



U.S. Department of Justice

**PUBLIC COPY**

Immigration and Naturalization Service

*Handwritten initials: HA*

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

[Redacted]

**JAN 08 2003**

FILE: [Redacted]

Office: Miami

Date:

IN RE: Applicant:

[Redacted]

**Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy**

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

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

This is the decision 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 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 that 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 that 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 waiver application was denied by the District Director, Miami, Florida, and a subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Associate Commissioner for Examinations. The matter is before the Associate Commissioner on a motion to reopen. The motion will be dismissed, and the order dismissing the appeal will be affirmed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Haiti who attempted to procure admission into the United States on April 4, 1994, by presenting a photo-switched passport from the British Turks & Caicos Islands in the name [REDACTED]. The applicant was charged with being excludable 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 attempted to procure admission into the United States by fraud. The applicant was paroled into the United States until July 3, 1994, for an exclusion hearing. The charging documents were never forwarded to the immigration court.

The applicant filed an application on February 24, 2000, seeking to have her status adjusted to that of permanent resident under section 902 of the Haitian Refugee Immigrant Fairness Act of 1998 (HRIFA). On July 2, 2001, the applicant married a lawful permanent resident, [REDACTED]. The applicant seeks the above waiver in order to remain in the United States and reside with her spouse.

The 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 motion, the applicant submits a physician's report which indicates that [REDACTED] is under the physician's care for severe hypertension and is on a strict regimen of medications and a low sodium diet. The physician states that Mr. [REDACTED] has been a very poor compliant in the treatment plan. The physician states that, in his medical and humanitarian opinion, the presence of the applicant may help improve Mr. [REDACTED] compliance in the diet and medications to avoid a severe emergency.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act provides that:

- (i) 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 provides that:

- (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 section 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 Cervantes-Gonzalez, Interim Decision 3380 (BIA 1999)

In 1986, Congress expanded the reach of the ground of inadmissibility in the Immigration Marriage Fraud Amendments of 1986, P.L. No. 99-639, § 6(a), 100 Stat. 3537, redesignated as section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act by the Immigration Act of 1990 (Pub. L. No. 101-649, Nov. 29, 1990, 104 Stat. 5067). In 1986, 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. This feature of the 1986 Act renders an alien perpetually inadmissible based on past misrepresentations.

In 1990, section 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-

(2) 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, ... (or to obtain a benefit under this Act). The latter portion was added in 1996 by the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA).

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.

To recapitulate, the applicant knowingly obtained a photo-switched passport in an assumed name and used that document to attempt to procure admission into the United States in April 1994, a felony.

Congress has increased the penalties on fraud and willful misrepresentation, including the narrowing of the parameters for eligibility, the re-inclusion of the perpetual bar and eliminating children as a consideration in determining the presence of extreme hardship. 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 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-Moralez, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (BIA 1996).

In Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, supra, the Board of Immigration Appeals (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 BIA noted in Cervantes-Gonzalez that the alien's wife knew that he was in deportation proceedings at the time they were married. The BIA stated that this factor goes to the wife's expectations at the time they were wed. The alien's wife was aware that she may have to face the decision of parting from her husband or following him to Mexico in the event he was ordered deported. The alien's wife was also aware that a move to Mexico would separate her from her family in the United States. The BIA found this to undermine the alien's argument that his wife will suffer extreme hardship if he is deported. The BIA then refers to Perez v. INS, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), where the court stated 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.

The applicant in the present matter had been unlawfully present in the United States since July 4, 1994, and it must be presumed that her husband was aware of that when they married in July 2001.

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.

There are no laws that require a United States citizen to leave the United States and live abroad. The applicant's spouse is employed in the United States. He is not required to leave and go to Haiti. 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 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."

Although, on motion, the applicant submitted a physician's diagnosis which indicates that her husband suffers from hypertension, the record fails to show that hypertension, in and of itself, is considered a serious medical condition that cannot be treated routinely. The record indicates that the applicant's husband is not following the physicians prescribed treatment and instructions. The letter further indicates that the applicant's presence "may help improve compliance" but fails to indicate why her presence is not currently helping him to avoid the complications he is experiencing.

A review of the documentation in the record including the physician's diagnosis, 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, emotional and social disruptions involved in the removal of a family member.

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. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the order dismissing the appeal will be affirmed.

**ORDER:** The order of July 18, 2002, dismissing the appeal is affirmed.