release, he went to a physician. It was discovered that his foot had been fractured. Surgery was required to set the broken bones. Aye did not mention to his doctor the cause of his injuries. He was in a cast for three months until his foot healed.

Thereafter, Aye got an assignment that would cause him to fly to the United States and enter the country as a crewman in order to board a ship departing from an American port. On July 15, 2002, Aye flew to the U.S. with his crewman's visa and boarded his ship. He then sailed with his ship to various ports in South America, a trip that took approximately two months. At each port, Aye was given shore leave and spent several hours on shore.

Upon return to the U.S. on September 15, 2002, Aye called his wife and learned that the MIS again came to Aye's house demanding to know his whereabouts and searched the house thoroughly for anti-government literature but found nothing. Aye's wife is convinced that Aye would be apprehended upon his return to Myanmar. Aye's next crew assignment would take him back to Myanmar. Because of his fear of returning to Myanmar, he remained in the U.S. A notice to appear was issued. Aye was arrested and placed in DHS custody.

Aye comes to you (assume today's date) and you note that his next master hearing date before the Los Angeles Immigration Court is September 3, 2003, and that Aye has not previously filed an asylum application. Aye has no documents except his medical records, which confirm the fractured foot and surgery, and a copy of his Myanmar passport showing his entry into various ports in South America.

Discuss all issues relating to Aye's claim for asylum and any obstacles thereto and what his first course of action should be.

Sample Question #7

Cesar, a native and citizen of Mexico, was admitted to the U.S. as a visitor for pleasure in 1979. He adjusted status in February 1987 based upon his marriage to a U.S. citizen.

A criminal complaint was filed against Cesar alleging one count of committing a lewd act upon a child (his 12-year old step-daughter) in violation of California Penal Code §288(a). Cesar entered a plea of guilty on November 4, 1992, and was sentenced to state prison for a period of six years; the sentence was suspended under the terms and conditions that he serve one year in county jail and probation for a period of five years.

During his probation, Cesar and his family (his wife, mother-in-law, three children and step-daughter) underwent extensive family therapy. The family reconciled and are living happily together in the family home that Cesar and his wife bought when they married. Cesar is active in his church and his neighborhood watch organization. He has organized the annual Christmas block party for the past five years. His two next door neighbors are aware of the conviction but are still his friends. Upon release from prison, Cesar returned to the job he held prior to his conviction. The company was so satisfied with his performance that they eventually promoted Cesar to Senior Accountant in charge of the company's bookkeeping department.

Cesar was arrested at his naturalization interview last week and was issued a Notice to Appear for Removal proceedings. The NTA charges him subject to removal as an alien convicted of an aggravated felony under §101(a)(43)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

- 1. Can Cesar be released on bond? Discuss.**
 - 2. Does Cesar have any method of avoiding removal from the United States? Discuss.**
-

Sample Question #8

Renato is a 33-year-old native and citizen of the Philippines and a lawful permanent resident of the U.S. He immigrated to the U.S. nine years ago in the family 2nd (F2B) category.

Renato has come to you for an initial consultation regarding his eligibility for naturalization. During the course of your interview with Renato, you learn the following:

- ◆ Renato seeks naturalization because he wishes to sponsor his "girlfriend" Patricia, living in the Philippines, and their two daughters, ages 11 and 12, for immigration to the U.S. He claims that he has not yet married Patricia because he was aware that he had to remain single to be able to immigrate in the F2B category. He is prepared to return to the Philippines to marry Patricia now.
- ◆ Renato also informs you that he did not list his daughters on his visa application nor reveal their existence at the consular interview in

Manila nine years ago because he mistakenly believed that having children outside of marriage would lead to visa refusal.

- ◆ After he immigrated, Renato failed to register with the U.S. Selective Service because he was unaware of the requirement to do so.
- ◆ Eight years ago, Renato was convicted of one count of misdemeanor petty theft in California. The sentence was a fine of \$150.00, no jail time and three-year summary probation. Maximum possible incarceration for this offense was six months. He has no other crimes or offenses.
- ◆ Four years and six months ago, Renato returned to the U.S. after a nine-month stay in the Philippines. He has not left the U.S. since.

1. **What are the general naturalization requirements as they apply to Renato? Discuss.**
2. **What potential issues do the facts raise and what effect will each have on Renato's eligibility to naturalize? Discuss.**

Sample Question #9

Cleo is a native and citizen of Atlantis. There are active guerrilla groups in the country. The Zoronos are trying to undermine the current government by blowing up government buildings and transportation centers. Their actions have killed many innocent people. The government has been unable to stop the attacks by the Zoronos.

