U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20529

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

H2

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: LOS ANGELES, CA Date: JUL 2 [illegible] 2004

IN RE: Applicant [redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i).

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

[illegible] data deleted to [illegible] unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Interim District Director, Los Angeles, California, and 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 pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having procured admission into the United States (U.S.) by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant is married to a U.S. citizen and he seeks a waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(i) of the Act, in order to remain in the U.S. with his wife and children, and to adjust his status to that of a lawful permanent resident.

The interim district director (IDD) concluded the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on his wife if he were removed from the United States. The application was denied accordingly.

On appeal, the applicant states that he attempted to enter the U.S. unlawfully because his son had recently been born with Down Syndrome and had been hospitalized due to medical complications. The applicant makes no other assertions on appeal, and he does not state whether he believes the IDD's conclusion that his wife would not suffer extreme hardship if he were removed from the United States was erroneous based on either the IDD's analysis of the facts or the IDD's application of the law to his case.

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

> (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 applicant in the present case failed to identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact on appeal. His appeal will therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.