

PUBLIC COPY




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



H3

FILE:



Office: PORTLAND, OR

Date: AUG 31 2005

IN RE:



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

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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Portland, Oregon and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed, the previous decision of the district director will be withdrawn and the application declared moot.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(I), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than 180 days but less than one year. The applicant is married to a United States citizen and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), in order to reside in the United States with his spouse.

The 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 District Director*, dated March 9, 2004.

On appeal, the applicant submits a letter of support. *See Letter from Ebba F. Falconer*, dated April 8, 2004. In addition, the applicant submits a letter stating that his spouse suffers from diabetes and asthma and is unable to take care of herself. *See Letter from Artemio Prado-Cardenas and Jana N. Santiago*, dated April 9, 2004. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

(B) Aliens Unlawfully Present.-

(i) In general. - Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who-

(I) was unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than 180 days but less than 1 year, voluntarily departed the United States . . . prior to the commencement of proceedings under section 235(b)(1) or section 240, and again seeks admission within 3 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal, . . . is inadmissible.

....

(v) Waiver. - The Attorney General [Secretary] has sole discretion to waive clause (i) in the case of an immigrant who is the spouse or son or daughter of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General [Secretary] that the refusal of admission to such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such alien.

In the present application, the record indicates that the applicant entered the United States without inspection on or about March 27, 1996. On or about December 2, 1997, the applicant departed from the United States and subsequently reentered during February 1998. The applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 1,

1997, the date of enactment of unlawful presence provisions under the Act, until December 2, 1997, the date of his departure from the United States. The applicant is, therefore, inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) of the Act for being unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than 180 days. Pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I), the applicant was barred from again seeking admission within three years of the date of his departure.

An application for admission or adjustment is a "continuing" application adjudicated based on the law and facts in effect on the date of the decision. *Matter of Alarcon*, 20 I&N Dec. 557 (BIA 1992). The applicant's departure occurred in 1997. It has now been more than three years since the departure that made the inadmissibility issue arise in his application. A clear reading of the law reveals that the applicant is no longer inadmissible. He, therefore, does not require a waiver of inadmissibility, so the motion will be granted, the decision of the district director will be withdrawn and the waiver application will be declared moot.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed, the decision of the district director is withdrawn and the application is declared moot.