

BARBARA LAGOA AND IMMIGRATION

Highlights:

- Barbara Lagoa was part of the majority that issued a ruling in federal court curtailing the federal courts' ability to review decisions made by immigration officials.
 - The ruling came when an Indian immigrant, Patel, was ruled "ineligible for relief" from immigration official's decision to refuse him the changing of his immigration status based on his labor certificate.
 - Patel was ruled ineligible for relief due to immigration officials accusing him of purposefully marking himself as a U.S. citizen on his driver's license application, though he denied the mistake was intentional and sought an appeal with the federal courts.
 - Lagoa was part of the conservative majority that ruled against Patel's right to an appeal and set a precedent that immigration officials decisions could not be reviewed by the federal courts.

Lagoa Ruled Against Immigrants In Federal Court

LAGOA WAS PART OF THE MAJORITY THAT RULED AGAINST THE FEDERAL COURT'S ABILITY TO REVIEW DECISIONS BY IMMIGRATION OFFICIALS

The Court Accused Patel Of Intentionally Committing Fraud On His Georgia Driver's License Application By Marking Himself As An American Citizen And Denied His Petition To Stay In The U.S.

The Board Of Immigration Appeals Denied Patel's Petition To Change His Immigration Status To Stay In The Country. According to a blog on People for the American Way by Paul Gordon, "An immigration judge (IJ) and the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) denied Indian citizen Pankajkumar Patel's petition to change his immigration status so that he could remain in the country based on a labor certification." [People for the American Way-Blog Post-Paul Gordon, [9/18/20](#)]

Immigration Officials Accused Patel Of Intentionally Marking Himself As An American Citizen For A Driver's License Application And Thus Declared Him Ineligible To Receive Benefits. According to a blog on People for the American Way by Paul Gordon, "In Patel's case, officials concluded he was ineligible for relief because when he had applied for a Georgia driver's license, Patel had incorrectly checked a box that said he was a U.S. citizen. He testified that it had been a mistake, but immigration officials concluded it was intentional and that this made him inadmissible. Patel appealed to the Eleventh Circuit, arguing that the record did not support the officials' factual conclusion." [People for the American Way-Blog Post-Paul Gordon, [9/18/20](#)]

Patel Disputed The Finding And Argued It Was Unintentional

Patel Disputed The Finding And Argued It Was Unintentional. According to a blog on People for the American Way by Paul Gordon, "In Patel's case, officials concluded he was ineligible for relief because when he had applied for a Georgia driver's license, Patel had incorrectly checked a box that said he was a U.S. citizen. He testified that it had been a mistake, but immigration officials concluded it was intentional and that this made him inadmissible. Patel appealed to the Eleventh Circuit, arguing that the record did not support the officials' factual conclusion." [People for the American Way-Blog Post-Paul Gordon, [9/18/20](#)]

Lagoa Was Part Of The Majority That Ruled Patel Could Not Further Appeal To The Courts

Lagoa Was Part Of The Majority That Ruled Patel Could Not Appeal To The Courts. According to a blog on People for the American Way by Paul Gordon, "In an en banc decision joined by all five participating Trump judges—Kevin Newsom, Elizabeth Branch, Britt Grant, Robert Luck, and Barbara Lagoa—a majority of the Eleventh Circuit held that Patel cannot appeal that issue to the courts." [People for the American Way-Blog Post-Paul Gordon, [9/18/20](#)]

Lagoa And The Majority's Ruling Set Precedent That Curtailed The Court's Ability To Review Decisions Of Immigrant Officials

Lagoa And The Majority's Ruling Set A Precedent That Curtailed The Court's Ability To Review Decisions Of Immigrant Officials. According to a blog on People for the American Way by Paul Gordon, "With five Trump judges making a 9-5 majority decision possible, the Eleventh Circuit released an en banc ruling significantly curtailing courts' ability to review the decisions of immigration officials." [People for the American Way-Blog Post-Paul Gordon, [9/18/20](#)]

May 2022: The U.S. Supreme Court Upheld The Ruling

May 2022: The Supreme Court Ruled In The Appeals Court Favor And Curtailed The Federal Court's Ability To Review Immigration Official's Decisions. According to Justice Barrett's Majority opinion for the Supreme Court, "Federal courts have a very limited role to play in this process. With an exception for legal and constitutional questions, Congress has barred judicial review of the Attorney General's decisions denying discretionary relief from removal. We must decide how far this bar extends—specifically, whether it precludes judicial review of factual findings that underlie a denial of relief. It does." [Patel et al. V. Garland, Attorney General, No. 20-979, [5/16/22](#)]