

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

H3



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: MAR 30 2009

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:



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 Director, California Service Center, denied the Form I-601, 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). The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record reflects that the applicant is a 31-year-old native and citizen of Mexico who was found inadmissible to the United States. The record reflects that the applicant is the spouse of a U.S. citizen and father of two U.S. citizen children. He is the beneficiary of an approved relative petition filed on his behalf by his spouse. The applicant entered the United States without inspection in 1998, traveled abroad in 1999, and re-entered without inspection on April 1, 2000. He seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to become a lawful permanent resident and remain in the United States.

The Director determined that the applicant was inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B). The director further found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to his U.S. citizen spouse, and denied his waiver application accordingly.

On appeal, the applicant, through counsel, contends that his spouse would face extreme hardship if he the waiver was denied. *See* Applicant's Appeal Brief, and exhibits cited therein. Specifically, the applicant notes that his U.S. citizen spouse is financially and emotionally dependent upon him. The applicant further notes his spouse's medical condition and maintains that she needs him to remain in the United States. The applicant also notes his spouse's family ties to the United States and her lack of ties to Mexico.

Section 212(a)(9) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9), provides, in pertinent part:

(B) Aliens Unlawfully Present.-

(i) In general. - Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who-

(II) has been unlawfully present in the United States for one year or more, and who again seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal from the United States, is inadmissible.

(v) Waiver. - The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary)] has sole discretion to waive clause (i) in the case of an immigrant who is the spouse or son or daughter of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General [Secretary] that the refusal of admission to such immigrant alien

would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such alien.

(C) Aliens unlawfully present after previous immigration violations.-

(i) In general.-Any alien who-

(I) has been unlawfully present in the United States for an aggregate period of more than 1 year, or

(II) has been ordered removed under section 235(b)(1), section 240, or any other provision of law, and who enters or attempts to reenter the United States without being admitted is inadmissible.

(ii) Exception.- Clause (i) shall not apply to an alien seeking admission more than 10 years after the date of the alien's last departure from the United States if, prior to the alien's reembarkation at a place outside the United States or attempt to be readmitted from a foreign contiguous territory, the Secretary has consented to the alien's reapplying for admission

An alien who is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act may not apply for consent to reapply unless the alien has been outside the United States for more than 10 years since the date of the alien's last departure from the United States. *See Matter of Torres-Garcia*, 23 I&N Dec. 866 (BIA 2006). Thus, to avoid inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act, it must be the case that the applicant's last departure was at least ten years ago, the applicant has remained outside the United States and CIS has consented to the applicant's reapplying for admission. In the present matter, the applicant's last departure from the United States occurred in 1999. The applicant returned to the United States and is currently residing here. He, therefore, has not remained outside the United States for 10 years since his last departure. He is currently statutorily ineligible to apply for permission to reapply for admission. As such, no purpose would be served in adjudicating his waiver under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act.

The AAO takes note of the preliminary injunction that had been entered against the ability of DHS to follow *Matter of Torres-Garcia*. *Gonzales v. DHS*, 239 F.R.D. 620 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The Ninth Circuit, however, reversed the district court, and ordered the vacating of that injunction. *Gonzales v. DHS (Gonzales II)*, 508 F.3d 1227 (9th Cir. 2007). In its opinion, the Ninth Circuit held that the Board's decision in *Matter of Torres-Garcia* was entitled to judicial deference. *Gonzales II*, 508 F.3d at 1241-42. The Ninth Circuit's mandate issued January 23, 2009. On February 6, 2009, the district court denied the plaintiffs' motion for a new preliminary injunction. Order Denying Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Dkt # 59), *Gonzales v. DHS*, No. C06-1411-MJP (W.D. Wash. Filed February 6, 2006). Thus, as of the date of this decision, there is no judicial prohibition in force that precludes the AAO applying the rule laid down in *Matter of Torres-Garcia*.

Having found the applicant statutorily inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act, and ineligible for any exception, the AAO need not address his eligibility for a waiver under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act on the basis of a claim of extreme hardship to his U.S. citizen spouse.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212 of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility rests with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.