



Detail

Complaint Number: 762

Immigration Judge: (b)(6)

Complaint Received Date: 05/28/13

Current ACIJ
Santoro, Christopher A.

Base City
(b) (6)

Status
CLOSED

Final Action
Complaint dismissed due to the
complainant's failure to state a
claim

Final Action Date
05/28/13

Past ACJIS:

A-Numbers(s)	Complaint Nature(s)	Complaint Source(s)
(b)(6)	Other: effects of U.S. Immigration Law	Respondent (b) (6)
		(b) (6)

Complaint Narrative: Jude's failure to understand or take into account the long-term economic effects of deportation. (secondary complaint was that she was wrongfully convicted in state court ten years ago.)

Complaint History

05/28/13	ACIJ reviews the email; verifies matter is pending with the BIA
05/28/13	Complaint dismissed due to the complainant's failure to state a claim
06/07/13	Database entry created

Sep 11, 2013

1 of 1

Moutinho, Deborah (EOIR)

From: Santoro, Christopher A (EOIR)
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2013 8:38 AM
To: Moutinho, Deborah (EOIR)
Cc: Keller, Mary Beth (EOIR)
Subject: FW: letter to chief immigration judge
Attachments: Ltr05252013.pdf

Deborah,

(b) (5)

Thanks!

Christopher A. Santoro
Assistant Chief Immigration Judge

From: IJConduct, EOIR (EOIR)
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2013 8:23 AM
To: Santoro, Christopher A (EOIR)
Cc: Keller, Mary Beth (EOIR)
Subject: FW: letter to chief immigration judge

Good Morning

Please see the attached complaint concerning IJ (b) (6) in (b) (6)

Thank you
Deborah

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Saturday, May 25, 2013 4:27 PM
To: IJConduct, EOIR (EOIR)
Subject: letter to chief immigration judge

Please receive this letter for the Chief Immigration Judge

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

May 25, 2013

Chief Immigration Judge
Executive Office of Immigration Review
5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1902
Fall Church, VA, 22041
United States of America

RE: A(b) (6)

Your Honor,

Hereby I take the liberty to bring the following practices to your attention. As I believe that I am not the only person who encounters this type of practices, I truly ask that notification is taken about this letter, and that immigration judges nation wide are informed about the long term consequences of deportation: it is a life long sentence and business crime.

In 2004 my motion for cancellation of removal was denied (January 28, 2004, Judge(b) (6) Immigration Court (b) (6) despite the fact that I was ore than 7 years in the United States, more than 5 years permanent resident and had not been convicted of an aggravated felony.

I had been convicted of a misdemeanor stalking without evidence or offense. I went to request return of my papers I was missing from my office and was charged with trespassing and stalking. I never putted a person in reasonable fear of death, criminal sexual assault of bodily injury (b) (6) This conviction was without any grounds. Anyway there was no reason for deportation at all.

I initially continued my own company in clinical research in the (b) (6) but could not travel to the United States for attendance of conferences. In 2010 first again assume a function for a biopharmaceutical company with headquarters in the US and the (b) (6) affiliate requested I travel to the conference for scientific and business meetings. A visa was denied. It costed the company at the time EU 3000,- and me my next contract. Subsequently I received an invitation to interview for a position at a biopharmaceutical company in (b) (6) (b) (6) but when I mentioned I needed a visa, the company was not interested to support a future function; this was a second interference with work and income. Subsequently I worked for an international company and could circumvent travel to the US for the projects in the US

I had been assigned to. I never mentioned I had been deported or needed a visa; had I worked longer for this company, I would have had the need to travel to the United States. Recently I assume a function at an international company's headquarters in (b) (6) with corporate headquarters in the United States. Within the first 14 days they asked me to travel to the United States at the end of May this year to attend a conference and scientific and business meetings. I had to inform I needed a visa. The fact that I needed a visa led to immediate termination of my function. I had already rented an apartment but not yet moved. I lost EU 3,500.- in resources to the service agent and the deposit as well as my function. Once more my work and income were severely compromised.

