

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

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



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



H 2

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA

Date: APR 29 2005

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

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

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 Acting District Director, Jacksonville, Florida. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen. The motion will be dismissed and the previous decisions of the Acting District Director and the AAO will be affirmed.

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who was found to be inadmissible to the United States (U.S.) under § 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)(I), for having been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude. The applicant is married to a citizen of the United States and is the mother of two United States citizen children. She is the beneficiary of an approved petition for alien relative and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to § 212(h) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h), in order to remain in the United States and adjust her status to that of a lawful permanent resident.

The acting district director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed upon a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. The AAO affirmed the acting district director's decision on appeal.

In the present motion to reopen, the applicant asserts that she regrets having committed the crimes and states that she has been rehabilitated. She submits copies of documentation establishing that she completed a rehabilitation program in 1998. The applicant did not identify any legal errors in the prior AAO or acting district director decisions, and the evidence submitted on motion does not serve to overcome the finding that her husband would not suffer extreme hardship on account of her inadmissibility.

8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a) states in pertinent part:

(a) Motions to reopen or reconsider

....

(2) Requirements for motion to reopen. A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be proved in the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence.

....

(3) Requirements for motion to reconsider. A motion to reconsider must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or Service policy. A motion to reconsider a decision on an application or petition must, when filed, also establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision.

(4) Processing motions in proceedings before the Service. A motion that does not meet applicable requirements shall be dismissed

....

The applicant failed to identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in the acting district director's or AAO decisions. The applicant also did not submit new evidence regarding the acting district director's reasons for denying the waiver application. The motion will therefore be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed and the previous decisions of the Acting District Director and the AAO will be affirmed.