


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy
PUBLIC COPY



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

HC6



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ)
AAO 08 161 50023 (relates)
CDJ 2005 718 815 (relates)

Date:

AUG 16 2010

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

PETITION: 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 PETITIONER:

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.

Thank you,

Argum Sikka
for

Perry Rhew
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 for more than one year and seeking readmission within 10 years of his last departure. The applicant 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 in the United States with his U.S. citizen wife.

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 February 6, 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 April 29, 2009. Because the applicant is now a lawful permanent resident, further pursuit of the matter at hand is moot.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.