



HL

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Application date deleted to
of personal privacy

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536



File: [Redacted] Office: PANAMA CITY, PANAMA

Date: MAY 13 2002

IN RE: Applicant: [Redacted]

Application: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1182(g).

IN BEHALF OF APPLICANT: SELF-REPRESENTED

PUBLIC COPY

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Officer in Charge, Panama City, Panama, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Colombia who was found by a consular officer to be inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(1)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(1)(A)(i), for having a communicable disease of public health significance. The applicant is the unmarried son of naturalized United States citizen parents and seeks a waiver of this permanent bar to admission as provided under section 212(g) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1182(g), in order to travel to the United States to reside.

The officer in charge concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that he qualifies for a discretionary waiver and denied the application accordingly.

On appeal, the applicant's cousin, [REDACTED], states that the applicant's parents have provided all of the supporting documentation requested. Documentation submitted with the appeal includes a letter from a physician with Infectious Disease Consultants and a letter from the applicant. Mr. [REDACTED] also submits a letter requesting oral argument stating that the process and procedures that the Service has placed in this case are "fair" [sic].

Oral argument is limited to cases where cause is shown. 8 C.F.R. 103.3(b). The applicant has not established that this case involves unique facts or issues of law which cannot be adequately addressed in writing, therefore the request for oral argument is denied.

The record reflects that the applicant was last found to have tested positive to a Serilogic Test for the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Antibody on April 2, 2001.

Section 212(a) of the Act states:

CLASSES OF ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS OR ADMISSION.-
Except as otherwise provided in this Act, aliens who are ineligible under the following paragraphs are ineligible to receive visas and ineligible to be admitted to the United States:

(1) HEALTH RELATED GROUNDS.-

(A) IN GENERAL.- Any alien-

(i) who is determined (in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services) to have a communicable disease of public health significance, which shall include infection with the etiologic agent for acquired immune deficiency syndrome,

(B) WAIVER AUTHORIZED.-For provisions authorizing waiver of certain clauses of subparagraph (A), see subsection(g).

Section 212(g)(1) provides that the Attorney General may waive the application of subsection (a)(1)(A)(i) in the case of any alien who-

(A) is the spouse or the unmarried son or daughter, or the minor lawfully adopted child of a United States citizen, or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or of an alien who has been issued an immigrant visa, or

(B) has a son or daughter who is a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or an alien who has been issued an immigrant visa;

in accordance with such terms, conditions, and controls, if any, including the giving of bond, as the Attorney General, in the discretion of the Attorney General after consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, may by regulations prescribe;

The approval of an application for a waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(g) of the Act equates in this case to a waiver of the permanent bar to admission imposed upon the applicant by section 212(a)(1)(A)(i) of the Act. Congress provided for such a waiver but limited its application by requiring, in each case, a showing of the requisite familial relationship.

It should be noted that Congress did not intend that a waiver under section 212(g) be granted merely due to the existence of a qualifying relationship since it stipulated other terms, conditions, and controls that also have to be met, besides making the waiver discretionary. This Service bears the responsibility of determining, on a case-by-case basis, whether a person found to be inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(1)(A)(i) should be granted a waiver.

Current Service policy dictates that the discretion of the Attorney General shall not be used in HIV positive cases unless the applicant can establish that: (1) the danger to the public health of the United States created by his/her admission to the United States as an immigrant is minimal; (2) the possibility of the spread of infection created by his/her admission to the United States as an immigrant is minimal; and (3) should he/she be admitted as an immigrant, there will be no cost incurred by any level of government agency of the United States without prior consent of that agency.

There is no evidence contained in the record that the applicant has complied with item (3), above. On his waiver application, the applicant designated the Infectious Disease Consultants Hospital

Center as willing to provide care to the applicant at no cost to any governmental agency. However, the signature of the physician is not legible nor is any title or office held within the Center attached to the physician that would establish that the physician possesses the authority to obligate the Center for the payment of any expenses that might be incurred by the applicant. In addition, the physician's letter submitted on appeal merely indicates that a physician attached to Infectious Diseases Consultants has ". . . offered to supervise [the applicant's] treatment for the appropriate management of his HIV status." There is no evidence contained in the record to establish that should the applicant be admitted to the United States as a immigrant, there will be no cost incurred by any level of government agency of the United States without prior consent of that agency.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(g) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

The dismissal of the appeal does not preclude the applicant from filing a new waiver request with the required fee and in accordance with instructions, supported by documentation to establish that he warrants a waiver as a matter of discretion in accordance with Service policy.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.