


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



H3

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ) Date: JUL 29 2009
(CDJ 2004 811 157 relates)

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Immigration and Nationality 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).

John F. Grissom
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The record establishes that the applicant, a native and citizen of Mexico, entered the United States without authorization in March 1995 and did not depart until November 2005. The applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the date of the enactment of the unlawful presence provisions, until her departure in November 2005. The applicant was thus 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. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her U.S. citizen spouse.

The district director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Form I-601, Application for Waiver of Ground of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated August 24, 2006.

The applicant's spouse filed the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal to the Administrative Appeals Office (Form I-290B) on August 31, 2006. On the Form I-290B, the applicant's spouse stated that he did not agree with the decision and requested that "it be reviewed because I'm [the applicant's spouse] suffering extreme hardship because my wife [the applicant] is not with me...." *See Form I-290B*, dated August 31, 2006. The applicant and/or her spouse did not specifically identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact and/or provide documentation to further support extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse, the only qualifying relative in this case.

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. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

As noted above, the applicant and/or her spouse have failed to specifically identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. As no additional evidence is presented on appeal to overcome the decision of the district director, the appeal will be summarily dismissed in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under § 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.