


43



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services



FILE:



Office: PHOENIX DISTRICT OFFICE

Date: **OCT 22 2004**

IN RE:



APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v)

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

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

identifying data deleted to  
prevent disclosure of unarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

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

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico. The applicant was found inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA, the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II). The record reflects that the applicant is the spouse of a U.S. citizen. He seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to remain in the United States with his spouse.

The district director found that the applicant had failed to establish extreme hardship to his U.S. citizen spouse. The application for waiver was denied accordingly. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

The regulations governing these proceedings, 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(v), provide, 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.

On appeal, the applicant contends that the decision of the district director was biased and unsupported in law and fact. He also contends that he has established extreme hardship to his spouse and children. In support of the appeal, he submits no additional evidence, cites no precedent decisions, and makes no specific allegations of bias or legal or factual error in the district director's decision. The AAO finds that the appeal fails to raise for review any erroneous conclusions of law or fact. Furthermore, his claim of bias is unsupported anywhere in the record.

Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed under 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(v).

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.