



U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

HM

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536

[REDACTED]

FILE:

Office: SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Date:

FEB 2 2001

IN RE: Applicant:

[REDACTED]

APPLICATION:

Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under §
212(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1182(i)

IN BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[REDACTED]

PUBLIC COPY

Identification data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS


Mary C. Mulrean, Acting Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Acting District Director, San Francisco, California, and a subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Associate Commissioner for Examinations. The Associate Commissioner affirmed that decision on a motion to reopen. The matter is now before the Associate Commissioner on a second motion to reopen. The motion will be granted and the order dismissing the appeal will be reaffirmed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of the Philippines who was found to be inadmissible to the United States under § 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having procured admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation in 1989. The applicant married a United States citizen in April 1997 and is the beneficiary of an approved preference visa petition. The applicant seeks the above waiver in order to remain in the United States and reside with her spouse.

The acting district director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. The Associate Commissioner affirmed that decision on appeal.

On the first motion, counsel stated that Associate Commissioner failed to consider all relevant factors, including family separation, the husband relocating with the applicant to the Philippines, her husband's inability to get a job in that country, and her husband's inability to speak the languages of the Philippines. Counsel de-emphasized the applicant's fraudulent conduct and stated that the applicant is not a criminal, has lived the life of a model resident, has worked and paid her taxes. Counsel requested that the Associate Commissioner reconsider the prior decision.

On second motion, counsel argues that the dismissal of the first motion was in error in that it relied on erroneous information that the applicant's spouse is a lawful permanent resident of the United States when in fact he is a native-born United States citizen. Counsel states that this misunderstanding is monumental in that it presupposes that the applicant's spouse can easily travel to the Philippines because he is a citizen of that country. Counsel asserts that the applicant's spouse will suffer extreme hardship if he relocates to the Philippines with his spouse because he has never before been there, does not know the language or culture, has no family members to provide him support, and would be unable to find suitable employment due to high unemployment. Counsel also asserts that the applicant's spouse would be ostracized, ridiculed and discriminated against in the Philippines because he would be perceived as someone who had the opportunity for a good life in the United States but somehow had blown the opportunity.

On second motion, counsel also argues that the dismissal of the first motion interposed and claimed as adverse factors the applicant's unauthorized employment and unlawful presence in the United States. Counsel asserts that these factors are irrelevant

and inadmissible in the determination of a waiver under § 212(i).

The record reflects that the applicant purchased a fraudulent passport from a travel agency in 1989 for \$1,500.00. The travel agency then obtained a nonimmigrant visa for the applicant and she was admitted to the United States as a nonimmigrant visitor on March 23, 1989, with authorization to remain until November 22, 1989. Following her admission, she remained in the United States longer than authorized and obtained employment without Service authorization. After more than 7 years of unlawful presence and unauthorized employment, she then married her present spouse in 1997.

Section 212(a) CLASSES OF ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS OR ADMISSION.-Except as otherwise provided in this Act, aliens who are inadmissible under the following paragraphs are ineligible to receive visas and ineligible to be admitted to the United States:

(6) ILLEGAL ENTRANTS AND IMMIGRATION VIOLATORS.-

(C) MISREPRESENTATION.-

(i) IN GENERAL.-Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

Section 212(i) ADMISSION OF IMMIGRANT INADMISSIBLE FOR FRAUD OR WILLFUL MISREPRESENTATION OF MATERIAL FACT.-

(1) The Attorney General may, in the discretion of the Attorney General, waive the application of clause (i) of subsection (a)(6)(C) in the case of an alien who is the spouse, son or daughter of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the refusal of admission to the United States of such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such an alien.

(2) No court shall have jurisdiction to review a decision or action of the Attorney General regarding a waiver under paragraph (1).

Sections 212(a)(6)(C) and 212(i) of the Act were amended by the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA), Pub L. 104-208, 110 Stat. 3009. There is no longer any alternative provision for waiver of a § 212(a)(6)(C)(i) violation due to passage of time. In the absence of explicit statutory direction, an applicant's eligibility is determined under the statute in effect at the time his or her application is finally

considered. See Matter of Soriano, 21 I&N Dec. 516 (BIA 1996, A.G. 1997).

