

PUBLIC COPY
H2

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20529

U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

[Redacted]

FILE:

[Redacted]

Office: SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

JUL 08 2004
Date:

IN RE:

Applicant:

[Redacted]

APPLICATION:

Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under sections 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 Interim District Director, Sacramento, California, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of India. He was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to 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 benefits provided under the Act by fraud and willful misrepresentation of material facts. The applicant is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative filed by his naturalized U.S. citizen spouse. He seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i) in order to remain in the United States and reside with his U.S. citizen spouse and child.

The Interim District Director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative. The application was denied accordingly. *See Interim District Director's Decision* dated May 2, 2003.

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

After reviewing the amendments to the Act regarding fraud and misrepresentation and after noting the increased impediments Congress has placed on such activities, including the narrowing of the parameters for eligibility, the re-inclusion of the perpetual bar, eliminating alien parents of U.S. citizens and resident aliens as applicants 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.

The record clearly reflects that the applicant has a long history of willfully misrepresenting material facts in order to obtain benefits provided under the Act. The applicant's history dates back to November 1976 when he entered the United States through Mexico without inspection and continues to April 2001 when he filed an Application for Adjustment of Status (Form I-485) with the Immigration and Naturalization Service (now known as Citizenship and Immigration Service (CIS)). The specifics were discussed at length in the director's decision and will not be repeated here.

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. 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).

In the present case, the applicant must demonstrate extreme hardship to his U.S. citizen spouse.

Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, 22 I&N Dec. 560 (BIA 1999) provides a list of factors the BIA deemed 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.

On appeal, counsel states that CIS failed to correctly assess the extreme hardship the applicant's spouse and child would suffer if the applicant's waiver application is denied and he is forced to depart the country. Counsel submits a brief in which he states that if the applicant were forced to leave the United States the applicant's spouse would suffer financially because she relies on the applicant's income to survive. In addition counsel states that if the applicant were not permitted to remain in the United States he would have to sell his businesses leaving and their child without any income.

It is not clear from the record of proceedings would relocate to India with the applicant if his waiver application is denied and he is removed from the United States. The record reflects that the applicant's spouse is a native of India. She is a native of India, and no reason was provided, other than educational opportunities in the United States for her child, as to why she would not be able to readjust to life in India and obtain gainful employment if she decided to relocate to India.

There are no laws that require to leave the United States and live 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 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 his brief counsel further states that the Interim District Director erred in finding the applicant's removal would not result in any hardship to his U.S. citizen child. He further states that the child has resided in the United States for over 10 years and has been educated in the United States, and it would be financially and emotionally devastating for her to be forced to relocate to India.

As mentioned, section 212(i) of the Act provides that a waiver of the bar to admission resulting from section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the qualifying family member, citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such alien. Congress specifically

did not mention extreme hardship to a U.S. citizen or resident child. The assertions regarding the hardship of applicant's child would suffer will thus not be considered.

Furthermore counsel states that [REDACTED] and her child will suffer financially if the applicant is not permitted to remain in the United States. According to counsel the applicant would be forced to sell his businesses if his waiver application is not approved. No documentary evidence was provided to substantiate the claim that the businesses would have to be sold if the applicant is not permitted to remain in the United States. No reason was given as to why Ms. Jagpal could not hire an individual to manage the businesses if she cannot or does not desire to do so by herself.

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 (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. The U.S. Supreme Court additionally 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, when considered in its totality reflects that the applicant has failed to show that his U.S. citizen spouse would suffer extreme hardship if he were removed from the United States. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether the applicant 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. 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.