January 25, 2019

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR: L. Francis Cissna
Director
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Kevin K. McAleenan
Commissioner
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Ronald D. Vitiello
Deputy Director and Senior Official Performing the Duties of
Director
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

FROM: Kirstjen M. Nielsen
Secretary

SUBJECT: Policy Guidance for Implementation of the Migrant Protection Protocols

On December 20, 2018, I announced that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), consistent with the Migrant Protection Protocols (MPP), will begin implementation of Section 235(b)(2)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) on a large-scale basis to address the migration crisis along our southern border. In 1996, Congress added Section 235(b)(2)(C) to the INA. This statutory authority allows the Secretary of Homeland Security to return certain applicants for admission to the contiguous country from which they are arriving on land (whether or not at a designated port of entry) pending removal proceedings under Section 240 of the INA. Consistent with the MPP, citizens and nationals of countries other than Mexico ("third-country nationals") arriving in the United States by land from Mexico—illegally or without proper documentation—may be returned to Mexico pursuant to Section 235(b)(2)(C) for the duration of their Section 240 removal proceedings.
Section 235(b)(2)(C) and the MPP

The United States issued the following statement on December 20, 2018, regarding implementation of the Migrant Protection Protocols:

[T]he United States will begin the process of implementing Section 235(b)(2)(C) . . . with respect to non-Mexican nationals who may be arriving on land (whether or not at a designated port of entry) seeking to enter the United States from Mexico illegally or without proper documentation. Such implementation will be done consistent with applicable domestic and international legal obligations. Individuals subject to this action may return to the United States as necessary and appropriate to attend their immigration court proceedings.

The United States understands that, according to the Mexican law of migration, the Government of Mexico will afford such individuals all legal and procedural protection[s] provided for under applicable domestic and international law. That includes applicable international human rights law and obligations as a party to the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (and its 1967 Protocol) and the Convention Against Torture.

The United States further recognizes that Mexico is implementing its own, sovereign, migrant protection protocols providing humanitarian support for and humanitarian visas to migrants.

The United States proposes a joint effort with the Government of Mexico to develop a comprehensive regional plan in consultation with foreign partners to address irregular migration, smuggling, and trafficking with the goal of promoting human rights, economic development, and security.¹

The Government of Mexico, in response, issued a statement on December 20, 2018. That statement provides, in part, as follows:

1. For humanitarian reasons, [the Government of Mexico] will authorize the temporary entrance of certain foreign individuals coming from the United States who entered that country at a port of entry or who were detained between ports of entry, have been interviewed by U.S. immigration authorities, and have received a notice to appear before an immigration judge. This is based on current Mexican legislation and the international commitments Mexico has signed, such as the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, its Protocol, and the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, among others.

2. It will allow foreigners who have received a notice to appear to request admission into Mexican territory for humanitarian reasons at locations designated for the international transit of individuals and to remain in national territory. This would be a "stay for humanitarian reasons" and they would be able to enter and leave national territory multiple times.

3. It will ensure that foreigners who have received their notice to appear have all the rights and freedoms recognized in the Constitution, the international treaties to which Mexico is a party, and its Migration Law. They will be entitled to equal treatment with no discrimination whatsoever and due respect will be paid to their human rights. They will also have the opportunity to apply for a work permit for paid employment, which will allow them to meet their basic needs.

4. It will ensure that the measures taken by each government are coordinated at a technical and operational level in order to put mechanisms in place that allow migrants who have received a notice to appear before a U.S. immigration judge have access without interference to information and legal services, and to prevent fraud and abuse.2

Prosecutorial Discretion and Non-Refoulement in the Context of the MPP

In exercising their prosecutorial discretion regarding whether to place an alien arriving by land from Mexico in Section 240 removal proceedings (rather than another applicable proceeding pursuant to the INA), and, if doing so, whether to return the alien to the contiguous country from which he or she is arriving pursuant to Section 235(b)(2)(C), DHS officials should act consistent with the non-refoulement principles contained in Article 33 of the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees3 (1951 Convention) and Article 3 of the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT).4 Specifically, a third-country national should not be involuntarily returned to Mexico pursuant to Section 235(b)(2)(C) of the INA if the alien would more likely than not be persecuted on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion (unless such alien has engaged in criminal, persecutory, or terrorist activity described in Section 241(b)(3)(B) of the

---


3 The United States is not a party to the 1951 Convention but is a party to the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, which incorporates Articles 2 to 34 of the 1951 Convention. Article 33 of the 1951 Convention provides that: "[n]o Contracting State shall expel or return ('refouler') a refugee in any manner whatsoever to the frontiers of territories where his life or freedom would be threatened on account of his race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion."

4 Article 3 of the CAT states, "No State Party shall expel, return ('refouler') or extradite a person to another State where there are substantial grounds for believing that he would be in danger of being subjected to torture." See also Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (FARRA), Pub. L. No. 105-277, Div. G, Title XXII, § 2242(a) (8 U.S.C. § 1231 note) ("It shall be the policy of the United States not to expel, extradite, or otherwise effect the involuntary return of any person to a country in which there are substantial grounds for believing the person would be in danger of being subjected to torture, regardless of whether the person is physically present in the United States.").
INA), or would more likely than not be tortured, if so returned pending removal proceedings. The United States expects that the Government of Mexico will comply with the commitments articulated in its statement of December 20, 2018.

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement will issue appropriate internal procedural guidance to carry out the policy set forth in this memorandum.5

This memorandum is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, its departments, agencies, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person.

5 A DHS immigration officer, when processing an alien for Section 235(b)(2)(C), should refer to USCIS any alien who has expressed a fear of return to Mexico for a non-refoulement assessment by an asylum officer.