

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**
PUBLIC COPY

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



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

H5

#2

FILE:

Office: MILWAUKEE, WI

Date:

DEC 03 2009

IN RE: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 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.

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).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Perry Rhew".
Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico. The acting district director found, and the applicant does not contest, that in August 2000, the applicant attempted to enter the United States by presenting a border crossing card with another person's identity. The acting district director found, and the applicant does not contest, that the applicant was permitted to withdraw her application for entry into the United States. In addition, the acting district director found, and the applicant does not contest, that four days later, the applicant attempted to enter the United States by using a counterfeit form I-94 with a fraudulent I-551 Temporary Evidence of Lawful Permanent Residence stamp along with her picture in the name of another person. The applicant was removed under section 235(b) of the Act. Two weeks later, the applicant entered the United States without inspection. The applicant now seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to reside with her lawful permanent resident husband, her U.S. citizen father, and her lawful permanent resident mother in the United States.

The acting district director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship a qualifying relative. The acting district director further found that the applicant's repeated attempted illegal entries and actual illegal entry into the United States shows that the applicant has a disregard for the laws of the United States. The acting district director denied the application accordingly. *Decision of the Acting District Director*, dated March 7, 2006.

The AAO maintains plenary power to review each appeal on a de novo basis. 5 U.S.C. 557(b) ("On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial decision except as it may limit the issues on notice or by rule."); *see also Janka v. U.S. Dep't of Transp., NTSB*, 925 F.2d 1147, 1149 (9th Cir. 1991). The AAO's de novo authority has been long recognized by the federal courts. *See, e.g., Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n.9 (2d Cir. 1989).

An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the field office does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd* 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Dor*, 891 F.2d at 1002 n.9 (noting that the AAO reviews appeals on a de novo basis).

Section 212(a)(9) of the Act states in pertinent part:

....

(C) Aliens unlawfully present after previous immigration violations. -

(i) In general. - Any alien who -

(I) has been unlawfully present in the United States for an aggregate period of more than 1 year, or

(II) has been ordered removed under section 235(b)(1), section 240, or any other provision of law,

and who enters or attempts to reenter the United States without being admitted is inadmissible.

(ii) Exception. - Clause (i) shall not apply to an alien seeking admission more than 10 years after the date of the alien's last departure from the United States if, prior to the alien's reembarkation at a place outside the United States or attempt to be readmitted from a foreign contiguous territory, the Secretary has consented to the alien's reapplying for admission. The Secretary, in the Secretary's discretion, may waive the provisions of section 212(a)(9)(C)(i) in the case of an alien to whom the Secretary has granted classification under clause (iii), (iv), or (v) of section 204(a)(1)(A), or classification under clause (ii), (iii), or (iv) of section 204(a)(1)(B), in any case in which there is a connection between—

(1) the alien's having been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty; and

(2) the alien's --

(A) removal;

(B) departure from the United States;

(C) reentry or reentries into the United States; or

(D) attempted reentry into the United States.

An alien who is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act may not apply for consent to reapply unless the alien has been outside the United States for more than 10 years since the date of the alien's last departure from the United States. *Matter of Torres-Garcia*, 23 I&N Dec. 866 (BIA 2006), *aff'd.*, *Gonzalez v. Dept. of Homeland Security*, 508 F.3d 1227, 1242 (9th Cir. 2007). Thus, to avoid inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act, it must be the case that the applicant's last departure was at least ten years ago, the applicant has remained outside the United States, and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has consented to the applicant's reapplying for admission.

In the present matter, the applicant entered the United States without inspection after having been ordered removed. Therefore, the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(C)(i)(II) of the Act. The applicant's last departure from the United States occurred in August 2000. The applicant reentered the United States approximately two weeks after her removal and is currently residing in the United States. Therefore, she has not remained outside the United States for ten years since her last departure. Accordingly, she is currently statutorily ineligible to apply for permission to reapply for admission. As such, no purpose would be served in adjudicating her waiver under section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i).

Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.