



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

H2



FILE:



Office: LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Date: JAN 25 2005

IN RE:

Applicant:



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, Services, 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 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 attempted to procure admission into the United States by willful misrepresentation of material facts in October 1992. The applicant is married to a U.S. citizen 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).

The district director, services concluded that the applicant failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on his wife and denied the application accordingly. On appeal, counsel states that the district director failed to give due weight to the factors set forth in the waiver application. Counsel does not submit any new evidence or present any new contentions, but attaches copies of documentation previously submitted and considered.

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.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides that a waiver of the bar to admission resulting from § 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, in order for the applicant to qualify for a § 212(i) waiver of inadmissibility, he must demonstrate extreme hardship to his U.S. citizen wife. It is noted that Congress specifically did not include hardship to an alien's children as a factor to be considered in assessing extreme hardship. Hardship to the applicant's three U.S. citizen children will therefore not be considered in this decision.

In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560 (BIA 1999), the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") outlined the following factors it deemed relevant to determining extreme hardship to a qualifying relative in § 212(i) waiver cases:

The factors deemed relevant in determining extreme hardship to a qualifying relative include, but are not limited to, the following: 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 to such countries; the financial impact of departure from this country; and finally, significant conditions of health, particularly when tied to an unavailability of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate.

Cervantes-Gonzalez at 565-566. (Citations omitted).

In the present case, the record reflects that the applicant is from Mexico, and that his wife is a native of the United States. According to documentation on the record, the applicant's wife is bilingual in Spanish and English and has previously been in Mexico. Counsel asserts that the applicant's wife would suffer emotional hardship if she remained in the U.S. while the applicant returned to Mexico, and that it would be emotionally and financially difficult for the applicant's wife to raise three children and work on her own. The record contains a psychological evaluation performed by Dr. [REDACTED]. Dr. [REDACTED] predicts, based on a single interview with the applicant's wife, that the applicant's wife could suffer dire psychological consequences of either a separation from the applicant or relocation to Mexico. It does not appear that the applicant's wife was under treatment prior to or subsequent to her visit with Dr. [REDACTED], nor did the evaluation recommend any therapy or treatment for the applicant's wife. In sum, the type of emotional reaction the applicant's wife appears to be experiencing is not considered extreme; rather, it is a normal consequence of the separation from close family members.

The record also does not support the contention that the applicant would be unable to contribute to the family's finances if he is removed to Mexico. 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.

It is unclear whether, on appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant's wife would experience extreme hardship should she accompany the applicant to Mexico. The evidence does not establish that this would be the case.

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, when considered in its totality reflects that the applicant has failed to show that his wife 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 § 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.