

identifying data deleted to
prevent disclosure of
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Ave. NW Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

713

PUBLIC COPY



FILE:

Office: LIMA, PERU

Date:

DEC 26 2008

IN RE:



APPLICATION:

Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)

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 Officer-in-Charge, Lima, Peru. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Brazil who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year and seeking readmission within 10 years of her last departure from the United States. The applicant is married to a U.S. citizen and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States.

The officer-in-charge found that after reviewing all of the available facts, the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen spouse as a result of her continued inadmissibility. The application was denied accordingly. *Decision of the Officer-in-Charge*, dated April 1, 2005.

On appeal, the applicant's spouse asserts that he is suffering financially and emotionally as a result of residing in Brazil while traveling to the United States to run his business. *See Letter from Applicant's Spouse*, dated April 26, 2005.

In the present application, the record indicates that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in November 2002. The applicant remained in the United States until January 2004. Therefore, the applicant accrued unlawful presence from when she entered the United States in November 2002 until January 2004, the date she departed the United States. In applying for an immigrant visa, the applicant is seeking admission within 10 years of her January 2004 departure from the United States. Therefore, the applicant is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(II) of the Act for being unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than one year.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

(B) Aliens Unlawfully Present.-

(i) In general. - Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who-

(II) has been unlawfully present in the United States for **one year or more**, and who again seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal from the United States, is inadmissible.

(v) Waiver. - The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary)] has sole discretion to waive clause (i) in the case of an immigrant who is the spouse or 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 such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such alien.

A section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship the alien herself experiences due to separation is irrelevant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver proceedings unless it causes hardship to the applicant's spouse. 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 AAO notes that extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse must be established in the event that he resides in Brazil or in the event that he resides in the United States, as he 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.

The first part of the analysis requires the applicant to establish extreme hardship to her spouse in the event that he resides in Brazil. In the applicant spouse's statement he asserts that he has been residing in Brazil since November 22, 2004. He states that he had to give up his business and is in the process of selling his home to be with the applicant. He states that in Brazil he is financially dependant on his parents and the applicant's parent's, which is an embarrassment for him. The record does not indicate that the applicant would be unable to find employment in Brazil. In addition, the AAO notes that relocation to a foreign country generally involves some inherent difficulties such as some financial loss, adapting to cultural norms and finding new employment, however, the current record does not reflect that relocation is resulting in extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse.

The second part of the analysis requires the applicant to establish extreme hardship in the event that her spouse remains in the United States. The AAO notes that the applicant's spouse did not address this part of the analysis in his statement as he is currently residing in Brazil. Because no assertions were made regarding the hardship that will result from separation, the AAO finds that the applicant has not established that her spouse would suffer extreme hardship as a result of separation.

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 spouse 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(a)(9)(B) 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.