


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Avenue, Rm. 3000 N.W.
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



H 1

FILE:

Office: SAN ANTONIO, TX Date: SEP 08 2006

IN RE:



APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(d)(11) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(11).

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

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

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "James A. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Application for a Waiver of Inadmissibility was denied by the District Director, San Antonio, TX and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act ("the Act"), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)(I), as an alien who has assisted other individuals in illegally entering the United States.

The district director concluded that the applicant did not qualify for a waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(d)(11) of the Act or under section 212(a)(6)(E) of the Act. He asserts that the individuals the applicant assisted in illegally entering the United States did not solely consist of his spouse, parent, son, or daughter and the applicant had never been an alien legally admitted for lawful permanent residence. The application was denied accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated June 9, 2004.

8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(v) states in pertinent part:

(v) Summary dismissal. An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

The record reflects that the applicant's mother submitted a notice of appeal to the District Director on July 13, 2004. In the notice she states that she is a naturalized U.S. citizen and all of her children are in the United States with her except the applicant. She also states that she would like the applicant's waiver to be granted so he can apply for a tourist visa. The applicant submitted no other evidence or information on appeal. The applicant's notice of appeal will therefore be dismissed pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(v).

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.