


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY




DATE: MAY 25 2012 Office: LAS VEGAS, NV

FILE: 

HY


IN RE:

Applicant: 

APPLICATION:

Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



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.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew

Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Las Vegas Nevada. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed as applicant is not inadmissible and the underlying waiver application is unnecessary.

The applicant is a native of the former Soviet Union and a citizen of Israel who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (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 and seeking admission within ten years of his last departure from the United States. The applicant's spouse is a U.S. citizen and he seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), in order to reside in the United States.

The field office director found that the applicant had failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and the application was denied accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated March 16, 2010.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

(B) Aliens Unlawfully Present.-

(i) In general. - Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who-

(I) was unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than 180 days but less than 1 year, voluntarily departed the United States . . . prior to the commencement of proceedings under section 235(b)(1) or section 240, and again seeks admission within 3 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal,...is inadmissible.

....

(II) has been unlawfully present in the United States for one year or more, and who again seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal from the United States, is inadmissible.

....

(v) Waiver. - The Attorney General [Secretary] has sole discretion to waive clause (i) in the case of an immigrant who is the spouse or 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 Attorney General

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

The record reflects that the applicant entered the United States with a B2 visa on June 29, 2004; his authorized period of stay expired on December 28, 2004; he filed the Form I-485, Application to Register Permanent Residence of Adjust Status, on August 6, 2009; he was granted advance parole and departed the United States on November 4, 2009; and he was paroled into the United States on December 4, 2009.

Based on this history, the applicant was unlawfully present in the United States from December 29, 2004, the day after his authorized period of stay expired, until August 6, 2009, the date he filed Form I-485. The AAO notes that at the time of the field office director's decision, the applicant would have been deemed inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), for having accrued unlawful presence of more than one year and seeking admission within ten years of his November 4, 2009 departure from the United States.

In *Matter of Arrabally and Yerrabelly*, 25 I&N Dec. 771 (BIA 2012), the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) held that an alien who leaves the United States temporarily pursuant to advance parole under section 212(d)(5)(A) of the Act does not make a departure from the United States within the meaning of section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act. Here, the applicant obtained advance parole under section 212(d)(5)(A) of the Act, temporarily left the United States pursuant to that grant of advance parole, and was paroled into the United States to pursue a pending application for adjustment of status. In accordance with the BIA's decision in *Matter of Arrabally*, the applicant did not make a departure from the United States for the purposes of section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act. Accordingly, the applicant is not inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act. The applicant's waiver application is thus unnecessary and the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed as the underlying waiver application is unnecessary.