



combination of those two documents sufficed to stop Garcia-Romo's physical-presence period, which meant that he had not reached the ten-year requirement. *Id.* at 201, 205. In *Niz-Chavez v. Garland*, the Supreme Court reached the opposite conclusion for a petitioner who received a combination of documents similar to those that Garcia-Romo received. 141 S. Ct. 1474, 1486 (2021). The Court held that the government must provide a single document containing all of the information required by 8 U.S.C. § 1229(a) for the document to be a notice to appear and thus stop a noncitizen's physical-presence period. *Id.* So the Court vacated our decision in Garcia-Romo's case and remanded it to us. *Garcia-Romo v. Garland*, No. 19-1316, 2021 WL 1725158 (U.S. May 3, 2021).

*Niz-Chavez* makes clear that the combination of the two documents Garcia-Romo received did not trigger the stop-time rule. 141 S. Ct. at 1486. Because that was the basis for the decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals below, we grant Garcia-Romo's petition for review, vacate the BIA's decision, and remand for proceedings consistent with *Niz-Chavez*.