

Chapter 1 : How U.S. immigration laws and rules have changed through history | Pew Research Center

The Trump administration is expanding enforcement of U.S. immigration laws that could result in immediate deportation for millions of undocumented migrants. The Department of Homeland Security.

The reality is more complicated, and the blame cannot be placed squarely on Democrats. In a call with reporters, White House top adviser Stephen Miller made a series of assertions in his argument that Congress should pass laws sought by the administration on illegal immigration, particularly migration by families and children. With just over 16,000 Border Patrol agents stationed at the southern border, that comes out to roughly two-and-a-half apprehensions per agent per month. In most every year tracked except for last year, crossings tend to trend upwards in the spring, as weather for the journey improves. The numbers for are still consistent with Obama administration years -- slightly below fiscal years and but slightly above and The crossings in April of this year were more than triple April , but that comparison is distorted, as crossings last April were at lower levels unseen in modern history before they started to pick up and stabilize more in line with recent years. In fiscal year , there were just over , apprehensions of people crossing the border illegally -- the lowest ever recorded, DHS said at the time, touting it as a year low. The administration has complained in particular about the greater share of these crossings that involve children and family units, which have picked up in recent years, but are not inconsistent with the last few years of the Obama administration. The Trump administration has been trying to tighten the rights of asylum seekers, a policy under international law and US law that says non-citizens who can show they are likely to be persecuted in their home countries can legally stay in the US. If an immigrant tells an officer at the border that they fear persecution, they are given a "credible fear" test to determine if they may have a claim. Fact check Because of a massive backlog in the immigration courts, it can take years for those cases to work their way to completion, and many immigrants are given the ability to work and live in the US in the meantime, putting down roots. The funding for immigration courts and judges has increased only modestly over the years as funding and resources for enforcement have increased dramatically. The administration points to the much lower percent of asylum claims that are eventually granted as a sign that there are too many asylum claims. But statistical analyses have also shown that immigrants are far more likely to appear in court and win their cases when they have legal representation, something they are not guaranteed or provided by the government. Both created protections for children in immigration custody. Unaccompanied minors from non-neighboring countries must be turned over to the Department of Health and Human Services for resettlement within three days of arrest, as opposed to being held in lengthy detention, and children with their families also cannot be held in lengthy detention. Miller said that because the Flores case prohibits the detention -- essentially jail-like conditions -- of children longer than three weeks, families are almost always released while they await court proceedings that will take much longer and that is a "loophole. Dianne Feinstein, who helped sponsor the original TVPRA in , has strongly pushed back on the labeling of these laws as "loopholes. Studies have found that migration from Central America is largely driven by conditions at home, where poverty, violence and gang activity are extremely high. Until those factors are improved, a Migration Policy Institute study concluded , flows to the US north to the border will continue. A White House-backed bill earlier this year, which included hardline immigration measures, border security and drastic cuts to legal and family-based migration as well as a path to citizenship for certain young undocumented immigrants, got only 39 votes in the Senate, including those of three Democrats. A bipartisan proposal that did not include such hardline measures got 54 votes, including eight Republicans and nearly all Democrats. Republican leadership has consistently told conservatives pushing the bill that it would not have nearly enough Republican votes to pass.

Chapter 2 : Fact checking the Trump administration on immigration - CNNPolitics

Immigration presents courts and administrative agencies tremendous challenges due to a lack of consensus and resources for total enforcement of laws governing entry to and status in the country.

