

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

Hr



FILE:



Office: BOSTON, MA (HARTFORD, CT)

FEB 09 2007
Date:

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

PUBLIC COPY

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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant is a native of Guyana and citizen of the Netherlands 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 attempting to procure admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant is the daughter of a U.S. citizen and she 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.

The 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 Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated November 22, 2005.

On appeal, the applicant has submitted a letter from her representative which indicates that the applicant's father relied on her financially and that he has medical problems. *Letter in Support of Appeal*, dated December 5, 2005. The AAO notes that the file does not include a Form G-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Representative, for the applicant's representative, nor is there evidence that the representative is authorized to represent the applicant before the AAO.

In support of this assertion, the applicant submits the aforementioned letter. The entire record was reviewed and considered in arriving at a decision on the appeal.

The record reflects that the applicant attempted to enter the United States on July 20, 1998 by misrepresenting information on her Form I-94W, Nonimmigrant Visa Waiver Arrival/Departure Form. The Form I-94W asks if the applicant has ever been denied a U.S. visa or entry into the United States and she answered in the negative. *Applicant's Form I-94W*, dated July 20, 1998. However, she had been refused entry to the United States on June 2, 1996 and she was denied a nonimmigrant visa on July 7, 1998. As a result of this prior misrepresentation, the applicant is inadmissible to the United States.

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 the presence of 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.

Therefore, an analysis under *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez* is appropriate in this case. The AAO notes that extreme hardship to the applicant's father must be established in the event that the applicant's father relocates to the Netherlands or in the event that he remains 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 father in the event that he relocates to the Netherlands. This prong of the analysis is not addressed by the applicant.

The second part of the analysis requires the applicant to establish extreme hardship in the event that her father remains in the United States. The aforementioned letter indicates that her father relies on her financially, he has suffered several heart attacks and strokes within the past few years, he is unable to take care of himself, and the applicant and her family have been taking care of him. *Letter in Support of Appeal*. There is no substantiating evidence of these claims.

After a thorough review of the record, the AAO finds that extreme hardship has not been established in the event that the applicant's father relocates to the Netherlands or 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 notes that a review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's father 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.