



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)

[Redacted]

Date: **AUG 27 2014**

Office: NEWARK, NJ

FILE: [Redacted]

IN RE: [Redacted]

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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[Redacted]

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Field Office Director, Newark, New Jersey, denied the waiver application and 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 Venezuela who was found to be inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)(II), for having been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude. The applicant seeks a waiver to reside in the United States with his U.S. citizen wife and stepdaughter.

In a decision, dated April 30, 2013, the field office director found that the applicant had failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and denied the waiver application accordingly.

On appeal, the applicant states that the field office director's decision was erroneous and capricious since he has shown extreme hardship to his U.S. citizen wife and children. The applicant states that he will be submitting additional evidence within 30 days. It has now been over one year and no additional evidence has been submitted.

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 specifically identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in the field office director's decision. The appeal is therefore summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.