The plaintiffs also referenced the notion of federal preemption and stated that, "The Constitution and the federal immigration laws do not permit the development of a patchwork of state and local immigration policies throughout the country". Federal resources will be taxed and diverted from federal enforcement priorities as a result of the increase in requests for immigration status determination that will flow from Arizona [14] Governor Brewer promised to appeal the ruling, calling it "a temporary bump in the road. The brief supported Arizona. Under the current situation, the States have lost control over their borders and are left to guess at the reality of the law. Additionally, 81 members of the U. Congress filed a Proposed Brief of Amici Curiae. A motion to expedite the normal appeal schedule was also filed. Arizona gave the following reasons for the motion to expedite: An expedited briefing schedule will not unreasonably burden the parties because it is consistent with the expedited briefing schedule Plaintiff-Appellee received for the initial ruling on its Motion for Preliminary Injunction, the issues on appeal are narrower than those the district court addressed and have largely been briefed by the parties, and the parties are well represented with sufficient counsel to brief the issues under the schedule Defendants-Appellants have proposed. On November 1, , the U. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit heard arguments in the case. Noonan wrote in his concurrence: For those sympathetic to immigrants to the United States, it is a challenge and a chilling foretaste of what other states might attempt. Supreme Court rather than request a hearing en banc before the Ninth Circuit; [25] that appeal was filed on August 10, The court heard oral arguments for this case on April 25, However, Justice Kennedy specified in the majority opinion that state police may not detain the individual for a prolonged amount of time for not carrying immigration documents; and that cases of racial profiling are allowed to proceed through the courts, if such cases happen to arise later on. Section 3 of S. The majority opinion analyzed the four provisions in question within the framework of preemption , derived from the Supremacy Clause , requiring that federal law will prevail when state and federal laws conflict. The Court held that "the Federal Government has occupied the field of alien registration," meaning that all state action, "even complementary state regulation is impermissible. In contrast to Section 3, the criminal provisions of Section 5 had no direct counterpart under federal law, leading the Court to apply the "ordinary principles of preemption" rather than the doctrine of field preemption. Under those principles, Section 5 stood as an obstacle to the objectives of Congress of not imposing "criminal penalties on aliens who seek or engage in unauthorized employment. Section 6 of S. The provisions at issue required Arizona officers to make a "reasonable attempt" to determine the immigration status of any person stopped, detained, or arrested on a legitimate basis if "reasonable suspicion" existed that the person is an alien and is unlawfully present in the United States. Listing several examples, Justice Kennedy wrote that Section 2 B "likely would survive preemption" if it is interpreted only to require state officers to conduct a status check "during the course of an authorized, lawful detention or after a detainee has been released. That power to exclude has long been recognized as inherent in sovereignty. Justice Thomas concluded that none of the challenged sections presented an actual conflict with federal law, so preemption doctrine did not apply. And whatever little authority they have gained is consistent with federal law.

Chapter 3 : Administrative law - Wikipedia

The USCIS Legal Resources section provides information on laws, regulations and other authorities, including interpretations and policies that USCIS and other immigration-related components of the Department of Homeland Security follow. The mission of the USCIS Office of Chief Counsel (OCC) is to.

The Republican-controlled Arizona legislature passed the controversial law to try to stem the flood of thousands of illegal immigrants who cross its border from Mexico and to cut down on drug trafficking and other crimes in the area. The lawsuit is part of a broader approach by President Barack Obama to deal with the Attorney General Eric Holder, said in a statement. The legal action, filed while Congress was on a week-long break, is a political gamble by the administration as a Pew Research Center poll showed 59 percent of people approve of the Arizona crackdown. And the legal fight also comes at a critical juncture, four months ahead of the mid-term congressional elections, and the Hispanic community has been a major voting bloc that typically has sided with Democrats but Republicans have tried to woo. The Justice Department filed the lawsuit in federal court in Arizona and asked for an injunction to prevent the law from taking effect on July Arizona Governor Jan Brewer condemned the lawsuit as a waste of taxpayer funds and said the state law was needed because the federal government had not done its job. Brewer vowed to fight the lawsuit and said she had set up a legal defense fund to cover legal fees stemming from the federal challenge and other lawsuits. Constitution gave the federal government sole authority over immigration matters. Some immigration provisions provide exceptions to illegal immigrants on humanitarian grounds, whether the individuals were fleeing natural disasters or political persecution, the Justice Department added. The lawsuit drew fierce criticism from Russell Pearce, the Arizona state legislator who authored the law. A Justice Department official said that if the court refused an injunction, the federal government would closely monitor enforcement of the Arizona law for possible illegal racial profiling or other civil rights violations. Obama has warned that the Arizona law could lead to a patchwork of different laws passed by the various U. Obama has backed allowing undocumented immigrants in good standing to pay a fine, learn English and become citizens. He also has supported tightening border security and clamping down on employers that hire undocumented workers. But opposing Republicans have said that border security must be significantly improved before dealing with the millions of illegal immigrants, many of them Hispanics, in the country. The suit came after the U. Supreme Court said last week that it would decide whether another Arizona law that punishes employers who knowingly hire illegal immigrants infringed on federal immigration powers. The case is United States of America v. State of Arizona et al; Case No. District Court for the District of Arizona.

