



# H2

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

Removing data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

File: [REDACTED] Office: MIAMI, FLORIDA

Date: **JAN 09 2002**

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

Application: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under  
Section 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.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,  
EXAMINATIONS

  
Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application was denied by the Acting District Director, Miami, Florida, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Haiti who was found to be inadmissible to the United States under section 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 a benefit by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant is married to a United States citizen and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1182(i), in order to remain in the United States and adjust her status under the Haitian Refugee Immigrant Fairness Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277 (HRIFA).

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.

On appeal, the applicant states that she and her husband have a good relationship that would suffer should there be any separation. She also states that she has been in the United States for a long time, has not committed any crime, has worked to take care of herself and her family, and that her deportation from the United States would result in extreme hardship to her.

The record reflects that the applicant sought to procure admission into the United States on October 2, 1994 by presenting a photo-substituted Haitian passport in another person's name. On August 17, 1995, an immigration judge ordered the applicant excluded and deported from the United States for fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact.

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 902 of HRIFA provides that an applicant who is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act is ineligible for adjustment of status under HRIFA unless he or she receives a waiver of that ground of inadmissibility.

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 section 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 section 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 BIA stipulated that the factors deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship pursuant to section 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 contains a statement from the applicant's spouse indicating that the applicant has been a strong support for him since the couple's marriage in March 1997 and that she helps him emotionally and financially. The spouse states that the applicant is his best friend and confidante in life, that he would be lost without her, and that the couple want to try to start a family together.

In Perez v. INS, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), the court stated that "extreme hardship" is hardship that is unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation.

The court held in INS v. Jong Ha Wang, 450 U.S. 139 (1981), that the mere showing of economic detriment to qualifying family members is insufficient to warrant a finding of extreme hardship.

A review of the documentation in the record 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 remain in the United States. Hardship to the applicant herself is not a consideration in section 212(i) waiver proceedings. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether she merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 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.

12/27/01/AAOPXN01/G/73776063.601