

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
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



H5-

FILE: [Redacted] Office: PORTLAND, OREGON Date:

APR 21 2011

IN RE: [Redacted]

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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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 \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

f,
Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Portland, Oregon. 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 who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for attempting to enter the United States through fraud or misrepresentation of a material fact. The applicant's spouse is a U.S. citizen, and the applicant requires a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to reside in the United States with her spouse and children.

In a decision dated December 12, 2008, the Field Office Director found that the applicant failed to establish that her qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship as a consequence of her continued inadmissibility. The application was denied accordingly. *See Decision of the Field Office Director* dated December 12, 2008.

On appeal, the applicant's attorney provided a brief in support of the applicant's waiver. In his brief, the attorney asserts that the qualifying spouse has established that the qualifying spouse would suffer extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's continued inadmissibility.

The record contains an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130), an Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601), a Notice of Appeal (Form I-290B), an appeal brief, an affidavit from the qualifying spouse, documentation regarding the applicant and qualifying spouse's property, their children's birth certificates, the Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission Into the United States After Deportation or Removal (Form I-212) and the evidence accompanying the Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status (Form I-485).

USCIS records reflect that the applicant attempted to enter the United States on January 15, 1998 using a valid permanent resident card belonging to another individual and was processed for expedited removal and then removed. The applicant subsequently reentered the United States without inspection shortly thereafter in January of 1998. As a result of her misrepresentation, the applicant is inadmissible to the United States pursuant to sections 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act.

An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the Service Center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); see also *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004) (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a de novo basis).

Section 212(a)(9)(C)(i) of the Act states, in pertinent part:

(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. The Secretary, in the Secretary's discretion, may waive the provisions of section 212(a)(9)(C)(i) in the case of an alien to whom the Secretary has granted classification under clause (iii), (iv), or (v) of section 204(a)(1)(A), or classification under clause (ii), (iii), or (iv) of section 204(a)(1)(B), in any case in which there is a connection between --

(1) the alien's having been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty; and

(2) the alien's--

(A) removal;

(B) departure from the United States;

(C) reentry or reentries into the United States; or

(D) attempted reentry into the United States.

An alien who is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act may not apply for consent to reapply for admission 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. *Matter of Briones*, 24 I&N Dec. 355, 358-59 (BIA 2007). To avoid inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act, the applicant must have departed the United States at least ten years ago, remained outside the United States during that time, and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) must consent to the applicant's reapplying for admission. *Id.* at 358, 371; *Matter of Torres-Garcia*, 23 I&N Dec. 866, 873 (BIA 2006), *aff'd.*, *Gonzalez v. Dept. of Homeland Security*, 508 F.3d 1227, 1242 (9th Cir. 2007). The applicant was removed under section 235(b)(1) of the Act in January 1998 and reentered the United States without inspection later that month. She is therefore inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act, and since she did not remain outside the United States for 10 years since her last departure, and she is statutorily ineligible to apply for permission to reapply for admission. As such, no purpose would be served in adjudicating her waiver under section 212(i) of the Act.

The applicant is statutorily ineligible to seek an exception from her inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(C) of the Act and the AAO finds no purpose would be served in considering the merits of her Form I-601 waiver application under section 212(i) of the Act. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.