

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**



H6

Date:

JAN 19 2012

Office: LIMA, PERU

FILE:



IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), and section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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, Lima, Peru. The matter was before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. On October 7, 2011, the AAO remanded the case to the field office director to initiate proceedings to revoke the approved Form I-130 petition. The AAO reopens the matter on Service Motion solely to clarify the status of the applicant's Form I-130, Petition for Alien Relative. The prior decision of the AAO is withdrawn and the appeal will be dismissed.

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of Peru who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 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, and section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for willful misrepresentation of a material fact in order to procure an immigration benefit as well as for marriage fraud. The applicant is married to a U.S. citizen and 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), and section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to reside with her husband in the United States.

The field office director found that the applicant's first marriage was fraudulent and that the applicant is ineligible to receive benefits from USCIS. The field office directly denied the waiver application accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated June 10, 2009.

On appeal, the applicant's husband contends he has been suffering extreme hardship since his wife's departure from the United States. Specifically, the applicant's husband contends he has diabetes and has been experiencing financial hardship.

Section 204(c) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(c), provides that no alien relative petition shall be approved if:

- (1) the alien has previously been accorded, or has sought to be accorded, an immediate relative or preference status as the spouse of a citizen of the United States or the spouse of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, by reason of a marriage determined by the Attorney General [Secretary of Homeland Security] to have been entered into for the purpose of evading the immigration laws or
- (2) the Attorney General [Secretary] has determined that the alien has attempted or conspired to enter into a marriage for the purpose of evading the immigration laws.

No waiver is available for violation of section 204(c) of the Act. The corresponding regulation provides:

**Fraudulent marriage prohibition.** Section 204(c) of the Act prohibits the approval of a visa petition filed on behalf of an alien who has attempted or conspired to enter into a marriage for the purpose of evading the immigration laws. The director will deny a petition for immigrant visa classification filed on behalf of any alien for whom there

is substantial and probative evidence of such an attempt or conspiracy, regardless of whether that alien received a benefit through the attempt or conspiracy. Although it is not necessary that the alien have been convicted of, or even prosecuted for, the attempt or conspiracy, the evidence of the attempt or conspiracy must be contained in the alien's file.

8 C.F.R. § 204.2(a)(ii). A decision that section 204(c) of the Act applies must be made in the course of adjudicating a subsequent visa petition. *Matter of Rahmati*, 16 I&N Dec. 538, 359 (BIA 1978). USCIS may rely on any relevant evidence in the record, including evidence from prior USCIS proceedings involving the beneficiary. *Id.* However, the adjudicator must come to his or her own, independent conclusion, and should not ordinarily give conclusive effect to determinations made in prior collateral proceedings. *Id.*; *Matter of Tawfik*, 20 I&N Dec. 166, 168 (BIA 1990).

In this case, the record shows that the applicant married [REDACTED] on April 4, 1994. The record reflects that on January 31, 1995, the applicant arrived at Miami International Airport. During inspection, the applicant admitted to an immigration officer that her aunt contracted with a man to look for a husband for her. The applicant admitted that a marriage was arranged with [REDACTED] that the marriage was never consummated, and that her intention was to live with her aunt to work and study in the United States. The applicant was not admitted to the United States and voluntarily returned to Peru. *Record of Sworn Statement of [REDACTED]* dated January 31, 1995.

The record further shows that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in July 1996. The applicant and [REDACTED] divorced on November 10, 1997. In addition, the record shows that the applicant married [REDACTED] a U.S. citizen, on December 23, 1997. [REDACTED] filed a Form I-130 on the applicant's behalf on March 19, 2001. The record shows that a Notice of Intent to Deny the Form I-130 was issued on December 24, 2002, according the applicant the opportunity to rebut the allegation that she entered into a fraudulent marriage with [REDACTED]. The applicant responded, claiming that the immigration officers harassed, coerced, and threatened her, and that she was deceived and naïve in marrying [REDACTED]. *Affidavit of [REDACTED]* dated January 21, 2003. The district director found that the applicant did not meet her burden of establishing that she had not previously engaged a fraudulent marriage to obtain an immigration benefit and denied the Form I-130 accordingly. *Denial of Visa Petition Pursuant to Section 204(c)*, dated May 26, 2004.

The record further shows that the applicant and [REDACTED] divorced on November 6, 2006. The applicant married her current husband, [REDACTED] a U.S. citizen, on November 24, 2006. [REDACTED] filed a Form I-130 on behalf of the applicant, which was approved on September 28, 2007. On March 23, 2011, the approved Form I-130 was revoked based the applicant's previous fraudulent marriage.

The AAO finds that the applicant is inadmissible under section 204(c) of the Act and that no waiver is available. In addition, in the absence of an approved Form I-130, the applicant is not entitled to

apply for an immigrant visa, and her visa cannot be approved regardless of whether she is admissible or, if not, whether a waiver is available for any ground of inadmissibility. Therefore, the waiver application is moot and the appeal will be dismissed.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. *See* 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.