

PUBLIC COPY

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

H2

[Redacted]

FILE: [Redacted]

Office: PHOENIX, AZ

Date **JUL 06 2004**

IN RE: [Redacted]

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

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[Redacted]

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.

Robert P. Wiemann

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Interim District Director, Phoenix, Arizona, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Canada who was found to be inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)(I), for having been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude. The applicant is the spouse of a United States citizen and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(h) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h), so that she may reside in the United States with her husband.

The interim district director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Interim District Director*, dated June 4, 2003.

On appeal, counsel requests an extension to perfect the appeal. *Form I-290B*, dated July 7, 2003. The AAO notes that approximately one year has passed since the filing of the appeal and no additional documentation has been received into the record.

8 C.F.R. § 103.3(v) (2002) 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 applicant has failed to identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in her appeal. The appeal will therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.