


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



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

PUBLIC COPY



H3


FILE:



Office: PHOENIX, ARIZONA

Date: FEB 03 2005

IN RE:



APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under § 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, Phoenix, Arizona. The matter 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 The appeal will be dismissed, the previous decision of the district director will be withdrawn and the application declared moot.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 § 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. The applicant is the daughter of a U.S citizen father and lawful permanent resident (LPR) mother, and she seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her parents.

The district director found that based on the evidence in the record, the applicant had failed to establish extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen father. The application was denied accordingly. On appeal, the applicant contends that, since the applicant suffers from Downs Syndrome and requires at least one of her parents to care for her, her U.S. citizen father and LPR mother would suffer extreme hardship whether they remain in the United States, far from their mentally disabled daughter, or relocate to Mexico, where they would have no employment and no support system.

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 and was admitted as a visitor in 1988. It is presumed that she was authorized not more than six months stay at that time. On December 10, 1997, the applicant filed an Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status (Form I-485). On August 31, 1999, the applicant departed the United States and returned pursuant to an Authorization for Parole of an Alien into the United States (Form I-512).

The proper filing of an affirmative application for adjustment of status has been designated by the Attorney General [Secretary] as a period of stay for purposes of determining bars to admission under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) and (II) of the Act. See *Memorandum by Johnny N. Williams, Executive Associate Commissioner, Office of Field Operations dated June 12, 2002*. The applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the date of enactment of unlawful presence provisions under the Act, until December 10, 1997, the date of her proper filing of the Form I-485. The applicant is, therefore, inadmissible to the United States under § 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 § 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I), the applicant was barred from again seeking admission within three years of the date of her 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). There has been no final decision made on the applicant's I-485 application, so the applicant, as of today, is still seeking admission by virtue of adjustment from her parole status. The applicant's departure occurred in 1999. It has now been more than three years since the departure that made the inadmissibility issue arise in her application. A clear reading of the law reveals that the applicant is no longer inadmissible. She, therefore, does not require a waiver of inadmissibility, so the appeal will be dismissed, the decision of the district director will be withdrawn and the waiver application will be declared moot.

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