Any function with international companies is not possible as I have to travel to the United States for my work and the fact that I have been deported requires me to ask a visa; apart from that there is a 10 years bar.

The situation in the United States at the time has already costed me thousands of dollars. The justice system does not realize the long term impact of its unjust practices for defendants and respondents. It is time that judges are informed about these consequences as unjust practice is a business crime for the defendant/respondent, it is life long interference with work and income and pension and impoverishment. There are almost no functions in my situation that do not require travel to the United States.

Once more I really emphasize that this type of consequences is brought to Immigration Judges nation wide. They never receive long term feedback on their justice practices and I believe it is utmost important they are informed about these longterm consequences.

I did address this straight with the Immigration Court; there is no law that made late reopening possible, more over it was mentioned that work is not a cognible reason for travel to the United States. It is time for a change, as it is not acceptable that work, income and pension are compromised by justice practices years ago.

Thank you for your attention to this letter.

(b) (6)

cc: Juan P. Osuna, Director EOIR

Immigration Judge Complaint Intake Form

HQ Use Only:
 complaint #: _____
 source: first / subsequent

Date Received at OCIJ: May 28, 2013

complaint source type	
<input type="checkbox"/> anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> respondent's attorney <input type="checkbox"/> third party (e.g., relative, uninterested attorney, courtroom observer, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> BIA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> respondent <input type="checkbox"/> OIL <input type="checkbox"/> ___ Circuit <input type="checkbox"/> EOIR <input type="checkbox"/> OPR <input type="checkbox"/> DHS <input type="checkbox"/> OIG <input type="checkbox"/> Main Justice <input type="checkbox"/> media
complaint receipt method	
<input type="checkbox"/> letter <input type="checkbox"/> fax	<input type="checkbox"/> IJC memo (BIA) <input type="checkbox"/> unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> email <input type="checkbox"/> phone (incl. voicemail) <input type="checkbox"/> in-person <input type="checkbox"/> other: _____
date of complaint source (i.e., date on letter, date of appellate body's decision)	complaint source contact information
5/25/2013	name: _____ address: _____ email: _____ phone: _____ fax: _____
Additional complaint source details (i.e., DHS component, media outlet, third party details, A-number)	(b) (6)
(b) (6)	

IJ name	base city	ACIJ
(b) (6)		Santoro
relevant A-number(s)	date of incident	
(b) (6)	1/28/2004	
allegations		
Judge's failure to understand or take into account the long-term economic effects of deportation. (Secondary complaint was that she was wrongfully convicted in state court ten years ago.)		
nature of complaint		
<input type="checkbox"/> in-court conduct <input type="checkbox"/> incapacity	<input type="checkbox"/> out-of-court conduct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> other: effects of U.S. immigration law	<input type="checkbox"/> due process <input type="checkbox"/> bias <input type="checkbox"/> legal <input type="checkbox"/> criminal

EOIR FOIA Processing (EOIR)

From: Santoro, Christopher A (EOIR)
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2013 9:51 AM
To: IJConduct, EOIR (EOIR)
Cc: Keller, Mary Beth (EOIR)
Subject: Response to (b) (6)
Attachments: (b) (6).pdf

(b) (6)

Please see the attached response to your recent letter. Thank you.

Christopher A. Santoro
Assistant Chief Immigration Judge



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

Office of the Chief Immigration Judge

5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 2500
Falls Church, Virginia 22041

May 28, 2013

(b) (6)

Dear **(b) (6)**

We received your letter dated May 25, 2013 concerning your January 28, 2004 hearing in the Arlington Immigration Court. Our records indicate that you have an appeal of a recent decision in your case pending before the Board of Immigration Appeals. Therefore, as this matter is currently under judicial review, we cannot comment on the facts of your case.

With regard to your concerns about whether immigration judges understand the consequences of their decisions, we assure you that they do. Nevertheless, judges are required to apply the laws enacted by the Congress of the United States. Thank you for bringing your concerns to our attention.

Christopher A. Santoro
Assistant Chief Immigration Judge