


Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

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

**PUBLIC COPY**



H2

FILE: [Redacted] Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ) Date: OCT 28 2009  
(CDJ 2004 716 097 relates)

IN RE: [Redacted]

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

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).

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

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 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 U.S. citizen stepfather 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 November 6, 2006.

On appeal, the applicant states that he lived in the United States for nine years, “but [he] did try to do things right.” The applicant explains that “the first time [he] sen[t] an application was in 1998[, but] for some reason they sen[t his] application back.” The applicant contends he has tried to “follow every step that [he has] been t[old] to do.” He further states that he knows he is not someone the United States needs, but that he would like to live in the United States and has not done illegal things or bothered others. The applicant states he “probabl[y] do[esn’t] have an extreme reason . . . to approve[] [his] appeal,” but claims that if his waiver application is approved, he “will not defraud this country.” *Notice of Appeal to the Administrative Appeals Unit (AAU) (Form I-290B)*.

The regulation at 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 district director’s decision. Accordingly, the appeal is summarily dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is summarily dismissed.