


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



H3

SEP 17 2007

FILE:

Office: LIMA, PERU

Date:

IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION:

Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Officer-in-Charge (OIC), Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed as the applicant is not inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), thus the relevant waiver application is moot.

The applicant, [REDACTED] is a native and citizen of Uruguay who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year. The applicant sought a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), which the OIC denied, finding that the applicant failed to establish hardship to a qualifying relative. *Decision of the OIC, dated November 16, 2005.* The applicant submitted a timely appeal.

The AAO will first address the finding of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II).

Section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) of the Act provides that any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who has been unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than 180 days but less than 1 year, and again seeks admission within 3 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal, is inadmissible.

Section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act provides that any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who has been unlawfully present in the United States for 1 year or more, and again seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal, is inadmissible.

Unlawful presence accrues when an alien is present in the United States after the expiration of the period of stay authorized by the Attorney General or is present in the United States without being admitted or paroled. Section 212(a)(9)(B)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(ii). The periods of unlawful presence under sections 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) and (II) are not counted in the aggregate.¹ For purposes of section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act, time in unlawful presence begins to accrue on April 1, 1997.²

The three- and ten-year bars of sections 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) and (II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) and (II), are triggered by a departure from the United States following accrual of the specified period of unlawful presence. If someone accrues the requisite period of unlawful presence but does not subsequently depart the United States, then sections 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) and (II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) and (II), would not apply. *See* DOS Cable, note 1. *See also Matter of Rodarte*, 23 I&N Dec. 905 (BIA 2006)(departure triggers bar because purpose of bar is to punish recidivists). With regard to an adjustment applicant who had 180 days of unauthorized stay in the United States before filing an adjustment of status

¹ Memo, Virtue, Acting Assoc. Comm. INS, Grounds of Inadmissibility, Unlawful Presence, June 17, 1997 INS Memo on Grounds of Inadmissibility, Unlawful Presence (96Act.043); and Cable, DOS, No. 98-State-060539 (April 4, 1998).

² *See* DOS Cable, note 1; and IIRIRA Wire #26, HQIRT 50/5.12.

application, his or her return on an advance parole will trigger the three- and ten-year bar. Memo, Virtue, Acting Exec. Comm., INS, HQ IRT 50/5.12, 96 Act. 068 (Nov. 26, 1997).

The document in the record from the Embassy of the United States of America, Montevideo, Uruguay, dated June 22, 2005, reflects that the applicant entered the United States under the Visa Waiver Program on March 7, 2003, with authorization to stay in the country to June 6, 2003. It conveys that the applicant departed from the country on May 7, 2004. For purposes of calculating unlawful presence under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act, the applicant began to accrue time in unlawful presence from June 6, 2003 (the last day of authorized stay) to May 7, 2004, accruing 11 months and 6 days of unlawful presence. When she departed from the United States, she triggered the three-year-bar. However, it has now been more than three years since May 7, 2004, the date of departure; consequently, the applicant is not inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(9)(B)(i)(I).

Based on the record, the AAO finds that the applicant is not inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(9)(B)(i)(I).

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(2)(A) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. *See* section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The applicant has met that burden.

ORDER: The November 16, 2005 decision of the director is withdrawn. The appeal is dismissed as the underlying application is moot.