


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

#3



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CIUDAD JUAREZ, MEXICO Date: APR 17 2007

IN RE: [REDACTED]

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:

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 (OIC), Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, 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 Mexico, 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 United States 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 return to the United States and join his wife and family.

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. In rendering a decision on the appeal, the AAO reviewed the entire record.

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, without inspection, in 1993. He departed the United States in November 2000. The applicant is now seeking admission within ten years of his 2000 departure from the United States.

The OIC found the applicant inadmissible based upon the nearly three-year period of time he was unlawfully present in the United States between April 1, 1997 (the date the unlawful presence provisions of the Act were enacted) and his November 2000 return to Mexico. 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 the director's finding of inadmissibility. Rather, he is filing for a waiver of inadmissibility.

The AAO notes at the outset that the applicant and his wife have three children—born in 1996, 2000, and 2002—of whom all are United States citizens. 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 the applicant or the couple's children will face 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. In *Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996) (citations omitted), the BIA 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.

Once extreme hardship is established, it is but one favorable factor to be considered in the determination of whether the Secretary should exercise discretion favorably to the applicant. *See Matter of Mendez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (BIA 1996).

The record reflects that the applicant's wife is a twenty-seven-year-old citizen of the United States. She and the applicant have been married since January 29, 1997. On appeal, the applicant's wife submits a statement, dated September 30, 2005. In her statement, the applicant's wife states that she desires the applicant's presence in the family's life so that the couple can educate their children with the strength of their father and the tender love of their mother; that the children are sad due to their father's absence; and that she feels desperate without him.

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 Mexico 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).

Nor does the AAO find that any financial strain caused by the separation constitutes extreme hardship. Courts considering the impact of financial detriment on a finding of extreme hardship have repeatedly held that, while it must be considered in the overall determination, "[e]conomic disadvantage alone does not constitute "extreme hardship." *Ramirez-Durazo v. INS*, 794 F.2d 491, 497 (9th Cir. 1986) (holding that "lower standard of living in Mexico and the difficulties of readjustment to that culture and environment . . . simply are not sufficient."); *Shooshtary v. INS*, 39 F.3d 1049 (9th Cir. 1994) (stating, "the extreme hardship requirement . . . was not enacted to insure that the family members of excludable aliens fulfill their dreams or continue in the lives which they currently enjoy. The uprooting of family, the separation from friends, and other normal processes of readjustment to one's home country after having spent a number of years in the United States are not considered extreme, but represent the type of inconvenience and hardship experienced by the families of most aliens in the respondent's circumstances."); *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); *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 therefore finds that the applicant has 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.