Chapter 4 : NPR Choice page

The United States began regulating immigration soon after it won independence from Great Britain, and the laws since enacted have reflected the politics and migrant flows of the times. We looked at key immigration laws from to

Administrative court Unlike most common-law jurisdictions, the majority of civil law jurisdictions have specialized courts or sections to deal with administrative cases which, as a rule, will apply procedural rules specifically designed for such cases and different from that applied in private-law proceedings, such as contract or tort claims. Brazil[edit] In Brazil, unlike most Civil-law jurisdictions, there is no specialized court or section to deal with administrative cases. In , a constitutional reform, led by the government of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso , introduced regulatory agencies as a part of the executive branch. Since , Brazilian administrative law has been strongly influenced by the judicial interpretations of the constitutional principles of public administration art. Each Ministry has one or more under-secretary that performs through public services the actual satisfaction of public needs. There is not a single specialized court to deal with actions against the Administrative entities, but instead there are several specialized courts and procedures of review. However, many have argued that the usefulness of these laws is vastly inadequate in terms of controlling government actions, largely because of institutional and systemic obstacles like a weak judiciary, poorly trained judges and lawyers, and corruption. The three regulations have been amended and upgraded into laws. Administrative Compulsory Law was enforced in Administrative Litigation Law was amended in The General Administrative Procedure Law is under way. Special administrative courts include the National Court of Asylum Right as well as military, medical and judicial disciplinary bodies. The French body of administrative law is called "droit administratif". This section needs expansion. You can help by adding to it. June Germany[edit] Administrative law in Germany, called "Verwaltungsrecht" de: It is a part of the public law, which deals with the organization, the tasks and the acting of the public administration. It also contains rules, regulations, orders and decisions created by and related to administrative agencies, such as federal agencies, federal state authorities, urban administrations, but also admission offices and fiscal authorities etc. Administrative law in Germany follows three basic principles. Principle of the legality of the authority, which means that there is no acting against the law and no acting without a law. Principle of legal security, which includes a principle of legal certainty and the principle of nonretroactivity Principle of proportionality, which says that an act of an authority has to be suitable, necessary and appropriate [11] Administrative law in Germany can be divided into general administrative law and special administrative law. General administrative law[edit] The general administration law is basically ruled in the administrative procedures law *Verwaltungsverfahrensgesetz* [VwVfG]. It serves the purpose to ensure a treatment in accordance with the rule of law by the public authority. Furthermore, it contains the regulations for mass processes and expands the legal protection against the authorities. The VwVfG basically applies for the entire public administrative activities of federal agencies as well as federal state authorities, in case of making federal law. It defines the administrative act, the most common form of action in which the public administration occurs against a citizen. It is an official act [15] of an authority [16] in the field of public law [17] to resolve an individual case [18] with effect to the outside. The VwGO is divided into five parts, which are the constitution of the courts, [23] action, remedies and retrial, costs and enforcement¹⁵ and final clauses and temporary arrangements. Therefore, it is necessary to have the existence of a conflict in public law [28] without any constitutional aspects [29] and no assignment to another jurisdiction. Special administrative law[edit] The special administrative law consists of various laws. Each special sector has its own law. There are federal courts with special jurisdiction in the fields of social security law *Bundessozialgericht* and tax law *Bundesfinanzhof*. Its genesis is related to the principle of division of powers of the State. The administrative power, originally called "executive", is to organize resources and people whose function is devolved to achieve the public interest objectives as defined by the law. There is however a single General Administrative Law Act "Algemene wet bestuursrecht" or Awb that applies both to the making of administrative decisions and the judicial review of these decisions in courts. Unlike France or Germany, there are no special administrative

