

PUBLIC COPY

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

H2

FILE:

Office: MIAMI, FL

Date: DEC 28 2005

IN RE:

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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, Miami, Florida, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Haiti who 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 seeking to procure admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant is the spouse of a U.S. Citizen and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to reside in the United States with her family.

The acting district director concluded that the applicant 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 Acting District Director*, dated April 16, 2002.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that the acting district director's decision was incorrect and she cannot return to Haiti due to potential hardship and persecution. *See Form I-290B*, dated May 3, 2002.

The record includes previously submitted letters from the applicant. The entire record was reviewed and considered in arriving at a decision on the appeal.

The record reflects that on May 10, 1994, the applicant attempted entry into the United States by presenting a fraudulent French passport. As a result of this prior misrepresentation, the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act.

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.

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 a U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. 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 deems relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. These factors include, but are not limited to, the presence of lawful permanent resident or United States citizen family ties to 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.

Therefore, an analysis under *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez* is appropriate in this case. The AAO notes that extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse must be established in the event that the applicant's spouse resides in Haiti or in the event that he resides in the United States, as he is not required to reside outside of the United States based on denial of the applicant's waiver request.

The first part of the analysis requires the applicant to establish extreme hardship to her spouse in the event that he resides in Haiti. This situation is not addressed by the applicant. The AAO notes, however, that her spouse is a native of Haiti and no reason was given as to why he could not return to the country of his birth.

The second part of the analysis requires the applicant to establish extreme hardship in the event that her spouse remains in the United States. The applicant contends that her family needs her presence to raise her child and that her husband and daughter count on her to be at their side. *Letter from Applicant*, dated June 13, 2000. The applicant states that there is nothing else to live for if separated from a loved one. *See id.* The AAO notes that the applicant's daughter is not a qualifying relative and her hardship is only relevant to the extent it causes hardship to the applicant's spouse. This type of hardship has not been shown.

Based on the evidence presented, extreme hardship has not been shown in the event that the applicant's spouse relocates to Haiti. In addition, the record does not show that the applicant's spouse will suffer extreme hardship in the event that he remains in the United States.

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 spouse will endure hardship as a result of separation from the applicant and is sympathetic to his situation. However, his 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.

The AAO notes that 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.