UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW
IMMIGRATION COURT – (b) (6)

In the Matter of:	NON-DETAINED
(b) (6)	File No.: (b) (6)
In Removal Proceedings	Next Hearing Date: December 16, 2013 Immigration Judge: Geisse

ORDER OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE

Upon consideration of the Unopposed Motion to Administratively Close Proceedings, the Court states the following:

1. The parties have agreed to administrative closure of the instant proceedings.

2. Other: _____.

THEREFORE, it is HEREBY ORDERED that the motion be:

[ ] **GRANTED.** These proceedings are hereby administratively closed upon the joint consent and motion of the parties. Proceedings may be recalendared at any time upon either party's motion, and this order does not constitute a final judgment rendered on the merits of these proceedings.

[ ] **DENIED.** _____

May 2, 2013
IJ Geisse

Date: 5-2-13

Certificate of Service

This document was served by: [ ] Mail [ ] Personal Service
To: [ ] Alien [ ] Alien c/o Custodial Officer [ ] Alien's Atty/Rep [ ] DHS

Date: 5-2-13 By: Court Staff _____

File: (b) (6)

Date: JUN 29 2011

In re: (b) (6)

IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS

APPEAL

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Anoop Prasad, Esquire

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Daryl T. Eremin
Senior Attorney

APPLICATION: Asylum; withholding of removal; Convention Against Torture

This case is before the Board pursuant to a (b) (6) order of the United States Court of Appeals for the (b) (6) *v. Holder*, (b) (6) The Department of Homeland Security has moved to remand the record to the Immigration Judge in light of the (b) (6) (b) (6) order, and the Board's recent decision in *Matter of A-G-G-*, 25 I&N Dec. 486 (BIA 2011) (setting out the framework for making a firm resettlement determination). The respondent replies that she qualifies for an exception to the firm resettlement bar, and she alternatively requests that the record be remanded to the Immigration Judge to make factual findings regarding firm resettlement. In view of the decision of the Ninth Circuit, our recent decision in *Matter of A-G-G-*, *supra*, and the positions of the parties, we will remand the record to the Immigration Judge for further consideration of the issues presented in this case. Accordingly, the following orders will be entered.

ORDER: The Board's March 10, 2006, decision is vacated insofar as it addresses the issue of firm resettlement.[1]

FURTHER ORDER: The record is remanded to the Immigration Judge for further proceedings not inconsistent with the (b) (6) order and the entry of a new decision.

Ellen Rebowitz
FOR THE BOARD

[1] The (b) (6) found that the Immigration Judge properly pretermitted the respondent's applications for withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture insofar as Burma is not the proposed country of removal.