If an amendment makes the statute more restrictive after the application is filed, the eligibility is determined under the terms of the amendment. Conversely, if the amendment makes the statute more generous, the application must be considered by more generous terms. Matter of George and Lopez-Alvarez, 11 I&N Dec. 419 (BIA 1965); Matter of Leveque, 12 I&N Dec. 633 (BIA 1968).

In 1986, Congress expanded the reach of the ground of inadmissibility in the Immigration Marriage Fraud Amendments of 1986, P.L. No. 99-639, and redesignated as § 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act by the Immigration Act of 1990 (Pub. L. No. 101-649, Nov. 29, 1990, 104 Stat. 5067) effective June 1, 1991. Congress imposed the statutory bar on (a) those who made oral or written misrepresentations in seeking admission into the United States; (b) those who have made material misrepresentations in seeking entry admission into the United States or "other benefits" provided under the Act; and (c) it made the amended statute applicable to the receipt of visas by, and the admission of, aliens occurring after the date of the enactment based on fraud or misrepresentation occurring before, on, or after such date.

In 1990, § 274C of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1324c, was inserted by the Immigration Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-649, Nov. 29, 1990, 104 Stat. 5059), effective for persons or entities that have committed violations on or after November 29, 1990. Section 274C(a) provided penalties for document fraud stating that it is unlawful for any person or entity knowingly "...to use, attempt to use, possess, obtain, accept, or receive or to provide any forged, counterfeit, altered, or falsely made document in order to satisfy any requirement of this Act,...."

In 1994 Congress passed the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act (P.L. 103-322, September 13, 1994), which enhanced the criminal penalties of certain offenses, including 18 U.S.C. 1546:

(a)...Impersonation in entry document or admission application; evading or trying to evade immigration laws using assumed or fictitious name...knowingly making false statement under oath about material fact in immigration application or document....

(b) Knowingly using false or unlawfully issued document or false attestation to satisfy the Act provision on verifying whether employee is authorized to work.

The penalty for a violation under (a) increased from up to 5 years imprisonment and a fine or both to up to 10 years imprisonment and a fine or both. The penalty for a violation under (b) increased from up to 2 years imprisonment or a fine or both to up to 5 years imprisonment or a fine, or both.

In 1996, Congress expanded the document fraud liability to those who engage in document fraud for the purpose of obtaining a benefit under the Act. Congress also restricted § 212(i) of the Act in a number of ways with the recent IIRIRA amendments. First, immigrants who are parents of U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident children can no longer apply for this waiver. Second, the immigrant must now show that refusing him or her admission would cause extreme hardship to the qualifying relative. Third, Congress eliminated the alternative 10-year provision for immigrants who failed to have qualifying relatives. Fourth, Congress eliminated judicial review of § 212(i) waiver decisions, and Fifth, a child is no longer a qualifying relative.

After reviewing the amendments to the Act and to other statutes regarding fraud and misrepresentation from 1957 to the present time, and after noting the increased penalties Congress has placed on such activities, including the narrowing of the parameters for eligibility, and the re-inclusion of the perpetual bar, it is concluded that Congress has placed a high priority on reducing and/or stopping fraud and misrepresentation related to immigration and other matters.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides that a waiver of the bar to admission resulting from § 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship on a qualifying family member. Although extreme hardship is a requirement for § 212(i) relief, once established, it is but one favorable discretionary factor to be considered. See Matter of Mendez, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (BIA 1996).

In Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, Interim Decision 3380 (BIA 1999), the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) stipulated that the factors deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship pursuant to § 212(i) of the Act include, but are not limited to, the following: the presence of a lawful permanent resident or United States citizen spouse or parent in this country; the qualifying relative's family ties outside the United States; the conditions in the country or countries to which the qualifying relative would relocate and the extent of the qualifying relative's ties in such countries; the financial impact of departure from this country; and finally, significant conditions of health, particularly when tied to an unavailability of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate.

In Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, the Board also held that the underlying fraud or misrepresentation may be considered as an adverse factor in adjudicating a § 212(i) waiver application in the exercise of discretion. Matter of Tijam, Interim Decision 3372 (BIA 1998), followed. The Board declined to follow the policy set forth by the Commissioner in Matter of Alonso, 17 I&N Dec. 292 (Comm. 1979), and noted that the United States Supreme Court ruled in INS v. Yueh-Shaio Yang, 519 U.S. 26 (1996), that the Attorney General has the authority to consider any and all negative factors, including the respondent's initial fraud.

