



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED]

Office: LOS ANGELES, CA

Date:

OCT 08 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

PUBLIC COPY

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

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

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who was found 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 attempted to procure admission to the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant is the spouse of a lawful permanent resident of the United States. The applicant 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 with her spouse and child.

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

On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant's lawful permanent resident spouse would suffer extreme hardship if the waiver were denied. *Appeal to Denial of I-601 Waiver*, dated October 21, 2003.

In support of these assertions, counsel submits a declaration of the applicant; a declaration of the applicant's spouse; a copy of the birth certificate and permanent resident card of the applicant's spouse; a letter and English translation verifying the residential lease of the applicant and her spouse; a copy and English translation of the marriage certificate of the applicant and her spouse; a copy of the United States birth certificate of the applicant's son; copies of income tax returns filed by the applicant and copies of other financial documents for the applicant and her spouse. The entire record was considered in rendering this decision.

The record reflects that on or about November 11, 1991, the applicant presented a United States birth certificate belonging to another individual in an attempt to obtain admission into the United States.

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.

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 herself 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 spouse. 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 (BIA 1999) provides a list of factors the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) 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 fails to make any assertions regarding extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse if he relocates to Mexico in order to remain with the applicant.

Counsel fails to establish that the applicant's husband would suffer extreme hardship if he remains in the United States in the absence of the applicant. The AAO notes that, as a lawful permanent resident, 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. Counsel contends that the applicant and her spouse have been inseparable since they met in 1987 and share a United States citizen child. *Declaration of Guillermo Garcia-Flores*, dated October 20, 2003. Counsel asserts that the applicant's spouse will suffer hardship in being separated from the applicant and their child if the applicant is not granted a waiver of her inadmissibility. *Id.* The AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse will endure hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. The AAO notes, however, that the assertions of counsel fail to amount to extreme hardship. The situation of the applicant's spouse, 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. Counsel states that the applicant's husband would be faced with the additional expenses of supporting the applicant if she returns to Mexicali. *Id.* The record fails to establish that the income of the applicant's spouse is insufficient to cover the cited expenses. Further, the record does not demonstrate that the applicant will be unable to earn an income from a location outside of the United States in order to financially provide for herself. Moreover, 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.

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.

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 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* 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.