

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

H2

APR 17 2007

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: EL PASO, TX Date:

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:

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, El Paso, Texas, 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 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 procured admission into the United States by misrepresenting himself as a U.S. citizen in 1992. The applicant is the son of a lawful permanent resident and has two U.S. citizen children. He seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i).

The district director stated that the applicant had submitted a waiver application, but had not provided any evidence of extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. The application was denied accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated June 3, 2005.

On appeal, the applicant submits statements from his mother and two children explaining why the denial of his waiver application would result in extreme hardship. *Form I-290B*, dated June 24, 2005. The applicant also provides statements of support from his brothers, sisters and his employer.

The record indicates that in 1992, the applicant misrepresented himself to be a U.S. citizen in an attempt to gain entry into the United States.

The AAO notes that aliens making false claims to U.S. citizenship on or after September 30, 1996 are ineligible to apply for a Form I-601 waiver. See Sections 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) and (iii) of the Act. Provisions of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 afford aliens in the applicant's position, those making false claims to U.S. citizenship prior to September 30, 1996, the opportunity to apply for a waiver.

In considering a case where a false claim to U.S. citizenship has been made, Service [CIS] officers should review the information on the alien to determine whether the false claim to U.S. citizenship was made before, on, or after September 30, 1996. If the false claim was made before the enactment of IIRIRA, Service [CIS] officers should then determine whether (1) the false claim was made to procure an immigration benefit under the Act; and (2) whether such claim was made before a U.S. Government official. If these two additional requirements are met, the alien should be inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act and advised of the waiver requirements under section 212(i) of the Act.

Memorandum by Joseph R. Greene, Acting Associate Commissioner, Office of Programs, Immigration and Naturalization Service, dated April 8, 1998 at 3. Therefore, because the applicant's false claim to U.S. citizenship occurred before September 30, 1996 the applicant is eligible for a waiver pursuant to section 212(i) 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.

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 the applicant's U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident spouse and/or parent. Hardship the alien himself experiences or his children experience due to separation is not considered in section 212(i) waiver proceedings unless it causes hardship to the applicant's spouse and/or parent. 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).

The concept of extreme hardship to a qualifying relative "is not . . . fixed and inflexible," and whether extreme hardship has been established is determined based on an examination of the facts of each individual case. *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999). In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the Board of Immigration Appeals set forth a list of non-exclusive factors relevant to determining whether an applicant has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. These factors include, with respect to the qualifying relative, the presence of family ties to U.S. citizens or lawful permanent residents in the United States, family ties outside the United States, country conditions where the qualifying relative would relocate and family ties in that country, the financial impact of departure, and significant health conditions, particularly where there is diminished availability of medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate. *Id.* at 566.

Relevant factors, though not extreme in themselves, must be considered in the aggregate in determining whether extreme hardship exists. In each case, the trier of fact must consider the entire range of factors concerning hardship in their totality and determine whether the combination of hardships takes the case beyond those hardships ordinarily associated with deportation.

Matter of O-J-O-, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996) (citations omitted).

The AAO notes that extreme hardship to the applicant's mother must be established in the event that she resides in Mexico or in the event that she resides in the United States, as she is not required to reside outside of the United States based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request. The AAO will consider the relevant factors in adjudication of this case.

In her declaration, the applicant's mother states that she became a lawful permanent resident in 1990 and has been living in the United States. *Mother's Declaration*, undated. She states that the applicant is the only child she has left because her other son died in 1999 when he was twenty-five years old. She states that she has not been the same since her child's death and that she needs the applicant to be in the United States with her because she feels that he is her whole life. She also states that she raised the applicant and his brother on her own, never marrying the applicant's father. She asserts that she would not be able to survive without the applicant and would not know what she would do if she returned to Mexico with him. The applicant's mother states that she fears for the applicant if he is removed to Mexico because of the economic and safety problems in Mexico. The applicant's mother also describes how the applicant is very involved in his children's lives. *Id.*

The AAO notes that the applicant did not submit any documentation to support his mother's statements. No evidence was submitted detailing the emotional hardship she suffered after the death of her youngest child and how the applicant is a means of emotional support. Neither is there any country condition information to support her statements concerning the conditions in Mexico and why she could not return to Mexico with her son.

In addition to his mother's declaration the applicant submitted a statement from his daughter [REDACTED], which is also signed by the applicant's son, [REDACTED]. The applicant's daughter states that the applicant is everything to her and her brother. *Daughter's Statement*, undated. She states that her brother suffers from asthma and if the applicant is removed from the United States her brother would become ill. She pleads with the Citizenship and Immigration Service (CIS) to allow the applicant to remain in the United States.

The AAO notes, as stated above, that hardship the applicant's children experience due to separation is not considered in section 212(i) waiver proceedings unless it causes hardship to the applicant's spouse and/or parent. The applicant has not shown how the hardship suffered by his children would cause his mother extreme hardship.

Therefore, the applicant has not shown that his mother would suffer extreme hardship as a result of relocating to Mexico or as a result of being separated from the applicant if she remained 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.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's mother 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 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.