




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services


identifying data deleted to  
prevent identity unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

H3



FILE:



Office: LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Date:

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, 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 procured admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation, in presenting a U.S. birth certificate in the name of another individual, on January 12, 1991. The applicant is married to a U.S. citizen and is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative. The applicant has three U.S. citizen children. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to § 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i).

The district director concluded that the applicant failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. On appeal, counsel states that the applicant was unaware that she had to submit supporting documentation with the Form I-601 Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility. Counsel submits a statement written by the applicant's husband and copies of the applicant's marriage certificate, her husband's naturalization certificate, the children's birth certificates, and the deed to her home. The AAO has reviewed the entire record and concurs with the district director's assessment that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to her spouse.

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, she must demonstrate extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen spouse. 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 U.S. citizen children will therefore not be considered in this decision.

In addition to significant amendments made to the Act in 1996, by the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act ("IIRIRA"), Pub. L. 104-208, 110 Stat. 3009 (1996), Congress expanded the reach of the grounds of inadmissibility in the Immigration Marriage Fraud Amendments of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-639, and redesignated as section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act by the Immigration Act of 1990 (Pub. L. No. 101-649, Nov. 29, 1990, 104 Stat. 5067). Moreover, the Act of 1990 imposed a statutory bar on those who make oral or written misrepresentations in seeking admission into the United States and on those who make material misrepresentations in seeking admission into the United States or in seeking "other benefits" provided under the Act. In 1990, section 274C of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1324c was added by the Immigration Act of 1990 (Pub. L. No. 101-649, *supra*) for persons or entities that have committed violations on or after November 29, 1990. Section 274C(a) states that it is unlawful for any person or entity knowingly "[t]o use, attempt to use, possess, obtain, accept, or receive or to provide any forged, counterfeit, altered, or falsely made document in order to satisfy any requirement of this Act." Moreover, in 1994, Congress passed the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act (Pub. L. No. 103-322, September 13, 1994) which enhanced the criminal penalties of certain offenses, including "impersonation in entry document or admission application; evading or trying to evade immigration laws using assumed or fictitious name". See 18 U.S.C. § 1546.

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 section 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 and her husband are both natives of Mexico. Her husband is 38 years old and appears to be in good health. The applicant's husband states that his extended family lives in the United States, and that he cannot relocate to Mexico, because he would be depriving his children of too many opportunities. It is noted that the applicant is not required to depart the United States; to do so would be entirely his choice.

In his statement on appeal, the applicant's husband writes that if the applicant is removed, he will be obligated to obtain suitable childcare for his three children. He writes that he and the children will miss the applicant greatly, and that her absence will cause him emotional hardship. The record does not contain evidence

establishing that the applicant's husband's suffering or childcare challenges would be greater than that which similarly situated persons experience. The type of hardship the applicant's husband fears appears to be typical to individuals whose close family members are removed; it is not extreme.

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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 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.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, reflects that the applicant has failed to show that her U.S. citizen spouse would suffer extreme hardship if she 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.