


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 MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



H2

FILE: [REDACTED]
(CDJ 2004 759 108 and
[REDACTED])

Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO
(CIUDAD JUAREZ)

Date: **JAN 26 2010**

IN RE: [REDACTED]

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:

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.

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 spouse and their U.S. citizen child in the United States.

The District Director found that the applicant had failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated November 14, 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 October 17, 2008. Because the applicant is now a lawful permanent resident, further pursuit of the matter at hand is moot.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.