




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

Identify...  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



H6

FILE: [redacted] Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO (CIUDAD JUAREZ) Date: **MAR 26 2010**  
CDJ 2003 622 025

IN RE: [redacted]

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

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.

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, Mexico, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record reflects that the applicant is a 49-year-old 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 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. The applicant is married to a citizen of the United States, and he seeks a waiver of inadmissibility under 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 in the United States.

The director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to his spouse, and denied the application accordingly. *Decision of the Director*, dated July 19, 2007. On appeal, the applicant's wife contends through counsel that she received ineffective assistance of counsel from a notario in Mexico, and she requested additional time to present evidence of extreme hardship. *See Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal*, dated Aug. 15, 2007. To date, over two years later, no additional evidence has been received.

The immigration regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) state, in pertinent part:

*Summary dismissal.* An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

The applicant failed to identify any erroneous conclusions of law or statements of fact in the director's decision, and failed to provide additional evidence. The AAO, therefore, will summarily dismiss the appeal.

**ORDER:** The appeal is summarily dismissed.