

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

HA

PUBLIC COPY



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: PHOENIX, AZ Date: **NOV 17 2006**

IN RE: [REDACTED]

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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the District Director, Phoenix, AZ. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who was found to be inadmissible to the United States (U.S.) under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B), for having accrued more than one year of unlawful presence. The applicant is married to a U.S. citizen and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(v).

The district director concluded that the applicant failed to show that his qualifying relative would suffer extreme hardship over and above the normal economic and social disruptions involved in the removal of a family member. The application was denied accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated March 1, 2005.

On appeal, the applicant's spouse states that she is requesting 90 days to submit all the information and documents necessary that will serve as evidence in this case. She states that she is also hiring an attorney for the same matter. *Form I-290B*, dated March 31, 2005.

The AAO notes that no additional documentation was submitted in regards to this appeal.

8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(v) states in pertinent part that:

(v) Summary dismissal. An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

The AAO finds that the applicant's appeal fails to identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in the district director's decision. The appeal is therefore summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.