

**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* MS2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



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

*H6*

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Date:

**AUG 10 2010**

CDJ 2006 532 477

IN RE:

[REDACTED]

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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[REDACTED]

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.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Mexico City, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed as 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 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 his wife 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 April 28, 2008.

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records show that, subsequent to filing the instant application, the applicant was admitted to the United States as an immigrant on March 11, 2009. Because the applicant is now a lawful permanent resident, further pursuit of the matter at hand is moot.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.