

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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**



PUBLIC COPY



715

DATE: Office: LOS ANGELES, CA FILE:

IN RE: JUL 29 2011 Applicant:

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,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Los Angeles, California, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

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)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for seeking to procure admission to the United States through fraud or the willful misrepresentation of a material fact. The applicant's spouse, two children and two stepchildren are U.S. citizens. The applicant seeks 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 family.

The field office director found that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on the applicant's qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated March 4, 2009.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant's spouse would experience extreme hardship and that the applicant is entitled to a waiver as a matter of discretion. *Brief in Support of Appeal*, dated May 27, 2009.

The record includes, but is not limited to, counsel's brief, the applicant's spouse's statement, a psychological evaluation, educational records, statements from the applicant's stepchildren, financial records, insurance information and a letter from the applicant's church. The entire record was reviewed and considered in arriving at a decision on the appeal.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act provides, in pertinent part, that:

- (i) Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

The record reflects that the applicant presented a Mexican passport with a counterfeit I-551 stamp when seeking to procure admission to the United States on June 26, 1999. Based on this misrepresentation, the applicant is inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act.

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 . . . the Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security] has consented to the alien's reapplying for admission....

On June 27, 1999, the applicant was ordered removed from the United States pursuant to section 235(b)(1) of the Act. The applicant subsequently entered the United States without inspection on or around July 1, 1999. The AAO also finds that the applicant is inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(C)(i)(II) of the Act for having been ordered removed under section 235(b)(1) of the Act and reentering the United States without being admitted. An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the Field Office 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).

To seek an exception from a finding of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(C)(i)(II) of the Act, an applicant must file for permission to reapply for admission (Form I-212). However, consent to reapply under section 212(a)(9)(C)(ii) of the Act can only be granted to one who has left the United States, is currently abroad and is seeking admission to the United States at least ten years after the date of his or her last departure. *See Matter of Torres-Garcia*, 23 I&N Dec. 866 (BIA 2006). The record does not reflect that the applicant in the present matter has met these requirements. Accordingly, the applicant is statutorily ineligible to seek an exception from her inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(C)(i)(II) of the Act and the AAO therefore finds no purpose would be served in considering the merits of her Form I-601 waiver application under section 212(i) of the Act. The appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.