






U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

(b)(6)




DATE: FEB 25 2013 OFFICE: SAN SALVADOR

FILE: 

IN RE: 

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), section 212(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), and Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission After Deportation or Removal under section 212(a)(9)(A)(iii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(iii)

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 AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen with the field office or service center that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, San Salvador, El Salvador. 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 El Salvador who entered the United States without admission or parole on June 3, 2004 and was placed into immigration proceedings. On January 4, 2006, the applicant failed to appear for proceedings and was ordered removed *in absentia*. The applicant did not depart from the United States until her removal on June 12, 2010. The applicant was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (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 seeking readmission within 10 years of her departure. The applicant was also found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(A) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A), as an alien previously removed, 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 procure entry to the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation, and section 212(a)(6)(B) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(B), for failing to attend removal proceedings and seeking admission to the United States within five years of her subsequent removal. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her lawful permanent resident mother.

The Field Office Director determined that the applicant is statutorily inadmissible to the United States for five years since her last departure, due to her failure to attend removal proceedings, and denied the application accordingly. *See Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated August 18, 2011.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant asserts that the applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to a qualifying relative if her waiver application is denied. Counsel further asserts that the applicant failed to appear at her immigration court proceedings because her notice of hearing was not mailed to her address. Counsel contends that the applicant is eligible to apply for permission to reapply for admission to the United States.

Section 212(a)(6)(B) of the Act states:

Failure to attend removal proceeding. -Any alien who without reasonable cause fails or refuses to attend or remain in attendance at a proceeding to determine the alien's inadmissibility or deportability and who seeks admission to the United States within 5 years of such alien's subsequent departure or removal is inadmissible.

As noted above, the record reflects that the applicant entered the United States without admission or parole on June 3, 2004. On January 4, 2006, the applicant was ordered removed *in absentia* after she failed to appear at a removal hearing. The applicant was removed from the United States on June 12, 2010. The applicant has not contested these facts. Rather, the applicant has argued that she had "reasonable cause" for failing to attend her removal proceeding, and that she is not inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(B) of the Act as a consequence.

Counsel for the applicant asserts that the applicant did not appear at her removal hearing proceedings because her notice of hearing was mailed to an address other than the applicant's address. Counsel seeks an exception to section 212(a)(6)(B) through the applicant's Form I-212 application for permission to reapply for admission after her removal from the United States. The AAO notes that the applicant is required to submit a Form I-212 application based her previous removal, pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(A)(iii) of the Act. The applicant's Form I-212 application does not address her inadmissibility to the United States under section 212(a)(6)(B) of the Act, just as this application alone also fails to address her inadmissibility under 212(i) and 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act.

There is no statutory waiver available for inadmissibility arising under section 212(a)(6)(B) of the Act. However, an alien is not inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(B) of the Act if the alien can establish that there was a "reasonable cause" for failure to attend his or her removal proceeding.

Counsel asserts that the applicant has demonstrated reasonable cause for her failure to attend removal proceedings. However, the instant appeal relates to a Form I-601 application for a waiver of inadmissibility arising under sections 212(i) and (a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act. Inadmissibility under section 212(a)(6)(B) of the Act and the "reasonable cause" exception thereto, is not the subject of the Form I-601 and is not within the subject matter jurisdiction of the AAO to adjudicate with this appeal.