courts of first instance in the Netherlands, but regular courts have an administrative "chamber" which specializes in administrative appeals. The courts of appeal in administrative cases however are specialized depending on the case, but most administrative appeals end up in the judicial section of the Council of State Raad van State. Before going to court, citizens must usually first object to the decision with the administrative body who made it. This is called "bezwaar". This procedure allows for the administrative body to correct possible mistakes themselves and is used to filter cases before going to court. Sometimes, instead of bezwaar, a different system is used called "administratief beroep" administrative appeal. The difference with bezwaar is that administratief beroep is filed with a different administrative body, usually a higher ranking one, than the administrative body that made the primary decision. Administratief beroep is available only if the law on which the primary decision is based specifically provides for it. An example involves objecting to a traffic ticket with the district attorney "officier van justitie" , after which the decision can be appealed in court. In Sweden , there is a system of administrative courts that considers only administrative law cases, and is completely separate from the system of general courts. Migration cases are handled in a two-tier system, effectively within the system general administrative courts. Turkey[edit] In Turkey, the lawsuits against the acts and actions of the national or local governments and public bodies are handled by administrative courts which are the main administrative courts. The decisions of the administrative courts are checked by the Regional Administrative Courts and Council of State.

Chapter 5 : Obama administration sues Arizona over immigration law | Reuters

Trump Administration Tightens Enforcement Of Immigration Law Homeland Security Secretary John Kelly unveiled rules aimed at tougher enforcement of immigration laws. It's a policy shift that puts.

Amends naturalization requirements to extend eligibility to individuals of African nativity or descent. Any Chinese immigrant who resided in the U. The Geary Act extended this law for an additional 10 years and required that Chinese nationals obtain identification papers. Permitted the deportation of any unauthorized immigrants or those who could be excluded from migration based on previous legislation. Made it a federal misdemeanor to bring unauthorized immigrants into the country or aid someone who is entering the U. Established a federal Bureau of Immigration. It is the first U. Required immigrants over the age of 16 to demonstrate basic reading ability in any language. Immigration from Asian countries continued to be barred. Nationality quotas did not apply to countries in the Western Hemisphere, government officials or temporary visitors. Under this law, total annual immigration was capped at , Border Patrol as a federal law enforcement agency to combat illegal immigration and smuggling along the borders between inspection stations. As a result, the law favored migration from northern and western European countries with longer histories of migration to the U. Immigration from Asian countries continued to be barred, and the law added a formal restriction on Japanese immigration. Denied entry to the U. Required employers to pay a wage equal to that paid to U. In effect until In contrast to other quotas, which are based on country of citizenship, the quota for Chinese was based on ancestry. Chinese residents were also eligible to naturalize. As a result, most spots were for immigrants from the United Kingdom, Ireland and Germany. Under this law, political activities, ideology and mental health, among other criteria, served as a basis for exclusion and deportation. This law also created quota preferences for skilled immigrants and family reunification. Immigrants from the Western Hemisphere were exempt from the preference system until No visa cap was placed on the number of immediate family members of U. The Eastern Hemisphere was granted , of the total visas each year with a 20, cap per country. Beginning in , the Western Hemisphere was given , visas annually with no specific country limits. This act extended the refugee delineation to include those fleeing Cambodia and Vietnam and designated funds for the relocation and resettlement of refugees. In , it was amended to include Laotian refugees. This mostly affected Mexico at the time since it was the only Western Hemisphere country that substantially exceeded 20, visas annually. In , an amendment to the law established a worldwide limit of , visas annually. This removed the prior Eastern and Western hemisphere caps. Removes refugees from the immigration preference system, expanding the annual admission for refugees. The removal of refugees from the immigration preference system reduced the annual visa allocation to , Subsequent executive action and legislation for refugees included deportation relief and admission based on region or nationality. Examples include the George H. Creates the H-2A visa for temporary, seasonal agricultural workers. Imposes sanctions on employers who knowingly hire unauthorized workers and increases border enforcement. In , the Reagan administration decided that minor children of parents who were legalized under the law should be protected from deportation. In , the George H. Bush administration decided that all spouses and unmarried children of people who were legalized under the law could apply for permission to remain in the country and receive work permits. This policy was formalized in the Immigration Act of It also creates H-1B visas for highly skilled temporary workers and H-2B for seasonal, non-agricultural workers and revises the grounds for exclusion and deportation, particularly those based on political and ideological grounds. Establishes or revises measures for worksite enforcement, to remove criminal and other deportable aliens and to tighten admissions eligibility requirements. Expands restrictions laid out in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act on access to means-tested public assistance programs for new legal permanent residents and unauthorized immigrants. This executive action is on hold as a state challenge works its way through the courts. Click to see additional references In addition to the following references, legislation text was used to develop the timeline.

