



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

H 2




FILE: [REDACTED] Office: PHOENIX DISTRICT OFFICE

Date: AUG 30 2007

IN RE: [REDACTED]

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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



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 black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant, a native and citizen of Mexico, was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to 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 record indicates that the applicant has lawful permanent resident parents. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(h) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h), in order to reside with his family in the United States.

The acting district director concluded that the record failed to show that the applicant's qualifying relatives would suffer hardship over and above the normal economic and social disruptions resulting from the removal of a family member. The application was denied accordingly. *Decision of the Acting District Director*, dated October 31, 2005.

On appeal, counsel states that the applicant's qualifying relatives are undergoing psychological and other examinations. He states that additional evidence in support of the waiver application will be submitted and requests 90 days to submit the additional evidence. *Form I-290B*, filed November 30, 2005.

The AAO notes that on July 19, 2007, the AAO sent a letter to counsel by fax requesting that any additional documentation be sent to the AAO within five business days. No additional documentation was received and therefore, the record is considered complete.

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

- (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 AAO finds that the applicant's appeal fails to identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in the acting district director's decision. The appeal is therefore summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.