

**U.S. Department of Homeland Security**  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



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

†t6

[REDACTED] DATE: Office: NEW YORK, NY File: [REDACTED]

IN RE: DEC 21 2012 Applicant: [REDACTED]

**APPLICATION:** 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 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.

If you believe the AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

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. The matter 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 Ireland. He 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 one year or more and seeking admission within ten years of his last departure. He is married to a United States citizen. He 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).

The District Director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that the bar to his admission would impose extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, his U.S. citizen spouse, and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) on January 25, 2011.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant asserts the applicant is not inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act because he did not accrue over 365 days of unlawful presence, and that the applicant's spouse would experience extreme hardship both upon relocation and separation. *Form I-290B*, received February 23, 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.

The record reflects that the applicant entered the United States in 2004, and overstayed his authorized period of stay until he departed the United States in 2008. The applicant was re-admitted pursuant to an approved advance parole issued on February 26, 2008. The District Director concluded that the applicant had triggered the unlawful presence provision of the Act by departing the United States under advance parole.

In *Matter of Arrabally and Yerrabelly*, 25 I&N Dec. 771 (BIA 2012), the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) held that an alien who leaves the United States temporarily pursuant to advance parole under section 212(d)(5)(A) of the Act does 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 to pursue a pending application for adjustment of status. In accordance with the BIA's decision in *Matter of Arabally*, 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.

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