Chapter 6 : Arizona v. United States - Wikipedia

Current Administration & Immigration - Home > Current Administration & Immigration - When there is a change in the party controlling the White House, we can expect shifts, rollbacks, and some unraveling of existing policies.

A New Era for U. Immigration Posted on By: As the president said in his inaugural speech: Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made to benefit American workers and American families. We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs. Protection will lead to great prosperity and strength. Trump, Inaugural Address Jan. This article describes the primary immigration actions of the administration that impact employers in the United States. EO-1 included, among other things, a day travel restriction on foreign nationals from seven countries Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen , a day restriction on refugee admissions, an indefinite restriction on Syrian refugee admissions The U. Department of Homeland Security DHS immediately took enforcement steps, including detention of individuals from the affected countries upon their arrival in the United States at multiple airports across the nation and refusal of admission to approved refugees, non-immigrant temporary visa holders, and immigrant visa green card holders who were U. In many cases, officials removed these individuals to their countries of origin. Challenging EO-1 In response to these government actions, multiple court actions were filed on January 28, , through February 3, , challenging the legality of the order and requesting emergency stays of the travel restrictions. These actions resulted in some temporary restraining orders prohibiting the detention and removal of foreign travelers with valid and non-immigrant visas. In contrast to the prior executive order, EO-2 included the following specific provisions relevant to the travel ban. Iraq was omitted from the six countries whose nationals would be subject to the day travel ban. The day ban was slated to take effect from March 16 through June 14, The travel ban expressly did not apply to U. District Court for the District of Hawaii issued a nationwide order on March 15, , blocking implementation of EO-2, which was scheduled to commence March District Court for the District of Maryland issued a similar decision, partially blocking implementation of EO-2 by enjoining, nationwide, Section 2 c of EO On May 25, , a divided U. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, sitting en banc, substantially upheld the nationwide preliminary injunction against Section 2 c of EO-2 issued by the District Court of Maryland. On June 26, , the U. Supreme Court announced that it would hear the U. On October 24, , challenges to EO-2 were also dismissed because the March order had expired. The proclamation imposed nationality-based travel restrictions as a result of the worldwide review conducted by the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Security, pursuant to Section 2 b of EO Sudan, which had been included in EO-1 and EO-2, was removed from the list of restricted countries. On October 17, , U. Guidance for Employers Although the latest travel ban has been enjoined, travelers can expect more scrutiny of their visa applications and more intense port of entry questioning. Provide clear and direct communications to their work corps, referring them to reliable sources for the specific parameters of the current vetting procedures. Provide guidance to employees on port admission and customs clearance processes, including ensuring that they carry full paperwork on their visa status or, if they are business travelers, the propriety of their activity e. Advise employees that because devices such as mobile phones, laptop computers, and tablets can be checked for social media activity and other data, archiving confidential data in advance of travel is wise Ensure that their leadership in human Resources HR , global mobility, legal, and security stay informed on further restrictions and port practice developments. The administration has announced and carried out changes to two primary categories to date, the H-1B and L-1 visa programs. The H-1B visa program allows U. The H-1B program is limited to 65, new H-1B visas per year, with an additional allotment of 20, for individuals who have earned a U. New H-1B visa petitions are generally accepted six months in advance of the federal fiscal yearâ€” on about April 1 of each year. The L-1 visa program allows multinational employers to transfer executives and managers, L-1A, or individuals with specialized or advanced knowledge of the enterprise, L-1B, to related U. Qualifying employees must have at least one year of experience working for the global enterprise outside of the United States, with the one year of