Cleo was a doctor employed in a government clinic in a rural area of Atlantis. Beginning in 2003, the Zoronos began coming to the clinic seeking medical treatment. Cleo provided general medical care – he cleaned infections, bandaged wounds, and removed bullets from people who were wounded. In addition to the medical care, the Zoronos demanded that Cleo provide them with medical supplies such as bandages, aspirin and antibiotics. They threatened to kill him if he did not do as they wished. Cleo complied with their requests.

The national police were suspicious of Cleo and began appearing at the clinic to interrogate him. They asked him if any Zoronos had been at the clinic for treatment or if he had any contact with the Zoronos. They also asked him to reveal the Zoronos' hiding places. Cleo told them that he treated everyone who came to the clinic and that he did not know where the Zoronos hid. Unhappy with his responses, the police detained him on three occasions between 2003-2004. They accused him of conspiring with the Zoronos and demanded that he reveal the Zoronos' hiding places. While in their custody,

they tortured him by beating and hitting him with sticks and applying burning cigarettes to his body. Twice they held his head under water until he almost drowned.

Cleo entered the U.S. on June 1, 2004 with a B-2 visa for pleasure and did not extend his visa after it expired six months later. Soon after arriving in the U.S., Cleo began having flashbacks from the torture he suffered. He became afraid that he was being followed and spent the first six months in the U.S. at a friend's house, locked inside a room. He went outside only to buy groceries. Since then, he improved somewhat but continues to have flashbacks and panic attacks. He continues to have problems sleeping and eating. Cleo shows you scars on his body from the torture.

Cleo seeks legal advice on August 1, 2005 as to how he may remain in the United States. Political conditions in Atlantis remain the same.

1. **What immigration remedies are available to Cleo, if any? Discuss all remedies and any bars that may apply.**
2. **What are the applications or petitions Cleo should file to apply for these remedies? Where are they filed? Who has jurisdiction to consider his request(s) for relief?**
3. **What type of documentation should Cleo obtain to support his case(s)? What would the documentation help to prove?**

Sample Question #10

Alberto is a native of Mexico born in 1971. Alberto first entered the U.S. in 1983. Alberto's mother, who was born in Sacramento, California, returned to Mexico with her parents as a teenager and has remained there ever since. She married Alberto's father, a citizen of Mexico, in 1970. Alberto's father immigrated to the U.S. in 1973 and a few years later obtained a divorce from Alberto's mother. Alberto's mother later married Alberto's stepfather, Samuel, when Alberto was only eight years old.

Alberto's mother and stepfather also eventually divorced, but subsequently Alberto moved in with his stepfather, Samuel. In 1983, Alberto and his stepfather entered the U.S. without inspection and remained. Alberto's stepfather worked in the fields and continued to care for Alberto, who lived with him until Alberto graduated from high school. Samuel applied for legalization under the amnesty program in 1987 and became a permanent resident in 1990. Samuel filed an application for naturalization last year and hopes to be interviewed and sworn in very soon.

Alberto was arrested and convicted in juvenile court in 1986 for shoplifting. In 1989, Alberto was convicted as an

adult for receiving stolen property, for which he received a two year suspended sentence. In 1994, Alberto went to Mexico to see his family. Alberto returned to the U.S. without inspection through the border near San Ysidro three weeks later.

Alberto wishes to remain in the U.S.

- A. **Discuss in detail, and in the alternative, all the possible affirmative immigration benefits and remedies which might be available for Alberto. Include the basis for eligibility and requirements for each such benefit or remedy.**

- B. **Describe any grounds of inadmissibility and/or deportability which might apply to Alberto, and any means to overcome such grounds, including statutory eligibility and requirements.**

Sample Question #11

Dr. Robert Huerto, a native of the Philippines, was employed in H-1B status as a pediatrician for Twin Cities Medical Group in St. Paul, Minnesota. In 2002, Twin Cities applied for a labor certification for Dr. Huerto, which was approved early in 2003. The prevailing wage in the application was \$120,000. On April 1, 2003, Twin Cities submitted an immigrant visa petition (form I-140) on behalf of Dr. Huerto. Simultaneously, he applied for adjustment of status (form I-485). Both of these applications were filed with the Nebraska Service Center. Dr. Huerto's wife and his children, Danny, age 20, and Bobby, age 17, reside in the Philippines.