Based on the fact that the applicant entered the United States with a fraudulent passport, it may be concluded that she was aware that she may face the decision of parting from her husband if he chose not to follow her to the Philippines in the event she was ordered deported. This factor undermines the applicant's argument that her husband would suffer extreme hardship if she is deported or found to be inadmissible to the United States. See Perez v. INS, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996) stating that "extreme hardship" is hardship that is unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. The common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship.

There are no laws that require the applicant's spouse to leave the United States and live abroad. Further, the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. See Hassan v. INS, 927 F.2d 465 (9th Cir. 1991). The uprooting of family and separation from friends does not necessarily amount to extreme hardship but rather represents the type of inconvenience and hardship experienced by the families of most aliens being deported. See Shoostary v. INS, 39 F.3d 1049 (9th Cir. 1994). In Cervantes-Gonzalez, the Board referred to a decision in Silverman v. Rogers, 437 F.2d 102 (1st Cir. 1970), in which the court stated that "even assuming that the federal government had no right either to prevent a marriage or destroy it, we believe that here it has done nothing more than to say that the residence of one of the marriage partners may not be in the United States."

It is also noted that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in Carnalla-Muñoz v. INS, 627 F.2d 1004 (9th Cir. 1980), held that an after-acquired equity (referred to as an after-acquired family tie in Matter of Tijam, Interim Decision 3372 (BIA 1998)), need not be accorded great weight by the district director in considering discretionary weight. The applicant in the present matter entered the United States in 1989 by fraud, obtained unauthorized employment and married her spouse in April 1997. She now seeks relief based on that after-acquired equity or after-acquired family tie.

Counsel has stated that the reference to "after-acquired equity" pertains to an equity acquired after a deportation order has been issued and the applicant is not under any type of proceedings. However, in Matter of Tijam, the Board referred to the addition of the discretionary component to § 241(a)(1)(H) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1231(a)(1)(H), and the granting of relief to aliens whose initial and other fraud was more than counterbalanced by after-acquired family ties.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, reflects that the applicant has failed to show that the qualifying relative would suffer extreme hardship over and above the normal economic and social disruptions involved in the removal of a family member.

The grant or denial of the above waiver does not turn only on the issue of the meaning of "extreme hardship." It also hinges on the

discretion of the Attorney General and pursuant to such terms, conditions, and procedures as she may by regulations prescribe.

The favorable factors include the applicant's family tie, the absence of a criminal record, and general hardship to the qualifying relative. The unfavorable factors include the applicant's procuring a nonimmigrant visa and admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation, the applicant's employment without Service authorization and her lengthy stay in the United States without Service authorization.

The United States Supreme Court ruled in INS v. Yueh-Shaio Yang, that the Attorney General has the authority to consider any and all negative factors in deciding whether or not to grant a favorable exercise of discretion. The Associate Commissioner does not deem it improper to give less weight in a discretionary matter to an alien's marriage which was entered into in the United States following a fraudulent entry and after a period of unlawful residence in the United States as opposed to a marriage entered into abroad followed by a fraudulent entry.

In the latter scenario the alien who marries abroad legitimately gains an equity or family tie which may result in his or her obtaining an immigrant visa and entering the United States lawfully even though the alien may fraudulently enter the United States after the marriage and before obtaining the visa. Whereas in the former scenario the alien who marries after he or she fraudulently enters the United States and resides without Service authorization does gain an after-acquired equity or family tie that he or she was not entitled to without the perpetration of the fraud.

Notwithstanding that the decision in Carnalla-Muñoz v. INS, related to an alien in removal or deportation proceedings, the alien's equity was gained subsequent to a violation of an immigration law, and when considering an issue as a matter of discretion an equity gained contrary to law should receive less weight than an equity gained through legal and legitimate means.

The applicant's actions in this matter cannot be condoned. Her equity (a marriage entered into following a fraudulent entry) can be given only minimal weight. The unfavorable factors outweigh the favorable ones.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under § 212(i) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. See Matter of T-S-Y-, 7 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1957). Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the order dismissing the appeal will be reaffirmed.

ORDER: The order of September 30, 1999 dismissing the appeal is reaffirmed.