U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW
IMMIGRATION COURT

(b) (6)

In the Matter of:
(b) (6)

APPLICANT

Case No: (b) (6)

IN EXCLUSION PROCEEDINGS

ORDER OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE

After considering the facts and circumstances of this case and as there is no opposition from the parties, it is HEREBY ORDERED that these proceedings be terminated with / without prejudice.

NTA dated: Apr 19, 1993.

Reason for Termination: RESPONDENT WAS GRANTED ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS BY USCIS

GABRIEL C. VIDELA
Immigration Judge
Date: Jul 9, 2010

Appeal Waived/Reserved by A/I: NO APPEAL
Appeal Due Date: _

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
THIS DOCUMENT WAS SERVED BY: MAIL (M) PERSONAL SERVICE (P)
TO: [X] ALIEN [ ] ALIEN c/o Custodial Officer [ ] Alien's ATT/REP [X] DHS
DATE: 7-9-10 BY: COURT STAFF
Attachments: [ ] EOIR-33 [ ] EOIR-28 [ ] Legal Services List [ ] Other

Form EOIR 35 - 6T (Termination)

U.S. Department of Justice
Executive Office for Immigration Review

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals

File: (b) (6) Date:

In re (b) (6)

IN EXCLUSION PROCEEDINGS

APR 18 2007

APPEAL

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Waisim M. Cheung, Esquire

CHARGE:

Notice: Sec. 212(a)(7)(A)(i)(I), I&N Act [8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(7)(A)(i)(I)] - Immigrant - no valid immigrant visa or entry document

212(a)(6)(C)(i), I&N Act [8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i)] - Fraud or willful misrepresentation of material fact

APPLICATION: Asylum; withholding of exclusion; protection under the Convention Against Torture

ORDER:

PER CURIAM. This case was last before us on November 8, 2002, when we summarily affirmed, without opinion, the results of the Immigration Judge's decision denying the applicant's application for asylum and withholding of exclusion, and his request for protection under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). The matter is now before us pursuant to the (b) (6) decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the (b) (6) The court rejected many of the reasons given by the Immigration Judge for finding the applicant not credible, and concluded that it could not determine with confidence that the same decision would be made absent the Immigration Judge errors. It therefore remanded the case. In view of the court's decision, we find that a remand to the Immigration Judge is necessary. Accordingly, the record is remanded to the Immigration Judge for further proceedings consistent with the court's decision.

FOR THE BOARD

CM