

# United States Court of Appeals

---

---



On October 9, 1997, an immigration judge (IJ) convened

Id. To make matters worse from Groccia's standpoint, Congress's

The respondents counter on two fronts. First, they suggest that we need not deal with Groccia's argument at all, inasmuch as the district court lacked jurisdiction over his habeas corpus petition. Second, they asseverate that, in all events, deportation proceedings commenced not with the service of the OSC, but with the later filing of the NTA. Since that filing did not occur until August 11, 1997, their thesis runs, the IIRIRA was in full force, section 212(c) stood repealed, and Groccia

We proceed to the vexing question of the three sections-



---





omissions by failing to make a proffer or to identify in this court any evidence tending to show reliance. He has not so much as adumbrated, even at this late date, a viable theory of reliance.

That ends the matter. Conventional forfeiture rules pertain

our Mattis opinion post-dated the earlier proceedings in this case.