H2

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE
425 Eye Street N.W.
BCIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F
Washington, D.C. 20536

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: Madrid Date: AUG 13 2003

IN RE: Applicant: [redacted]

APPLICATION: 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 APPLICANT: Self-represented

PUBLIC COPY

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision 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.

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 that 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 Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (Bureau) 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 that originally decided your case along with a fee of $110 as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.7.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Acting Officer in Charge, Madrid, Spain, and a subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is before the AAO on a motion to reopen. The motion will be dismissed, and the order dismissing the appeal will be affirmed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Morocco who was found to be inadmissible to the United States by a consular officer 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 married a United States citizen in September 2000, and he is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative. The applicant seeks the above waiver under section 212(h) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h).

The acting officer in charge concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. The AAO affirmed that decision on appeal.

On motion, the applicant states that his U.S. citizen wife and child cannot live in Morocco due to language, cultural, religious and ethnic differences. The applicant states that his police record has been cleared legally. He states that, before he got married, he told his wife all about the (incident). The applicant states that he misses his wife and child and that he is suffering and is hurt.

The applicant revisits the issue regarding his offense and resubmits a psychological evaluation of his wife dated May 10, 2002, for review.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2), a motion to reopen must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3), a motion to reconsider must state the reasons for reconsideration; and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4), a motion that does not meet applicable requirements shall be dismissed.

The issues in this matter were thoroughly discussed by the director and the AAO in their prior decisions. Since no new issues have been presented for consideration, the motion will be dismissed.

ORDER: The motion is dismissed. The order of January 14, 2003, dismissing the appeal is affirmed.