The AAO's appellate authority in this case is limited to those matters that are within the scope of the Form I-601 waiver application. The authority to adjudicate appeals is delegated to the AAO by the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) pursuant to the authority vested in her through the Homeland Security Act of 2002, Pub. L. 107-296. *See* DHS Delegation Number 0150.1 (effective March 1, 2003); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 2.1 (2003). The AAO exercises appellate jurisdiction over the matters described at 8 C.F.R. § 103.1(f)(3)(iii) (as in effect on February 28, 2003).<sup>1</sup> The AAO cannot exercise appellate jurisdiction over additional matters on its own volition, or at the request of an applicant or petitioner. As a "statement of general . . . applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy," the creation of appeal rights for adjustment application denials meets the definition of an agency "rule" under section 551 of the Administrative Procedure Act. The granting of appeal rights has a "substantive legal effect" because it is creating a new administrative "right," and it involves an economic interest (the fee). "If a rule creates rights, assigns duties, or imposes obligations, the basic tenor of which is not already outlined in the law itself, then it is substantive." *La Casa Del Convaleciente v. Sullivan*, 965 F.2d 1175, 1178 (1st Cir. 1992). All substantive or legislative rule making requires notice and comment in the Federal Register.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although 8 C.F.R. § 103(f)(3)(iii), as in effect on February 28, 2003, was subsequently omitted from the Code of Federal Regulations, courts have recognized that DHS continues to delegate appellate authority to the AAO consistent with that regulation. *See U.S. v. Gonzalez & Gonzalez Bonds and Insurance Agency, Inc.*, 728 F.Supp.2d 1077, 1082-1083 (N.D. Cal. 2010); *see also Rahman v. Napolitano*, 814 F.Supp.2d 1098, 1103 (W.D. Washington 2011).

Under 8 C.F.R. § 103.1(f)(3)(iii)(F) (as in effect on February 28, 2003), the AAO has authority to adjudicate “[a]pplications for waiver of certain grounds of excludability [now inadmissibility] under § 212.7(a) of this chapter.” 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(a)(1) currently provides that an alien who is inadmissible and eligible for a waiver may apply for a waiver on a form designated by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) in accordance with the form instructions. A waiver, if granted, applies to those grounds of inadmissibility and “to those crimes, events or incidents specified in the application for waiver.” 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(a). The form instructions for the Form I-601,<sup>2</sup> to which 8 C.F.R. § 212.7(a) refers, further defines the classes of aliens who may file a Form I-601, and the form itself provides a list of each ground of inadmissibility that can be waived, allowing the applicant to check a box next to those grounds for which the applicant seeks a waiver. As there is no statutory basis to waive inadmissibility under section 212(a)(6)(B) of the Act, neither the Form I-601 nor the instructions for Form I-601 list this ground of inadmissibility.

The object of the Form I-601 waiver application, in the context of an application for an immigrant visa filed at a consulate or embassy abroad, is to remove inadmissibility as a basis of ineligibility for that visa. An alien is not required to file a separate waiver application for each ground of inadmissibility, but rather one application that, if approved, extends to all inadmissibilities specified in the application. However, where an alien is subject to an inadmissibility that cannot be waived, approval of the waiver application would not have the intended effect. Thus, no purpose is served in adjudicating such a waiver application, and USCIS may deny it for that reason as a matter of discretion. *Cf. Matter of J- F- D-*, 10 I&N Dec. 694 (Reg. Comm. 1963).

Counsel addresses the decision of the Field Office Director and asserts that the applicant has shown a reasonable cause for her failure to attend her removal proceeding. As the AAO lacks jurisdiction to review the “reasonable cause” issue, we will not evaluate the facts as presented and find that no purpose is served in adjudicating the applicant’s application for a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to sections 212(i) and 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act.

The AAO notes that the Field Office Director denied the applicant’s Form I-212 Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission into the United States After Deportation or Removal (Form I-212) in the same decision. *Matter of Martinez-Torres*, 10 I&N Dec. 776 (reg. Comm. 1964) held that an application for permission to reapply for admission is denied, in the exercise of discretion, to an alien who is mandatorily inadmissible to the United States under another section of the Act, and no purpose would be served in granting the application. As the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(B) of the Act no purpose would be served in granting the applicant’s Form I-212.

Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361, provides that the burden of proof is on the applicant to establish eligibility for the benefit sought. The applicant has failed to overcome the basis of denial of her Form I-601 waiver application.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.uscis.gov/files/form/i-601instr.pdf>