

**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*

**JAN 05 2010**

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Date:

IN RE: [REDACTED]

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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

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, 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 Field Office Director, Los Angeles, California. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico. He was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) for having been convicted of Crimes Involving Moral Turpitude (CIMT). The applicant is the parent of three United States Citizen children. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(h) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h) in order to remain in the United States.

The Field Office Director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that the bar to his admission would *impose extreme hardship on a qualifying relative*, and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) on May 9, 2009.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant states that the Field Office Director erred in finding that the applicant's three U.S. citizen daughters would not suffer extreme hardship if he is removed. Counsel indicates that additional evidence will be filed with the appeal. The AAO subsequently granted the applicant's two requests for an extension in which to file a brief and/or additional evidence. However, as of the date of this decision, no additional evidence has been received and the record will be considered complete.

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 identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in the Field Office Director's decision. The appeal is therefore summarily dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.