

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  
20 Massachusetts Avenue N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20529-2090  
**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**



H6

DATE: JUL 30 2012      OFFICE: LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA      FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE:                      Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION:            Application for Waiver of Grounds 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:



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 "Perry Rhew", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of El Salvador 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 one year or more and seeking readmission within 10 years of her last departure from the United States. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her U.S. citizen husband.

The Field Office 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 Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *See Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated February 18, 2010.

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 initially entered the United States without inspection by U.S. immigration officials around July 29, 1995. She filed an Application for Temporary Protected Status (Form I-821) on or about March 16, 2001. She left the United States on or about May 7, 2002, and returned on May 20, 2002, pursuant to Advance Parole; valid until July 15, 2002. The applicant's Form I-821 was approved on September 16, 2002. The applicant accrued unlawful

presence from April 1, 1997, the effective date of the unlawful presence provisions in the Act, until March 16, 2001, when she filed the Form I-821; a period in excess of one year.<sup>1</sup>

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 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> The AAO notes that the record also reflects that the applicant entered the United States again on October 31, 2004, pursuant to Advance Parole; valid until March 9, 2005, and has remained to date.