experience having been fulfilled during the three years preceding the requested L-1 period of admission. The foreign arm of the company at which they worked may be either a parent, subsidiary, affiliate, or branch, or in the case of a joint venture, the transfer may occur between the joint venture and either partner. As a result of the leak, many employers—including large IT and sourcing companies—became more selective in cases they agreed to file during the H-1B lottery. The administration never issued this order, however, and the FY H-1B lottery was administered precisely as in other years, according to a random selection of petitions filed within the first five working days of April Pre-lottery Suspension of Premium Processing On March 3, , U. On July 24, , the agency lifted the suspension for certain H-1B cap-exempt petitions and on September 18, , reinstated premium processing for H-1B visa petitions subject to the cap. The Policy Memorandum placed the burden on employers to prove that positions qualify for H-1B specialty occupation classification. Hire American With regard to U. The government, in turn, has increased scrutiny over H-1B adjudications. In and memoranda, USCIS had instructed reviewing officers to give deference to the findings of a previously approved petition as long as the key elements were unchanged and there was no evidence of a material error or fraud related to the prior determination. The updated policy guidance rescinds the previous policy. This updated guidance provides clear direction to help advance policies that protect the interests of U. The report further outlined a lack of agency tracking of visits, associated costs, and outcomes. Enhance tracking of H-1B site visit activity, including tracking of targeted site visits and program costs, as well as analysis of adjudicative actions resulting from the site visits. Further identify data and assessments obtained through ASVVP post-adjudication and implement measures to systematically share this information with external stakeholders. Assess ASVVP to determine the best allocation of resources, including adjustments to the number of site visits per year, random sampling procedures, and the time and effort spent on each site visit. To ensure consistent approaches and documentation for site visits, the report recommended that the assessment also should identify policies, procedures, and training requiring an update. The report further recommended developing a career path for site visit officers who wish to remain in investigatory positions. Site visits will be prioritized, with a more results-oriented and data-driven approach in the ASVVP program. Guidance for Employers in View of These Developments With the addition of a seasoned agency veteran, USCIS is poised to take multifaceted action to enforce its goals—eradication of fraud and abuse in the H-1B visa program. In light of this, employers should review each aspect of their visa programs: Key actions for employers to take include the following: Undertake a close review of how candidates are selected and the standards that the company requires to qualify for a visa. In the H-1B area, USCIS will consider low-wage or entry-level skill positions to be an indicator that the employer is abusing the system. Ensure that legal, HR, and global mobility all have a line of sight into the use of visas, and create escalation protocols that allow legal to monitor compliance. If the company is placing its visa holders at customer sites, ensure that the direct management, supervision, and control of the workers is exclusively the domain of the company, not the customer. An audit trail that confirms this point is essential, and affirmation of that personnel authority and supervision should be maintained in the filing. When a material change occurs, include any site change outside of normal commuting distance in the H-1B arena, adhering to the amendment requirements in the regulations for each category. When relying on third-party staffing of functions such as IT, use suppliers that are reliable and willing to certify their compliance with immigration and employment regulations. Replace the employment-based immigrant visa system of the past 27 years with a merit-based selection process under which prospective immigrants would earn points based on education, English-language ability, high-paying job offers, age, extraordinary achievement, and high-value investment. Retain immigration preferences for the spouses and minor children of U. Eliminate the Diversity Visa lottery program, which currently provides 50, green cards annually to citizens of countries historically underrepresented in the annual flow of immigrants to the United States. Place an annual limit of 50, on the number of refugees eligible to become permanent residents. Due to the inherent unpredictability of selection, employers that wait to sponsor employees for permanent residency could lose valuable talent. While specific details regarding visa application procedures remain unsettled, the legislation states that applicants not selected after 12 months would be required to reapply. In that instance, points-based selection would replace the current annual H-1B visa lottery, during which H-1B petitions are

