

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

H3

FILE:

Office: MEXICO CITY (SANTO DOMINGO) Date: MAY 04 2009

IN RE:


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:

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).


John F. Grissom
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Mexico City. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Trinidad 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 for more than one year and seeking readmission within 10 years of her last departure. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to enter the United States and reside with her U.S. citizen husband.

The district director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen husband and denied the Form I-601 application for a waiver accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated December 14, 2006.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant contends that the decision to deny the waiver application and the immigration judge's decision to remove the applicant were not in accord with the Act and case law. *Statement from Counsel on Form I-290B*, submitted February 15, 2007. Counsel states that the applicant did not receive notice of her hearing in immigration court, and thus she was unable to attend. Counsel further requested 120 days in which to file a brief in support of the appeal. On June 29, 2007 counsel submitted another request for an extension to file a brief indicating that the applicant's immigration court record had been requested, but not yet received. No statements were made regarding the denial of the applicant's Form I-601 waiver application.

8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1) states in pertinent part that:

- (v) 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 AAO finds that the applicant's appeal fails to identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in the district director's decision. The appeal is therefore summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.