

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090  
20 Massachusetts Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

H6

DATE: DEC 17 2012 Office: SAN DIEGO, CA

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: [REDACTED]

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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[REDACTED]

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the District Director, San Diego, California, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed as applicant is not inadmissible and the underlying waiver application is unnecessary.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who entered the United States without inspection in 2000. The applicant departed the United States in September 2005 based on a grant of advance parole. He was paroled into the United States on both December 5, 2005 and February 2006. Upon adjudication of the application for adjustment of status, the District Director found the applicant 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 and seeking admission within 10 years of his last departure.<sup>1</sup> The applicant filed an application for a waiver of inadmissibility with his application for adjustment of status in order to reside in the United States with his U.S. citizen spouse and children.

The District Director concluded that the applicant failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Ground of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated July 20, 2011.

Section 212(a)(9) of the Act provides:

(B) ALIENS UNLAWFULLY PRESENT.-

(i) In general.- Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who-

(I) was unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than 180 days but less than 1 year, voluntarily departed the United States (whether or not pursuant to section 244(e) prior to the commencement of proceedings under section 235(b)(1) or section 240), and again seeks admission within 3 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal, or

(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.

---

<sup>1</sup> The District Director indicates that the applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for fraud or misrepresentation. *See Decision of the District Director*, dated July 20, 2011. However, the District Director concludes that the applicant is inadmissible 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 the record does not demonstrate that the applicant is inadmissible for fraud or misrepresentation.

In *Matter of Arrabally and Yerrabelly*, 25 I&N Dec. 771 (BIA 2012), the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) held that an applicant for adjustment of status who left the United States temporarily pursuant to advance parole under section 212(d)(5)(A) of the Act did not make a departure from the United States within the meaning of section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act. Here, the applicant obtained advance parole under section 212(d)(5)(A) of the Act, temporarily left the United States pursuant to that grant of advance parole, and was paroled into the United States. In accordance with the BIA's decision in *Matter of Arrabally*, the applicant did not make a departure from the United States for the purposes of section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act. Accordingly, the applicant is not inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act. The applicant's waiver application is thus unnecessary and the appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed as the underlying waiver application is unnecessary.