On August 1, 2003, Dr. Huerto terminated his employment and took a job as a pediatrician in Bakersfield, California. In 2004, his net income rose to \$200,000.

The CIS approved the visa petition on November 1, 2003. However, upset about Dr. Huerto's leaving for California, Twin Cities Medical Group wrote a letter to the CIS on December 1, 2003 withdrawing its visa petition on his behalf.

On March 1, 2005, the Nebraska Service Center mailed a Request for Evidence to Dr. Huerto requesting copies of his last two pay checks and his income tax returns for 2003 and 2004.

1. **Does Dr. Huerto's change of employment and/or the withdrawal of the visa petition submitted on his behalf render him ineligible to adjust his status? Discuss.**

2. **If Dr. Huerto adjusts his status, can his wife and Bobby obtain immigrant visas to follow to join him? Discuss.**

3. **Is Danny eligible to follow-to-join his father in the U.S.? If not, is there any other possible method for him to immigrate based upon these facts? Discuss.**

Sample Question #12

Lakshmi Kaur, a citizen of India, retained Attorney Jones and showed him an asylum application, an asylum statement, and a 10-page hearing transcript, including the Immigration Judge's (IJ) oral asylum denial. She also showed him a notice from the BIA stating that Lakshmi's brief is due in 30 days.

Attorney Jones interviewed Lakshmi and learned the following facts:

Lakshmi left India and flew to Los Angeles. During inspection by INS, she presented her birth certificate and journalist credentials. She requested asylum. The INS initiated removal proceedings, and paroled Lakshmi into the U.S. Several weeks later, she saw an ad in a local Hindi newspaper for "Attorney Smith, Immigration Specialist." She called his office and made an appointment.

Lakshmi went to see Smith and, during a 30-minute meeting, Smith told her that he was an experienced human rights lawyer and an immigration specialist. Lakshmi told him the reasons she left India and the reasons she feared returning. At the end of the meeting, she paid him the amount he asked for, which was \$5,000. He gave her a cash receipt signed "Attorney Smith." Before leaving, he had her sign a blank form and she gave him the following statement she had prepared.

Statement

I stood up for young women in my country because they are powerless. I wrote many articles about bride burning and they were published in the newspaper in my country. As a result, I received phone and written threats from religious fanatics. However, I did not let the threats stop me because I felt it was my duty to expose the dangers to young women before it is too late. Women are killed in India for insufficient dowries or if they are considered impure. This murder must stop.

The police had come to my home a number of times to tell me that they received complaints about my writing.

At least one of the police was himself a religious fundamentalist. One day, this officer came to my home. He pushed past me and came through the door, whereupon he raped me at knife-point and did other obscene things. He told me that if I told anyone I would be dead.

I was terrified after this. I contacted an agent and traveled to the U.S.

Smith went to a master calendar hearing with Lakhshmi and was given a date by the judge to file her asylum application. Right afterward, Smith had a meeting with Lakhshmi in the coffee shop on the first floor of the courthouse. He asked her to sign a blank asylum application, which she did.

As the date to return to court grew near, Lakhshmi began to call Smith. He did not return her calls. When they finally went to court, Lakhshmi asked to see what Smith was going to file. He showed her the application and the statement she had given to him. He told her that he did not have her review it because he had attached her own statement and she knew what it said. She asked him what else he planned to file. He said he needed nothing else because her case was very strong. "Judges don't like a lot of documents," he said.

After the hearing, Smith told Lakhshmi to call him a week before the final hearing date to make an appointment to come in. She followed his instructions, calling him repeatedly one week before the court date. When she finally reached him, he assured her that he would not need to meet with her before the hearing because she was well-spoken. He told her to make sure that she knew exactly what her statement said, and to be prepared to restate it exactly as written.

During the hearing, the IJ asked Lakhshmi why she had not submitted any articles she had authored, her journalist credentials, or any other proofs. She told the IJ that her attorney told her that articles were not necessary. Attorney Smith interrupted her and told the IJ that he told her to get articles but she failed to get any. After a brief hearing, the IJ denied the case on credibility grounds. Lakhshmi filed a timely notice of appeal pro se.

- 1. What ethical issues have been raised by Smith's actions during his representation of Lakhshmi? Discuss.**
- 2. In light of Smith's prior representation, what remedy or remedies should Jones pursue on Lakhshmi's behalf? Discuss.**
- 3. If the BIA had dismissed Lakhshmi's appeal, what procedures if any, are available? Discuss.**