


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals
Washington, DC 20529-2090

PUBLIC COPY




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



tlz

FILE: Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ) Date: **SEP 04 2009**
(CDJ 2000 658 452 relates)

IN RE: 

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(a)(9)(B)(v)
of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the 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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

John F. Grissom
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The record reflects that 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)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 212(a)(9)(B)(v), in order to reside with her husband and children in the United States.

The district director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen spouse and denied the application accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated January 5, 2007.

The applicant's husband, [REDACTED] filed an appeal before the AAO. [REDACTED] submitted a copy of his marriage certificate and re-submitted his letter that he had previously submitted with his waiver application. No argument was made on the Notice of Appeal.

The regulation at 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.