

PUBLIC COPY


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

HAQ

JAN 25 2005



FILE:



Office: SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Date:

IN RE:



APPLICATION:

Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under § 212(i) of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



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 District Director, San Francisco, California. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reconsider. The motion will be granted and the previous decisions of the district director and the AAO will be affirmed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of the Philippines who was found to be inadmissible to the United States under § 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 a benefit under the Act by fraud or willful misrepresentation by submitting an application to adjust status based on a fraudulent marriage document in 1995. The applicant is the son of naturalized U.S. citizens and is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to § 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to remain in the United States to care for his parents.

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. The decision of the district director was affirmed on appeal by the AAO. On motion to reconsider, counsel asserts that the AAO failed to accord sufficient weight to the factors presented in support of his contention on appeal that the applicant's parents would suffer extreme hardship should the applicant be removed from the United States. On motion, counsel submits a brief and copies of documentation already contained in the record. The entire record was considered in rendering this decision.

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:

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.

8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3) (2002) states in pertinent part:

A motion to reconsider must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or Service [now Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS)] policy. A motion to reconsider a decision on an application or petition must, when filed, also establish

that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision.

The record indicates that in 1995, the applicant filed a Form I-485 Application to Adjust Status based on a fraudulent marriage certificate. This act constituted a willful misrepresentation of material fact, perpetrated in order to obtain a benefit under the Act.

A § 212(i) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from violation of § 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 § 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 (BIA 1999) provides a list of factors the Bureau 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.

The AAO concludes that the dismissal of the appeal was correct, as the record failed to establish extreme hardship to the applicant's parents if they remain in the United States maintaining proximity to their other relatives and access to adequate health care. Counsel contends that the applicant's parents will be unable to continue living in the house in which they currently reside, if the applicant is removed. The AAO notes that moving from a house is an adjustment often required in such circumstances, and it does not constitute extreme hardship. The record contains no evidence that the applicant's parents would be forced into bankruptcy, or would otherwise suffer ruinous financial consequences due to the applicant's removal.

It appears that counsel asserts, on motion, that the applicant's parents would suffer extreme hardship should they choose to return to their native Philippines to remain near the applicant. Counsel contends that the AAO erred in dismissing the appeal in that it failed to give proper weight to the applicant's parents' inability to move back to the Philippines due to health, family, and financial factors. The decision of the AAO reflects that these factors were taken into consideration, but that they do not amount to a demonstration of extreme hardship. A review of the record reveals that this is a correct assessment.

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. The AAO recognizes that the applicant's parents will endure hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. 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.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's parents 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 § 212(a)(6)(C) 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 previous decisions of the district director and the AAO will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The motion is granted. The decision of dismissing the appeal is affirmed.