

PUBLIC COPY

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

Handwritten initials: XA



U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536

**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

[Redacted]

FILE: [Redacted]

Office: BALTIMORE, MD

Date: **APR 19 2004**

IN RE: [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)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[Redacted]

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Acting District Director, Baltimore, Maryland, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Ghana 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 legal permanent resident of the United States and is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative. The applicant seeks the above waiver of inadmissibility in order to remain in the United States with his spouse and U.S. citizen children.

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 for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *See* Decision of the Acting District Director, dated April 8, 2003.

On appeal, counsel contends that the applicant has established extreme hardship to his spouse and that the fraud for which the waiver is required does not outweigh the favorable factors in the application. Counsel asserts that the acting director's decision was contrary to humanitarian and public policy as intended by Congress in maintaining family unity. *See* Form I-290B, dated May 6, 2003.

In support of these assertions, the record contains a copy of the customary marriage register form for the applicant and his spouse; a copy of a declaration of the fathers of the married couple, dated March 8, 1995; copies of the U.S. birth certificates of the applicant's children; copies of medical documents relating to the applicant's wife; an affidavit regarding hardship of the applicant's wife, dated January 11, 2003 and copies of financial and tax documents for the couple. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

- (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:

- (1) The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary)] may, in the discretion of the Attorney General [Secretary], 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 [Secretary] 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.

The record reflects that the applicant procured entry into the United States on or about August 22, 1999 by presenting a Ghanaian passport belonging to another individual.

A section 212(i) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from violation of section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship the alien himself experiences upon deportation is irrelevant to section 212(i) waiver proceedings; the only relevant hardship in the present case is that suffered by the applicant's wife. Once extreme hardship is established, it is but one favorable factor to be considered in the determination of whether the Secretary should exercise discretion. *See Matter of Mendez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (BIA 1996).

Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565-566 (BIA 1999) provides a list of factors the Board of Immigration Appeals deems relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. These factors include 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 significant conditions of health, particularly when tied to an unavailability of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate.

Counsel asserts that the applicant's wife would face extreme hardship if she relocated to Ghana in order to remain with the applicant. Counsel contends that the applicant's spouse needs to remain in the United States to maintain access to necessary medical care as she suffers from asthma and the medical care available in Ghana will not suffice to treat her conditions. *See Affidavit Regarding Hardship of Danquah Dah*, dated January 16, 2003. The record does not establish that the asthma suffered by the applicant's spouse is severe. The record reflects that the applicant's spouse is able to control her asthma and function normally. *See Kaiser Permanente Provider Note for Danquah Dah*, dated January 9, 2003 (stating that the patient uses "inhaler rarely, she does not have any ... wheezing she fels [sic] well"). The record does not establish that medical care in Ghana would be inadequate to maintain the medical condition of the applicant's spouse.

Further, counsel does not establish extreme hardship to the applicant's wife if she remains in the United States in order to maintain access to suitable medical care. The AAO notes that, as a lawful permanent resident of the United States, the applicant's spouse is not required to reside outside of the United States as a result of denial of the applicant's waiver request. The applicant's wife states that she will be depressed if her husband departs from the United States and does not assist her in raising their children. *See Affidavit Regarding Hardship of Danquah Dah*. She states that she "cannot do it alone." *Id.* The record does not provide supporting evidence for the assertions of hardship made by the applicant's spouse. The record does not address the majority of factors identified in *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez* and generally, does not provide a basis for a finding of extreme hardship.

U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. *See Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991). For example, *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996), held that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship. In addition, *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), held that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship and defined extreme hardship as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. *Hassan v. INS*, *supra*, held further that 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. Moreover, the AAO notes that the

U.S. Supreme 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. The AAO recognizes that the applicant's wife will endure hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. However, her situation, based on the record, is typical to individuals separated as a result of deportation or exclusion and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse caused by the applicant's inadmissibility to the United States. 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 section 212(i) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. *See* Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.