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

H4

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: PHOENIX, ARIZONA Date: MAR 10 2004

IN RE: Applicant: [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, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Interim District Director, Phoenix, Arizona and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained, the decision of the interim district director will be withdrawn and the application declared moot.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who was found by the interim district director to be inadmissible to the United States under 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 a period of more than 180 days but less than one year. The applicant is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative filed by her now naturalized U.S. citizen spouse. She now seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v) in order to remain in the United States and reside with her U.S. citizen spouse and children.

The interim district director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. *See Interim District Director Decision* dated May 2, 2003.

On appeal the applicant asserts that the interim district director failed to correctly assess extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse and children.

The record reflects that the applicant entered the United States without inspection on December 28, 1996. She was unlawfully present in the United States from April 1, 1997 the date calculation for unlawful presence begins, until her application for adjustment of status was filed. A review of the documentation in the applicant's service file confirms that her I-485 Application for Adjustment of Status, was received by the Immigration and Naturalization Service ("INS", now Citizenship and Immigration Services, "CIS") on January 14, 1998. She thus accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997 to January 14, 1998, a period in excess of 180 days but less than one year, making her inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) of the Act.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act provides, in pertinent part, that:

> (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 (whether or not pursuant to section 244(e)) 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 aliens' departure or removal is inadmissible.*** [Emphasis added.]

The record reflects that Form I-512, Authorization for Parole of an Alien into the United States (I-512), was issued to the applicant on May 25, 1999. According to applicant's own statement she departed the United States about the end of June 1999. It was this departure that triggered her unlawful presence. Pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) she was barred from again seeking admission within three years of the date of her departure. She was paroled into the United States on July 20, 1999 to continue her application for adjustment of status. A second Form I-512 was issued on May 14, 2000 and the applicant traveled to Mexico the last week of May 2000 and was paroled into the United States on May 26, 2000 to continue her application for adjustment of status.

The standard rule followed by CIS is that 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 departures were in June 1999 and April 2000. It has now been more than three years since the departure that made the inadmissibility issue arise. A clear reading of the law reveals that the applicant is no longer inadmissible. She, therefore, does not need a waiver of inadmissibility, so that application is moot.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained, the interim district director decision's is withdrawn and the application for waiver of inadmissibility declared moot.