

American ideals, Universal values,

Executive Office for Immigration Review U.S. Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530

May 13, 2019

REJECTED "FACT SHEET"

NOTICE TO EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW (EOIR)

This notice is to inform you that the "fact sheet" you published in May 2019 is being rejected for the reasons given below. *In adjudicating cases, please refer to the Constitution, Immigration and Nationality Act, and Code of Federal Regulations to ensure due process in all cases.*

<u>Documents being rejected: "Myths vs Facts about Immigration Proceedings"</u>

- Improper Role for an Impartial Adjudicator: The role of EOIR is "to adjudicate immigration cases by fairly, expeditiously, and uniformly interpreting and administering the Nation's immigration laws"—not to produce "fact sheets" skewed against individuals appearing before the agency's immigration judges, who are not independent federal judges but employees of the Department of Justice who report to the Attorney General.
- Appearance of Bias: An independent court would not publish a "fact sheet" on a group of petitioners that insinuates their cases lack merit and minimizes the importance of due process. Yet EOIR has done just that—suggesting that many asylum applications lack merit, characterizing legal orientation programs which provide crucial information to unrepresented immigrants as dragging out proceedings and using up financial resources, and defending the use of video-teleconferencing hearings in the face of legitimate due process concerns.
- Incorrect "Facts": EOIR's "fact sheet" contains numerous distorted claims about asylum adjudication, including contentions Human Rights First previously debunked. In reality:
 - Between fiscal years 2008 and 2018, immigration judges on average approved over
 40 percent of asylum applications according to figures from the <u>Department of Justice</u>.
 - Many asylum seekers are unable even to file applications because they cannot find attorneys to assist them in filling out the 12-page form in English, filing it with the immigration court, or serving a copy on the government's attorney.
 - Asylum seekers with attorneys were four times more likely to win asylum than those appearing in immigration court pro se in 2018 according to data from Syracuse University TRAC. A study by the Government Accountability Office confirms that legal representation has a "significant effect on the outcome of [asylum] application[s]."
 - Asylum applicants overwhelming attend court hearings. A 15-year <u>study</u> by the American Immigration Council found that 96 percent of asylum-seeking families released from detention attended all of their immigration court hearings.



EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW

MYTHS vs FACTS ABOU IMMIGRATION PROCEEDING.

MAY 20

1. MYTH: Most tiens to claim a fear of persecution in expedited removal

proceeds. shave meritorious asylum claims.

FACT: Out of every 100 credible fear claims, on average, only about 12

result in a grant of asylum by an immigration judge.

2. Most aliens who claim a credible fear of persecution are asylum.

seekers.

FACT: On average, at Past half of aliens with make a credible lear claim

and are subsequently placed in removal occedings to not actually

apply for asylum.

3. MYTH: There is wide discremely an asylum graft rates across all

immigration courts.

FACT: The median a dual grant rate for all immigration courts is eleven

percent (1%) Eighty percent (80%) of immigration courts, 50 out of 62, have a grant rate of twenty-one percent (21%) or lower. Only 12 out of 62 courts have grant rates more than ten percent (10%) above the medical grant rate. Only 1 out of 62 courts has a grant rate

above fifty pacent (50%).

4. MYTH: F w aliens fail to attend their immigration court proceedings.

FACT: Forty-four percent (44%) of all non-detained removal cases end with

an in absentia order of removal due to an alien's failure to attend a

scheduled immigration court hearing.