

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

August Term, 2009

(Argued: January 25, 2010 Decided: February 4, 2010)

Docket No. 08-6301-cv

FRANCIS B. GILDERNEW,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

-v.-

ANDREA QUARANTILLO, District Director, New York City District Office, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services; EDUARDO AGUIRRE, Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services; JANET NAPOLITANO,¹ Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security; ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General of the United States; UNITES STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES, BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION; KIP HAWLEY, Administrator of Transportation Security Administration

*Defendants-Appellees.*²

¹ Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 43(c)(2), Janet Napolitano has automatically been substituted for Michael Chertoff as a defendant in this action in her official capacity as Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security.

² The Clerk of the Court is respectfully directed to amend the official caption in this action to conform to the caption in this opinion.

Before:

LEVAL, STRAUB, AND WESLEY, *Circuit Judges.*

Appeal from an order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (Berman, *J.*), entered on October 30, 2008, denying Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment and granting Defendants' cross-motion for summary judgment.

AFFIRMED.

EAMONN DORNAN, Dornan & Associates, P.L.L.C., New York, New York, *for Plaintiff-Appellant.*

F. JAMES LOPREST, JR., United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York (DAVID S. JONES, *of counsel*), New York, New York, *for Defendants-Appellees.*

1 PER CURIAM:

2 Plaintiff, a native and citizen of Ireland, commenced
3 this action seeking, *inter alia*, a declaratory judgment that
4 he was entitled to naturalize, as well as a grant of
5 naturalized citizenship following the denial of his
6 application by the United States Citizenship and Immigration
7 Services ("CIS"). Plaintiff contends that the CIS
8 improperly denied his application because his absence from
9 the country for over fourteen months - from September 16,
10 2004 to November 23, 2005 - does not, as the CIS contends,

1 disqualify him from naturalized citizenship under 8 U.S.C.
2 § 1427. The United States District Court for the Southern
3 District of New York (Berman, *J.*) denied Plaintiff's motion
4 for summary judgment and granted the Defendants' cross-
5 motion for summary judgment, thereby affirming the decision
6 of the CIS. *Gildernew v. Quarantillo*, No. 05 Civ.
7 10851(RMB), 2008 WL 4938289 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 29, 2008).
8 Plaintiff now appeals from that ruling.

10 **Background**

11 On February 13, 2002, Plaintiff applied to the New York
12 District office of the former Immigration and Naturalization
13 Service ("INS") to become a naturalized citizen of the
14 United States. On December 10 of that year, he appeared
15 before the agency for a naturalization exam and demonstrated
16 his fitness for citizenship by satisfying certain statutory
17 criteria, including a basic knowledge of United States
18 history and the ability to communicate in English.

19 In April of 2004, while his application was still
20 pending, Plaintiff applied to the CIS (the successor agency
21 to the INS) for a reentry permit to allow him to return to

1 the United States after a proposed trip to Ireland to "take
2 care of family affairs." Plaintiff indicated that he
3 expected to leave the United States in June of 2004 and
4 remain abroad for one year. He did not indicate that he was
5 an applicant for naturalized citizenship.

6 In September of 2004, Plaintiff voluntarily left the
7 United States. Plaintiff alleges that in April 2005, he
8 presented for inspection at the United States Bureau of
9 Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") at Dublin Airport in
10 Ireland, but was told that he could not enter the United
11 States because he was on the "no-fly" list maintained by the
12 Transportation Security Administration ("TSA"). Upon a
13 finding that there was "no derogatory information" on file
14 to preclude Plaintiff's admission to the country, he was
15 ultimately permitted to return to the United States in
16 November of 2005.

17 On May 8, 2006, the CIS notified Plaintiff that his
18 application for naturalized citizenship had been approved
19 and scheduled a ceremony for his oath of citizenship to be
20 administered later that month. However, when the CIS learned
21 that Plaintiff had been outside the country for over

1 fourteen months, the agency issued a motion to reopen his
2 application. On July 17, 2006, the CIS denied Plaintiff's
3 application because his absence from the country for over
4 one year while his application was pending made him
5 ineligible for naturalized citizenship.

