U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

H2

[redacted]

DEC 09 2009

FILE: [redacted] (relates) Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ) Date:
CDJ 2004 757 070 (relates)

IN RE: [redacted]

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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[redacted]

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).

Michael Shumway

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

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 is married to a U.S. citizen and 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 with his wife and child in the United States.

The district director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated December 29, 2006.

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records show that, subsequent to filing the instant application, the applicant was admitted to the United States as an immigrant on March 11, 2009. Because the applicant is now a lawful permanent resident, further pursuit of the matter at hand is moot.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.