

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
20 Massachusetts Ave. NW MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090
U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

DATE: **MAY 23 2012** OFFICE: BALTIMORE, MD

FILE: **[REDACTED]**

IN RE: APPLICANT: **[REDACTED]**

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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[REDACTED]

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen with the field office or service center that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry R. New, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Baltimore, Maryland, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who, on June 16, 1998, presented a border crossing card which did not belong to her in an attempt to procure admission into the United States. She was ordered removed, and on June 21, 1998, she entered the United States without inspection. She was found to be inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having attempted to procure admission to the United States through fraud or misrepresentation. The applicant was also found to be inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(A) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A), and requires permission to reapply for admission after removal. The applicant is the spouse of a lawful permanent resident and is the beneficiary of an approved Form I-130 Petition for Alien Relative. She seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to remain in the United States with her lawful permanent resident spouse and U.S. Citizen children.

The District Director concluded that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative, and was also inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act. *See Decision of District Director*, February 24, 2010. The waiver application was denied accordingly. *Id.*

On appeal, counsel for the applicant indicates the applicant's U.S. Citizen son suffers from ongoing speech and learning disabilities and would consequently experience extreme hardship without the applicant present.

The record includes, but is not limited to, financial and medical records, educational documents, evidence of birth, marriage, residence, and citizenship, statements from the applicant, a psychological evaluation, evidence of expedited removal proceedings, and other applications and petitions filed on behalf of the applicant. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

- (i) Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides:

- (1) The [Secretary] may, in the discretion of the [Secretary], waive the application of clause (i) of subsection (a)(6)(C) in the case of an alien who is the spouse, son or daughter of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if it is established to the satisfaction of the

[Secretary] that the refusal of admission to the United States of such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such an alien.

In the present case, the applicant admitted under oath that on June 16, 1998 she presented a border crossing card in the name of [REDACTED] which did not belong to her in an attempt to procure admission to the United States. Inadmissibility is not contested on appeal. The applicant is therefore inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for having attempted to procure admission to the United States through fraud or misrepresentation. The applicant's qualifying relative for a waiver of this inadmissibility is her lawful permanent resident spouse.

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 record reflects that after the applicant attempted to procure admission to the United States using a border crossing card which did not belong to her, she was ordered removed from the United States under section 235(b)(1) of the Act. *Order of Removal under Section 235(b)(1) of the Act*, June 16, 1998. Her departure was verified on June 16, 1998. *Verification of Removal*, June 16, 1998. In an affidavit the applicant admits she subsequently entered the United States without inspection on June 21, 1998. She is therefore inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(C)(i)(II) of the Act for entering the United States without inspection after having been ordered removed.

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. *See Matter of Torres-Garcia*, 23 I&N Dec. 866 (BIA 2006). 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* USCIS has consented to the applicant's reapplying for admission. In the present matter, the applicant is currently residing in the United States and therefore, has not remained outside the United States for 10 years since her last departure. 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.

In proceedings for a waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(i) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.