6 The agency relied on 8 U.S.C. § 1427, which provides in
7 relevant part, "[n]o person, except as otherwise provided in
8 this subchapter, shall be naturalized unless such applicant
9 ... has resided continuously within the United States from
10 the date of the application up to the time of admission to
11 citizenship." § 1427(a)(2). The statute further provides
12 that "[a]bsence from the United States for a continuous
13 period of one year or more during the period for which
14 continuous residence is required for admission to
15 citizenship (whether preceding or subsequent to the filing
16 of the application for naturalization) shall break the
17 continuity of such residence." § 1427(b).

18 **Discussion**

19
20
21 We review *de novo* a district court's grant of summary

1 judgment. See *Sheppard v. Beerman*, 317 F.3d 351, 354 (2d
2 Cir. 2003). We are faced with the question of whether 8
3 U.S.C. § 1427 precludes the naturalization of the Plaintiff
4 on the facts of this case. Because we conclude that it
5 does, the judgment of the district court is affirmed.

6 Plaintiff first argues that the one-year absence bar in
7 § 1427(b) applies only to the period preceding the
8 naturalization interview, and does not extend to the period
9 following the interview. That argument is unavailing
10 because it is clearly contrary to the language of the
11 statute. By its terms, § 1427(b) applies to the entire
12 period for which continuous residence is required, "whether
13 preceding or subsequent to the filing of the application for
14 naturalization." Plaintiff indicates no statutory exception
15 that applies to his case.

16 Plaintiff does rely on language in the paragraph
17 preceding the one quoted above, which provides that
18 "[a]bsence from the United States of more than six months
19 but less than one year during the period for which
20 continuous residence is required for admission to
21 citizenship, immediately preceding the date of filing the

1 application for naturalization, or during the period between
2 the date of filing the application and the date of any
3 hearing under section 1447(a) of this title, shall break the
4 continuity of such residence." § 1427(b). Plaintiff would
5 have us read that paragraph to define the "period for which
6 continuous residence is required" as only that period
7 "immediately preceding the date of filing the application
8 for naturalization." That argument fails because it is
9 based on a misreading of the statute.

10 First, the paragraph relied upon by Plaintiff applies
11 only to absences ranging from six months to less than one
12 year, as its prefatory words clearly indicate. And second,
13 even if that first paragraph of § 1427(b) did apply to the
14 circumstances of Plaintiff's case it would not save him.
15 The paragraph does not, as Plaintiff maintains, limit the
16 continuous residency requirement to that period of time
17 preceding the filing of the application, nor even to that
18 period of time preceding the naturalization interview. The
19 next clause clearly states: "*or during the period between*
20 *the date of filing the application and the date of any*
21 *hearing under section 1447(a) of this title."* §

1 1427(b) (emphasis added). Section 1447(a) provides for an
2 administrative hearing before an immigration officer
3 following the denial of an application for naturalization.
4 The two clauses, read together, therefore embody the entire
5 relevant period with respect to continuous residence: the
6 period immediately *preceding* the filing of the application,
7 and the period *subsequent* to the filing of the application
8 until the sooner of the applicant's admission to
9 citizenship, or an administrative hearing following denial
10 of the application. Because Plaintiff's § 1447(a) hearing
11 occurred on or around November 26, 2006, over one year *after*
12 his return to the United States, even if the first paragraph
13 of § 1427(b) applied to the facts of Plaintiff's case it
14 would clearly be no help to him.

15 Plaintiff further contends that nothing in the
16 legislative history surrounding § 1427 suggests that
17 Congress intended for the one-year absence bar to apply
18 against post-interview absences. But because the statute is
19 clear and unambiguous, we will not endeavor to divine the
20 intent of Congress by resort to legislative history. See
21 *Cervantes-Ascencio v. INS*, 326 F.3d 83, 86 (2d Cir. 2003).

