

No. 21-7

---

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

MERRICK B. GARLAND, ATTORNEY GENERAL, ET AL.,  
*Petitioners,*

*v.*

LEYMIS CAROLINA VELASQUEZ, ET AL.,  
*Respondents.*

---

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

---

**BRIEF FOR THE RESPONDENTS**

---

David Lee Wilson  
*Counsel of Record*  
WILSON LAW GROUP  
3019 Minnehaha Ave  
Minneapolis, MN 55406  
(612) 436-7100  
dwilson@wilsonlg.com  
*Counsel for Respondents*

---

## **QUESTION PRESENTED**

Whether a grant of temporary protected status under 8 U.S.C. 1254a(f)(4) must be treated as an admission into the United States for purposes of a foreign national's application for adjustment to lawful permanent resident status under 8 U.S.C. 1255.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
QUESTION PRESENTED .....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
OPINIONS AND ORDERS BELOW .....	2
JURISDICTION .....	2
STATEMENT .....	2
A. Statutory Background.....	2
B. Factual and Procedural Background.....	3
C. Intervening Case Law .....	3
ARGUMENT .....	3
CONCLUSION .....	4

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Flores v. United States Citizenship and Immigration</i> <i>Servs.</i> , 718 F.3d 548 (6th Cir. 2013) .....	1
<i>Lawrence v. Chater</i> , 516 U.S. 163 (1996) .....	4
<i>Leymis V. v. Whitaker</i> , 355 F. Supp. 3d 779 (D. Minn. 2018).....	2
<i>Melgar v. Barr</i> , 379 F. Supp. 3d 783 (D. Minn. 2019) .....	2
<i>Nolasco v. Crockett</i> , 978 F.3d 955 (5th Cir. 2020).....	1
<i>Ramirez v. Brown</i> , 852 F.3d 954 (9th Cir. 2017) .....	1
<i>Sanchez v. Mayorkas</i> , 141 S. Ct. 1809 (2021) ...	1, 3, 4
<i>Sanchez v. Secretary U. S. Dept. of Homeland</i> <i>Security</i> , 967 F.3d 242 (3rd Cir. 2020).....	1
<i>Serrano v. United States Atty. Gen.</i> , 655 F.3d 1260 (11th Cir. 2011).....	1
<i>Velasquez v. Barr</i> , 979 F.3d 572 (8th Cir. 2020) ..	1, 2, 3, 4
<i>Wellons v. Hall</i> , 558 U.S. 220 (2010) .....	4

### Statutes

28 U.S.C. 1254(1) .....	2
8 U.S.C. 1254a(f)(4) .....	i
8 U.S.C. 1255.....	i, 3

## INTRODUCTION

Prior to June 7, 2021, Circuit Courts were divided as to whether a grant of Temporary Protected Status rendered an alien “inspected and admitted” for the purposes of adjustment of status. The Sixth, Eighth, and Ninth Circuits had held that a grant of Temporary Protected Status did constitute an inspection and admission for the purposes of adjustment of status,<sup>1</sup> while the Third, Fifth, and Eleventh Circuits held the opposite view.<sup>2</sup>

On June 7, 2021, this Court decided *Sanchez v. Mayorkas*, 141 S. Ct. 1809 (2021). There, this Court affirmed the Third Circuit’s ruling and held “[t]he TPS program gives foreign nationals nonimmigrant status, but it does not admit them. So the conferral of TPS does not make an unlawful entrant (like Sanchez) eligible under § 1255 for adjustment to LPR status.” *Id.* at 1812–13. This resolved the split, thereby “abrogating *Velasquez v. Barr*, 979 F. 3d 572 [.]” *Id.* at 1809.

Thus, the merits of this case have been decided and there is simply no basis in law or fact today for contesting the petition.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Flores v. United States Citizenship and Immigration Servs.*, 718 F.3d 548 (6th Cir. 2013); *Velasquez v. Barr*, 979 F.3d 572 (8th Cir. 2020); *Ramirez v. Brown*, 852 F.3d 954 (9th Cir. 2017).

