

**identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

**PUBLIC COPY**

113



FILE:



Office: CIUDAD JUAREZ, MEXICO

Date: NOV 20 2007

(CDJ 2004 624 019 relates)


IN RE:



APPLICATION:

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 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.

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 waiver 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 rejoin her husband.

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

On appeal, the applicant contends that she departed the United States in 2005, not 2002 as noted in the OIC's decision. 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 she entered the United States, without inspection, in November 1997, and did not depart until April 2005.<sup>1</sup> The applicant is now seeking admission within ten years of her April 2005 departure from the United States. The applicant is, therefore, 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. The applicant does not contest the director's finding of inadmissibility. Rather, she is filing for a waiver of inadmissibility.

The record contains many references to the hardship that the applicant's United States citizen daughter will suffer if the applicant is refused admission into 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 does not mention extreme hardship to a United States citizen or lawful permanent resident child. Nor is extreme hardship to the applicant herself a permissible consideration under the statute. In the present case, the applicant's husband is the only qualifying relative, and hardship that the applicant or the couple's daughter will face cannot be considered, except as it may affect the applicant's husband.

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, 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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 held in *Matter of O-J-O*, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996) (citations omitted) 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

---

<sup>1</sup> The OIC erred when he stated that the applicant departed the United States in 2002. She actually departed the United States in 2005. However, this typographical error does not affect the applicant's inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(II) of the Act for having been unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than one year.

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 applicant's husband is a thirty-eight-year-old native-born citizen of the United States. He and the applicant have been married since May 9, 2001 and have a three-year-old daughter, who is a United States citizen.

The record contains three letters from the applicant's husband. In his first letter, dated March 25, 2005, the applicant's husband states that his gross salary is \$300 per week; that he can support the applicant and their daughter on his salary, but that the applicant would like to work so that they can make the family's future a better one; that the family would never ask for food stamp assistance; that he is unsure of the living conditions to which his daughter would be subjected if the family were to relocate to Mexico; and that the area in Mexico in which they would live does not have running water, that any water comes from a water hole, and that the nearest communication of any type (there are no telephones) is 15 miles away.

In his second letter, dated September 7, 2005, the applicant's husband states that the family would experience extreme hardship if the applicant's waiver application is denied; that the family would experience mental anguish, financial stress, and total inconvenience if the waiver application is denied; that the stress of living apart is not helping the family; that if the applicant is allowed to re-enter the United States the couple will progress, and that with the applicant's help he knows the family will succeed; and describes the poor living conditions in the town in which the applicant is currently living in Mexico.

In his third letter, which is undated, the applicant's husband states that he and the applicant have been together since 1997 and married since 2001.

In her December 12, 2005 letter, the applicant also states that she and the applicant have been living together since 1997 and married since 2001.

On appeal, the applicant's accredited representative states that the OIC erred when he stated that the applicant departed the United States in 2002. She states that the applicant actually departed the United States in 2005. The AAO acknowledges this error in the OIC's decision. However, the waiver application was not denied because the OIC found that the applicant departed the United States in 2002 rather than 2005. It was denied because the applicant had failed to demonstrate that her husband would experience extreme hardship if the waiver application were denied. The OIC's typographical error in this regard does not affect the applicant's inadmissibility 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. The applicant has not addressed the basis of the OIC's denial on appeal.

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).

In the instant case, the applicant is required to demonstrate that her husband would face extreme hardship in the event the applicant is required to remain in Mexico, regardless of whether he joins her in Mexico or remains in the United States. 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.

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 husband will face extreme hardship if the applicant is refused admission. The record does not demonstrate that he faces greater hardships 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 his situation, the financial strain of visiting the applicant in Mexico, the stress associated with maintaining two separate households, and the emotional and financial hardship of separation are common results of separation and do not rise to the level of "extreme" as contemplated by statute and case law.

Nor has the applicant established that her husband would face extreme hardship if he joined her in Mexico, as the record fails to demonstrate that he would face hardship beyond that normally faced by others in his situation. Diminished standards of living, separation from family, and loss of language skills are to be expected in the applicant's husband's situation.

In limiting the availability of the waiver to cases of "extreme hardship," Congress specifically 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 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991), *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 appeal, the AAO finds that the record fails to demonstrate that the applicant's husband would suffer hardship beyond that normally expected upon the inadmissibility of a spouse.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, reflects that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that her United States citizen husband would suffer hardship that is unusual or beyond that normally expected upon the inadmissibility or removal of a spouse. As noted previously, the common



(CDJ 2004 624 019 relates)

Page 6

results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship; the emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties and the financial hardship that results from separation are common results of deportation and do not constitute extreme hardship. "Extreme hardship" has been defined as hardship that is unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. 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 section 212(a)(9)(B)(v), 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 sustained not that burden. Accordingly, the AAO will not disturb the director's denial of the waiver application.

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