



HI

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

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



FILE: [Redacted] Office: MADRID, SPAIN

Date: JUN 18 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: SELF-REPRESENTED

Public Copy

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.

Justification data deleted to  
protect clearly unwarranted  
information personal privacy.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,  
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Acting Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the Officer in Charge, Madrid, Spain, and is now before the Associate Commissioner on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Spain who was found by a consular officer 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 sought to procure admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant is married to a United States citizen and is the beneficiary of an approved petition for alien relative. He seeks the above waiver in order to travel to the United States to reside with his spouse.

The officer in charge concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly.

On appeal, the applicant's spouse states that she is suffering psychological stress and depression due to the denial of her husband's waiver request. She indicates that she is currently residing in Spain but now needs to return to the United States in order to care for her mother and continue her studies.

The record reflects that the applicant was denied issuance of an immigrant visa under § 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act by a consular officer at the American Embassy in Madrid, Spain on August 25, 2000. The consular officer indicates that the finding of inadmissibility was based upon the applicant's having attempted to procure admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation at Portland, Maine in June 1999. At that time, the applicant was refused admission when attempting to reenter the United States from Canada without proper documentation.

The issue of inadmissibility is not the purpose of this proceeding. Issues of inadmissibility are to be determined by the consular officer when an alien applies for a visa abroad. This proceeding must be limited to the issue of whether or not the applicant meets the statutory and discretionary requirements necessary for the exclusion ground to be waived. 22 C.F.R. 42.81 contains the necessary procedures for overcoming the refusal of an immigrant visa by a consular officer.

Section 212(a) of the Act states:

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) of the Act states:

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).

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.

The record reflects that the applicant's spouse has resided in Spain for the past two and one-half years and that she and the applicant were married in Spain in July 2000. The spouse states that she and the applicant are facing financial difficulties due to her having been unable to obtain employment in Spain for the past six months. She desires to return to the United States in order to continue her studies and professional career. In addition, the spouse submits documentation indicating that her mother will require surgery in January 2001. The mother's physician states that the presence of the applicant's spouse is "expected in order to assist her mother post-surgery."

On appeal, the applicant's spouse also submits a psychological report dated December 13, 2000 from her therapist in Spain. The report indicates that the spouse sought psychological treatment in September 2000 for acute depression and that three months of treatment did not result in an improvement of the spouse's condition. While the spouse's medical condition is unfortunate, there is no indication in the record that it is a significant condition of health, that the applicant's presence is integral to the care and treatment of his spouse, or that suitable care and treatment is unavailable to the spouse in Spain.

There are no laws that require the applicant's United States citizen spouse to remain 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 Shooshtary v. INS, 39 F.3d 1049 (9th Cir. 1994). In Silverman v. Rogers, 437 F.2d 102 (1st Cir. 1970), 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."

The assertion of financial hardship to the applicant's spouse advanced in the record is contradicted by the fact that, pursuant to § 213A of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1183a, and the regulations at 8 C.F.R. 213a, the person who files an application for an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status on or after December 19, 1997 must execute a Form I-864 (Affidavit of Support) which is legally

enforceable in behalf of a beneficiary (the applicant) who is an immediate relative or a family-sponsored immigrant when an applicant applies for an immigrant visa. The statute and the regulations do not provide for an alien beneficiary to execute an affidavit of support in behalf of a U.S. citizen or resident alien petitioner. Therefore, a claim that an alien beneficiary is needed for the purpose of supporting a citizen or resident alien petitioner can only be considered as a hardship in rare instances.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, fails to establish the existence of hardship to the applicant's spouse caused by separation that reaches the level of extreme as envisioned by Congress if the applicant is not allowed to travel to the United States to reside. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether he merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

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 appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.