

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

115



DATE: SEP 29 2011


Office: NEWARK

FILE: 

IN RE: 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), and 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:

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, Newark, New Jersey, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Portugal was found to be inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having attempted to procure admission into the United States by fraud and/or willful misrepresentation. The applicant, therefore, seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i). In addition, the applicant was found inadmissible under sections 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(I), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than 180 days but less than one year, and under 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, therefore, also 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). Finally, the applicant was found inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(C)(i)(I) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(C)(i)(I), based on the applicant's entry without being admitted after having been unlawfully present in the United States for an aggregate period of more than one year.¹

The field office director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative pursuant to sections 212(i) and 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act. In addition, the field office director noted that there was no waiver available to the applicant based on his inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(C)(i)(I) of the Act because he had not waited outside the United States for 10 years as required by law. The applicant's Form I-601, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability (Form I-601) was denied accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated March 19, 2009.

In support of the appeal, counsel for the applicant submits a brief. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act states, in pertinent part, the following:

- (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.

Section 212(i) of the Act states, in pertinent part, the following:

- (1) The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary)] may, in the discretion of the Attorney General (Secretary), waive the application of clause (i) of subsection (a)(6)(C) in the case of an immigrant

¹ The applicant does not contest the field office director's findings of inadmissibility.

who is the spouse, 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 the United States of such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such an alien....

Section 212(a)(9) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

(B) Aliens Unlawfully Present.-

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

(I) was unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than 180 days but less than 1 year...and again seeks admission within 3 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal, or

(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. 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.

Regarding the applicant's ground of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), the record establishes that in July 1991, the applicant attempted to procure entry to the United States by presenting a fraudulently obtained U.S. nonimmigrant visa. *See Record of Sworn Statement in Affidavit Form*, dated July 25, 1991. The field office director correctly found the applicant to be inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) for having attempted to procure entry to the United States by fraud and/or willful misrepresentation. In addition, the AAO notes that in August 2001, the applicant again attempted to procure entry to the United States by fraud or misrepresentation. Specifically, the applicant attempted to enter the United States in August 2001 under the Visa Waiver Program to visit the United States, when in fact he intended to return to the United States to resume his residence. The record indicates that the applicant admitted to owning a bread delivery business in Kearney, New Jersey and residing in an apartment in said town. *See Record of Sworn Statement in Administrative Proceedings*, dated August 22, 2001.

Regarding the applicant's ground of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), the record establishes that the applicant entered the United States in 1991 without being admitted and did not depart the United States until an unspecified date in 1998. As noted by the field office director, the applicant triggered at least the three year bar of unlawful presence under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) of the Act for unlawful presence from April 1, 1997 to an unknown date in 1998. Further, the record establishes that the applicant entered the United States in 1998 without being admitted and did not depart the United States until March 2001. The AAO concurs with the field office director that the applicant is also inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act, for the ten year bar of unlawful presence. *Affidavit of Elio Tomas Soares*, dated August 17, 2006.

Regarding the applicant's ground of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(C)(i)(I) of the Act, the record establishes that the applicant reentered to the United States without being admitted in September 2001 after having accrued unlawful presence under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act by residing in the United States without authorization from 1998 until 2001, as discussed above. *Id.* at 1-2 and *Brief in Support of Appeal*.

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* USCIS has consented to the applicant's reapplying for admission. In the present matter, the applicant is currently residing in the United States and did not remain outside the United States for 10 years after 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) and 212(i) of the Act.

Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief at this time, no purpose would be served in discussing whether he has established extreme hardship to his U.S. citizen spouse or whether he merits a waiver as a matter of discretion. In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility, 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. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The waiver application is denied.