



---

2005 Decisions

Opinions of the United  
States Court of Appeals  
for the Third Circuit

---

10-26-2005

## Arias v. Atty Gen USA

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2005](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2005)

---

### Recommended Citation

"Arias v. Atty Gen USA" (2005). *2005 Decisions*. 347.  
[https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2005/347](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2005/347)

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2005 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

September 15, 2005

No. 04-1999

WALTER ANTONIO AMAYA ARIAS,  
Petitioner

v.

ALBERTO GONZALES, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
OF THE UNITED STATES; DEPARTMENT OF  
HOMELAND SECURITY; BUREAU OF  
IMMIGRATION & CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT,  
Respondents

(Agency No. A97 133 248)

Present: **SMITH, FISHER, and NYGAARD**, Circuit Judge.

Motion by Respondents to Amend or Modify the Decision by striking the final sentence in Part II of its opinion and in its place adding the following:

We therefore find that we have jurisdiction to review to review that legal determination. However, the BIA alternatively held that even if an involuntariness exception exists, Amaya Arias's support was not involuntary. Amaya Arias challenges this determination as well. Because this determination is, as previously noted, a factual one, we would have no jurisdiction to review it if Amaya Arias were only seeking review of the asylum claim. But as previously noted, he is also seeking review of the withholding denial, and we retain jurisdiction to review factual issues pertaining to that claim because the jurisdiction limitation at 8 U.S.C. Section 1182(b)(2)(D) does not apply to withholding claims, and therefore does not preclude our review of factual issues pertaining to such claims. Thus, because the availability of withholding of removal turns on the same factual issues that Amaya Arias raised in his asylum claim, we have jurisdiction to reach the merits of his claims, both factual and legal.

And

Amend the first sentence of part III to read:

“We now turn to the merits of the withholding claim.”

/s/ Rebecca L. Simon  
Case Manager 267-299-4947

---

**ORDER**

---

The foregoing motion is granted.

By the Court,

/s/ D. Michael Fisher  
Circuit Judge

Dated: October 26, 2005  
RLS/cc: RA  
LDJ