

**PUBLIC COPY**

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

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20536



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



FILE: [Redacted] Office: SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Date: APR 26 2004

IN RE: [Redacted]

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the District Director, San Francisco, California, 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 The appeal will be dismissed, the previous decision of the district director will be withdrawn and the application declared moot.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. The applicant is married to a United States citizen and he is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with his wife and U.S. citizen children. On August 9, 2002, the applicant's Form I-485 application was approved and the applicant was granted status as a legal permanent resident of the United States.

The district director found that based on the evidence in the record, the applicant had failed to establish extreme hardship to his U.S. citizen spouse. The application was denied accordingly. *See* District Director Decision, dated August 1, 2000.

On appeal, the applicant states that he has never committed a crime during the 10 years that he has resided in California. He requests a pardon for departing from the United States thereby triggering unlawful presence provisions under the Act. *See* Letter from Daniel Nieto Mondragon, dated September 5, 2000.

The record contains copies of the U.S. birth certificates of the applicant's children; a letter from the applicant's spouse, dated August 11, 2000; a letter from the applicant's spouse, dated June 2, 2000; a copy and translation of the Mexican birth certificate of the applicant; a copy of a photograph of the applicant and his family and a letter from the employer of the applicant, dated August 8, 2000. 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 reflects that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in 1988. On October 15, 1997, the applicant filed an Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status (Form I-485). In 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. 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 October 15, 1997, the date of his proper filing of the Form I-485. The applicant was, 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). Until the application is adjudicated, the applicant is continuously seeking admission by virtue of adjustment from his parole status. The applicant's departure was in 1998. 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. In addition, Service records indicate that on August 9, 2002, the applicant's Form I-485 application was approved and the applicant was granted status as a legal permanent resident of the United States. He, therefore, does not need 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.