

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

[REDACTED]

HG

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO Date: **AUG 24 2010**
[REDACTED] relates) (CIUDAD JAUREZ)
[REDACTED] (relates)

IN RE: [REDACTED]

PETITION: 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. section 1182(a)(9)(B)(v).

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[REDACTED] IS

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,

Perry Rhew
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 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 spouse and two 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 on October 29, 2007.

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records show that, subsequent to filing the instant application, the applicant was adjusted to the status of a lawful permanent resident on September 30, 2008. Because the applicant is now a lawful permanent resident, further pursuit of the matter at hand is moot.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.

