

*Information disclosed to  
public in violation of protected  
information of personal privacy*

**PUBLIC COPY**

**U.S. Department of Homeland Security**  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Office of Administrative Appeals  
20 Massachusetts Ave. NW MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

[Redacted]

H5

DATE: **APR 03 2012** OFFICE: LOS ANGELES, CA

FILE: [Redacted]

IN RE: APPLICANT: [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:

[Redacted]

**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*

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

In the present case, the applicant admitted under oath that on April 6, 1997 she presented a Form I-551 lawful permanent resident card which did not belong to her to gain admission into the United States. Admissibility is not contested on appeal. The applicant is therefore inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for having attempted to procure admission to the United States through fraud or misrepresentation. The applicant's qualifying relative for a waiver of this inadmissibility is her U.S. Citizen spouse.

Section 212(a)(9) 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 record reflects that after her April 6, 1997 misrepresentation, the applicant was ordered removed and her departure to Mexico was verified on April 8, 1997. The applicant subsequently entered the United States without inspection in 1999, and has remained ever since. The applicant is therefore inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(C)(i)(II) of the Act.

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); *Matter of Briones*, 24 I&N Dec. 355 (BIA 2007); and *Matter of Diaz and Lopez*, 25 I&N Dec. 188 (BIA 2010). In *Duran Gonzalez v. DHS*, 508 F.3d 1227 (9th Cir. 2007), the Ninth Circuit overturned its previous decision, *Perez Gonzalez v. Ashcroft*, 379 F.3d 783 (9th Cir. 2004), and deferred to the BIA's holding that section 212(a)(9)(C)(i) of the Act bars aliens subject to its provisions from receiving discretionary waivers of inadmissibility prior to the expiration of the

ten-year bar. The Ninth Circuit clarified that its holding in *Duran Gonzalez* applies retroactively, even to those aliens who had Form I-212 applications pending before *Perez Gonzalez* was overturned. *Morales-Izquierdo v. DHS*, 600 F.3d 1076 (9th Cir. 2010). See also *Duran Gonzales v. DHS*, 659 F.3d 930 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2011) (affirming the district court's order denying the plaintiff's motions to amend its class certification and declining to apply *Duran Gonzales* prospectively only); *Nunez-Reyes v. Holder*, 646 F.3d 684 (9th Cir. 2011) (stating that the general default principle is that a court's decisions apply retroactively to all cases still pending before the courts).

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 therefore, has not remained outside the United States for 10 years since her last departure. She is currently 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.

In proceedings for a waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(i) 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. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.