



**PUBLIC COPY**

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



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

File:  Office: NEWARK, NJ

Date: JAN 14 2003

IN RE: Applicant: 

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:



**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, Newark, New Jersey, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of the Philippines 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 procured admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant is married to a naturalized citizen of the United States and is the beneficiary of an approved petition for alien relative. She 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.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant is an immigrant and should be entitled to a waiver; the applicant has met her burden in establishing that she warrants a waiver of inadmissibility as a matter of discretion; a balance of adverse factors with social and human considerations must be used to determine whether the applicant warrants relief in the exercise of discretion; approval of a waiver is dependent, in part, upon a showing of extreme hardship to a qualifying relative; and, most importantly, the applicant has never committed a crime and has a clear record. Counsel also asserts that most of the applicant's family are in the United States, she has only her father who remains in the Philippines, financial conditions in the Philippines are poor, the applicant assists her spouse financially, and adequate medical care for the applicant's spouse may not be available in the Philippines.

The record reflects that the applicant has admitted that she procured admission into the United States on November 2, 1992 by presenting a fraudulent passport containing a fraudulent U.S. nonimmigrant visa for which she paid \$5,000 to a vendor prior to departing the Philippines.

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).

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, 22 I&N Dec. 560 (BIA 1999).

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).

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, the re-inclusion of the perpetual bar and eliminating children as a consideration in determining the presence of extreme hardship, 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 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, 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 record reflects that the applicant and her spouse, also a native of the Philippines who naturalized as a citizen of the United States in April 2000, were married in California on February 23, 2001. The spouse had an operation for a perforated duodenal ulcer on March 18, 2001 and was on temporary medical disability from his employment for a period of three months. He is on medication and must watch his diet, and the applicant assists him by preparing his meals and keeping up with his medication.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief; a physician's letter dated February 25, 2002 indicating that stress is the most significant factor in the occurrence or recurrence of peptic ulcer disease; and documentation previously submitted and considered by the district director in her denial of the applicant's waiver request. Counsel asserts that the applicant has never committed a crime and that the only negative factor present in her case is her entry into the United States with another person's passport. Counsel also asserts that the applicant assists her husband financially, medically and emotionally, and that her removal from the United States would cause him extreme hardship. Finally, counsel asserts that the spouse's medical condition is chronic and could take a turn for the worse with stress over the applicant's removal.

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. Further, the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. See Hassan v. INS, 927 F.2d 465 (9th Cir. 1991).

It is noted that there are no laws that require the applicant's spouse to relocate abroad. 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 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.

While unfortunate, the medical condition of the applicant's spouse is not indicated to a significant condition of health for which treatment is unavailable in the Philippines. There is also no evidence that the applicant's presence is integral to his care and treatment, merely that she assists him in preparing his meals and taking his medication.

A review of the factors presented, and the aggregate effect of those factors, indicates that the applicant has failed to establish that her spouse (the only qualifying relative) would suffer hardship that reaches the level of extreme as envisioned by Congress if the applicant is not allowed to remain in the United States at this time. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing the favorable or unfavorable exercise of the Attorney General's 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.