



2004 Decisions

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

1-28-2004

Coraggioso v. Atty Gen USA

Precedential or Non-Precedential: Precedential

Docket No. 03-1075

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2004

Recommended Citation

"Coraggioso v. Atty Gen USA" (2004). *2004 Decisions*. 1037.

http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2004/1037

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 2004 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. For more information, please contact Benjamin.Carlson@law.villanova.edu.

PRECEDENTIAL

Filed January 29, 2004

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 03-1075

SALVATORE CORAGGIOSO

Petitioner

v.

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General of the United States,

Respondent

On Appeal from an Order Entered in
The Board of Immigration Appeals
(No. A77 035 208)

Argued October 28, 2003

Before: SCIRICA, *Chief Judge*, NYGAARD and
AMBRO, *Circuit Judges*

(Opinion filed January 23, 2004)

John D. Perez, Esquire (Argued)
41-51 Wilson Avenue
Newark, NJ 07105

Attorney for Petitioner

Robert D. McCallum, Jr.
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Division
Donald E. Keener
Deputy Director
Michelle E. Gorden (Argued)
Senior Litigation Counsel
Michael P. Lindemann, Esquire
John D. Williams, Esquire
Office of Immigration Litigation
Civil Division, Department of Justice
P.O. Box 878, Ben Franklin Station
Washington, D.C. 20044
Attorneys for Respondent

ORDER AMENDING SLIP OPINION

AMBRO, *Circuit Judge*:

It is now ordered that the published Opinion in the above case filed January 23, 2004, be amended as follows:

On page 6 of the slip opinion, in the first full paragraph (“In interpreting the scope of the DV Program. . . .”), the penultimate sentence (which begins “If Congress had used . . .”) is changed to delete the word “been”, such that the sentence reads, “If Congress had used different language, our analysis may be different.”

By the Court,

/s/ Thomas L. Ambro, Circuit Judge

Dated: January 29, 2004

A True Copy:
Teste:

*Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals
for the Third Circuit*