<sup>2</sup> *Sanchez v. Secretary U. S. Dept. of Homeland Security*, 967 F.3d 242 (3rd Cir. 2020); *Nolasco v. Crockett*, 978 F.3d 955 (5th Cir. 2020); *Serrano v. United States Atty. Gen.*, 655 F.3d 1260 (11th Cir. 2011) (per curiam) with

## OPINIONS AND ORDERS BELOW

The opinion of the court of appeals in *Velasquez v. Barr* is reported at 979 F.3d 572 (8th Cir. 2020). The decisions of the District Court in *Leymis V. v. Whitaker* is reported at 355 F. Supp. 3d 779 (D. Minn. 2018). The decisions of the District Court in *Melgar v. Barr* is reported at 379 F. Supp. 3d 783 (D. Minn. 2019). These cases were consolidated on appeal in *Velasquez v. Barr*, 979 F.3d 572 (8th Cir. 2020).

Decisions from the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services are unreported. The agency's decision on Leymis Velasquez's application is reproduced at Pet. App. D 53a-56a. The agency's decision on Sandra Ortiz's application is reproduced at Pet. App. D 57a-60a. The agency's decision on Gilma Melgar's application is reproduced at Pet. App. D 61a-64a. The agency's decision on Sandra Ortiz's application is reproduced at Pet. App. D 68a-a.

## JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on October 27, 2020. The petition for a writ of certiorari was filed on July 1, 2021. The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

## STATEMENT

### A. Statutory Background

Respondents are content with Petitioner's recitation of the statutory and regulatory framework.

## **B. Factual and Procedural Background**

Respondents are content with Petitioner’s recitation of the factual and procedural history.

## **C. Intervening Case Law**

On June 7, 2021, this Court decided *Sanchez v. Mayorkas*, 141 S. Ct. 1809 (2021). It held “[t]he TPS program gives foreign nationals nonimmigrant status, but it does not admit them. So the conferral of TPS does not make an unlawful entrant (like Sanchez) eligible under § 1255 for adjustment to LPR status.” *Id.* at 1812–13. This “abrogate[ed] *Velasquez v. Barr*, 979 F. 3d 572[.]” *Id.* at 1809.

## **ARGUMENT**

This Court addressed and decided the issue at the heart of this case. *See Sanchez v. Mayorkas*, 141 S. Ct. 1809, 1811 (2021) (“The question here is whether the conferral of TPS enables him to obtain LPR status despite his unlawful entry.”). The Court concluded: “[a] TPS recipient who entered the United States unlawfully is not eligible under § 1255 for LPR status merely by dint of his TPS.” *Id.* at 1810.

That is the issue Petitioners raised here. *See* Pet. I (“Whether, under 8 U.S.C. 1254a(f )(4), a grant of temporary protected status must be treated as an admission into the United States for purposes of a foreign national’s application for adjustment to lawful permanent resident status under 8 U.S.C. 1255.”).

Petitioners are correct that “A GVR is appropriate when ‘intervening developments ... reveal a reasonable probability that the decision below rests upon a premise that the lower court would reject if given the opportunity for further consideration, and where it appears that such a redetermination may determine the ultimate outcome’ of the matter.” *Wellons v. Hall*, 558 U.S. 220, 225 (2010) (citing *Lawrence v. Chater*, 516 U.S. 163, 167 (1996) (per curiam)).

The decision rendered by the Eighth Circuit was premised on the legal issue decided in *Sanchez. Compare Velasquez*, 979 F.3d at 575, *with Sanchez*, 141 S. Ct. at 1811. There are no meaningful factual differences between the cases. *Compare Velasquez*, 979 F.3d at 575, *with Sanchez*, 141 S. Ct. at 1813. Thus, Petitioners are correct “that the decision below rests upon a premise that the lower court would reject if given the opportunity for further consideration.” *Lawrence*, 516 U.S. at 167 (1996).

There is simply no basis in law or fact today for contesting the petition.

## CONCLUSION

Respondents do not contest Petitioner’s request.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ David L. Wilson

David Lee Wilson

Counsel of Record

WILSON LAW GROUP

3019 Minnehaha Ave



5

Minneapolis, MN 55406  
(612) 436-7100  
dwilson@wilsonlg.com