

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Room 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

713



FILE:


Office: LIMA, PERU

Date: APR 04 2007

IN RE:

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

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



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

The applicant, a citizen of Brazil, was found inadmissible to the United States under 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. The applicant is the spouse of a U.S. citizen, and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), in order to enter the United States to join his wife and child.

The OIC concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on his wife, the qualifying relative, and denied the Form I-601, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility.

On appeal, the applicant contends that his wife and child would suffer extreme hardship if he is required to remain in Brazil, and submits additional documentation. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

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.

Regarding the applicant's grounds of inadmissibility, the record reflects that he entered the United States, in B-1/B-2 status, in June 2002. At the time he departed the United States in February 2004, his visa had been expired for more than a year. The applicant filed Form I-130 Immigrant Petition for Alien Relative, on or around June 3, 2004, and the instant Form I-601 was filed shortly thereafter.

The district director found the applicant inadmissible based upon the period of time that he was unlawfully present in the United States between the expiration of his B-1/B-2 visa and his February 2004 return to Brazil. As he had resided unlawfully in the United States for more than one year and then sought admission within ten years of his last departure, the district director correctly found the applicant inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act. The applicant does not contest this finding.

The record contains several references to the hardship that the applicant's child would suffer if the applicant were denied entry to the United States. However, section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act provides that a waiver under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act is applicable solely where the applicant establishes extreme hardship to his or her citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent. Congress specifically does not mention extreme hardship to a United States citizen or lawful permanent resident child. Nor is extreme hardship to the applicant himself a permissible consideration under the statute. In the present case, the applicant's wife is the only qualifying relative, and hardship to the applicant or his child cannot be considered, except as it may affect the applicant's wife.

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, in *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996), the BIA held that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship. In *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit defined "extreme hardship" as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. The Ninth Circuit emphasized that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. The United States Supreme Court additionally 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 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 alien 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. The BIA has held that:

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 record reflects that the applicant's wife is a twenty-four-year-old citizen of the United States. She has been a citizen of the United States since December 29, 1998. She and the applicant have been

married since March 26, 2002 and, at the time the instant appeal was filed in July 2005, the couple was expecting their first child.

The record contains statements from the applicant and his wife. The applicant and his wife express the difficulty the couple is facing while attempting to live separate lives. The applicant's wife states that she is experiencing tremendous emotional and financial turmoil without him; that she is having recurring thoughts of death; that there are days she wakes up and does not want to wake up; that she is extremely depressed and anxious; and that she is concerned that her child may be affected by her stress and depression. The applicant's husband explains that while living apart he is unable to provide enough financial support to enable his wife to live in dignity.

The record also contains a July 29, 2005 affidavit from [REDACTED] a psychologist who interviewed the applicant's wife on July 28, 2005. [REDACTED] found that the applicant's wife suffers from Major Depressive Disorder. He also found that further separation from the applicant would exacerbate her symptoms.

These affidavits do not establish extreme hardship. Although the input of any mental health professional is respected and valuable, the AAO notes that the submitted letter is based on a single interview between the applicant's wife and the psychologist. The record fails to reflect an ongoing relationship between a mental health professional and the applicant's wife or any history of treatment for the depression she suffers. Moreover, the conclusions reached in the submitted evaluation, being based on a single interview with the applicant's wife, do not reflect the insight and elaboration commensurate with an established relationship with a psychologist, thereby rendering the psychologist's findings speculative and diminishing the evaluation's value to a determination of extreme hardship.

The record, reviewed in its entirety and in light of the *Cervantes-Gonzalez* factors, cited above, does not support a finding that the applicant's wife will face extreme hardship if the applicant is refused admission. Particularly if she remains in the United States, the record demonstrates that she faces no greater hardship than the unfortunate, but expected, disruptions, inconveniences, and difficulties arising whenever a spouse is removed from the United States or refused admission. Although CIS is not insensitive to her situation, the financial strain of visiting the applicant in Brazil and the emotional hardship of separation are common results of separation and do not rise to the level of "extreme" as contemplated by statute and case law. In limiting the availability of the waiver to cases of "extreme hardship," Congress provided that a waiver is not available in every case where a qualifying family relationship exists. As noted previously, United States court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of removal are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. See *Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991), *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996); *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996) (holding that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship); *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. 810 (BIA 1968) (holding that separation of family members and financial difficulties alone do not establish extreme hardship). "[O]nly in cases of great actual or prospective injury . . . will the bar be removed." *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. 245, 246 (BIA 1984). Further, demonstrated financial difficulties alone are generally insufficient to establish extreme hardship. See *INS v. Jong Ha Wang*, 450 U.S. 139 (1981) (upholding BIA finding that economic detriment alone is insufficient to establish extreme hardship). The AAO finds that the OIC properly denied this waiver application. In adjudicating this petition, the AAO finds that the record fails to demonstrate that the applicant's wife would suffer hardship beyond that normally expected upon the removal or refusal of entry of a spouse.

The AAO therefore finds that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to his United States citizen spouse as required under INA § 212(i), 8 U.S.C. § 1186(i).

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(i), the burden of establishing that the application merits approval remains entirely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The applicant has not sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The waiver application is denied.