

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

H3

PUBLIC COPY

[Redacted]

FILE:

[Redacted]

Office: CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Date: JAN 03 2007

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:

[Redacted]

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, Chicago, Illinois, 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 The appeal will be dismissed, the previous decision of the district director will be withdrawn and the application declared moot.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 § 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 married to a naturalized United States citizen, and she seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her husband and children.

The district director found that the applicant had failed to establish extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen spouse, and the application was denied accordingly. On appeal, counsel maintains that the evidence shows that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship should the applicant be removed from the United States. 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 sometime in 1992. On December 17, 1997, the applicant filed an Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status (Form I-485). On July 13, 1998, the applicant was issued Authorization for Parole of an Alien into the United States (Form I-512) and subsequently used the advance parole authorization to depart and reenter the United States on August 14, 1998.

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 § 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 17, 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 1998. 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. Thus, she does not require a waiver of inadmissibility.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed, the prior decision of the district director is withdrawn, and the application for waiver of inadmissibility is declared moot.