

**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
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



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



H6

FILE:



Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ)

Date: **APR 21 2010**

IN RE:



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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. 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 \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Mexico City. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed, the previous decision of the district director will be withdrawn, and the application declared moot.

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)(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 is married to a naturalized 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), in order to reside with her husband and children in the United States.

The district director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated September 14, 2007.

The record contains, *inter alia*: a copy of the marriage certificate of the applicant and her husband, [REDACTED] indicating they were married on June 1, 1995; copies of the birth certificates of the couple's four U.S. citizen children; a letter from [REDACTED] a letter from the applicant; a note from [REDACTED] physician; letters from the couple's children; photographs of the applicant and her family; and an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision on the appeal.

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

Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who -

....

(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.

In this case, the district director found, and the applicant does not contest, that she entered the United States in 1993 without inspection and remained until December 1998. The applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the date of enactment of unlawful presence provisions under the Act, until her departure from the United States in December 1998. The applicant accrued unlawful presence of over one year. Pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), the applicant was barred from again seeking admission within ten years of the date of her departure.

An application for admission or adjustment is a “continuing” application, adjudicated on the basis of the law and facts in effect on the date of the decision. *Matter of Alarcon*, 20 I&N Dec. 557 (BIA 1992). There has been no final decision made on the applicant’s application for admission, so the applicant, as of today, is still seeking admission to the United States. The applicant’s departure occurred in 1998. It has now been more than ten years since the departure that made the applicant inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act. A clear reading of the law reveals that the applicant is no longer inadmissible.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed, the prior decision of the district director is withdrawn, and the application for a waiver of inadmissibility is declared moot.