selected at random for processing. Early sponsorship would ensure that the applicants have the best possible opportunities for selection for an immigrant visa in the event of oversubscription, which is highly likely. In addition, however, it will be important for employers to evaluate the impact of a points-based system on their recruitment and retention objectives and make their voice heard in the legislative debate. Extreme Vetting and Enhanced Scrutiny of Travelers In the first year of his term, President Trump and his administration took a number of steps to further his campaign promise to tighten U. These efforts have included the travel bans discussed above, as well as extreme vetting measures designed to heighten scrutiny of U. The nature of these searches, including the fact that they are normally conducted without a search warrant or any other indication of suspicion, has raised concerns by members of Congress⁶ and garnered media attention for their intrusiveness to travelers seeking to enter the United States. In the past, these types of searches, however, have been deemed generally permissible by the U. During the inspection process, travelers are subject to an examination to determine their admissibility into the United States and an examination of their belongings for evidence of contraband or criminal activity, without a warrant and without suspicion. On March, 20, , DHS announced that a new ban on certain types of electronics on international inbound flights to the United States would go into effect on March 21, The restrictions targeted flights leaving from majority-Muslim countries. Restricted items include electronics that are bigger than standard mobile telephones, including laptop computers, tablets, cameras, travel printers, and gaming devices. These restrictions were lifted by July 19, , but the agency continues to exercise its practice of searching electronic devices under the PIA analysis. The DACA program has provided work and temporary residency authorization for nearly , beneficiaries who were brought with their families to the United States as children and meet several guidelines. DACA has allowed these young peopleâ€”known as the Dreamersâ€”to work and study in the United States free from the threat of deportation. According to the announcement, DACA would remain in place for nearly six months, until March 5, Lastly, DHS will not approve any new applications for advance parole, although it will generally honor the validity period for previously approved applications for advance parole. Pending applications for advance parole will be administratively closed, and the fees will be refunded. The six-month extension of the program is designed to give Congress an opportunity to pass legislation to protect DACA beneficiaries, putting the issue of protecting individuals brought to the United States as children back in the hands of Congress. In determining the length of approved work authorization, employers should rely exclusively on their I-9 records. Employers should make sure their I-9 recordkeeping is upto-date and that they are properly reviewing their Section 3 reverification obligations. Be aware that each DACA case is distinct based on individual circumstances. Immigration Policy Priorities On October, 8, , the Trump administration published a list of three immigration policy objectives to 1 ensure safe and lawful admissions, 2 defend the safety and security of the United States, and 3 protect American workers. Two aspects of these policy objectives merit close evaluation by employers: In particular, the administration proposes strengthening the ability of the Department of State to detect and prevent fraud in the following ways: Ensure funding for the Visa Security Program and facilitate its expansion to all high-risk posts. Strengthen laws prohibiting civil and criminal immigration fraud and encourage the use of advanced analytics to proactively detect fraud in immigration benefit applications. The prioritization of visa fraud detection is a critical point for employers and their foreign national populations, as employers and employees should expect longer queues and increased security checks for visa benefits. Visa applicants may also find that consular officers will question their eligibility for a visa benefit even when an underlying visa petition has already been granted by DHS e. In this environment, employers should closely review their visa programs to ensure that they are in compliance with changing standards and work to establish leadership for and a broad-based culture of compliance in this area.

Chapter 7 : Obama interfering with immigration laws - Washington Times

FILE - Thousands of people take part in the "Free the People Immigration March," to protest actions taken by President Donald Trump and his administration, in Los Angeles, Feb. 18,

Chapter 8 : Trump Administration Expands Enforcement of US Immigration Laws

"So it's just important to remind everybody that while all immigration laws do afford people various forms of protection, the reality is that it's a violation of federal law to enter our.

Chapter 9 : The Changing Immigration Laws under the Trump Administration: A New Era for U.S. Immigration

Three state laws make it impossible for federal immigration officials to deport criminals born outside the United States, the Justice Department said in a lawsuit.