




U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

114

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APP.
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536



Public Copy

File: [Redacted] Office: BANGKOK, THAILAND

Date: , .NOV 15 2000

IN RE: Applicant: [Redacted]

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)

IN BEHALF OF APPUCANT: SELF-REPRESENTED

Identifying can... prevent clearly... invasion of personal privacy

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. AU documents have been returned to the office which originally decided our case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 1031(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER
EXAMINATIONS

[Handwritten signature]

Mary C. Mu rean, Acting Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Bangkok, Thailand, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Thailand who was found by a consular officer to be inadmissible to the United States under § 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 a period of one year or more. The applicant is the unmarried son of a lawful permanent resident alien and is the beneficiary of an approved preference visa petition. The applicant seeks the above waiver in order to reside in the United States with his mother.

The district director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly.

On appeal, the applicant submits a letter from his mother's psychiatrist that indicates his mother's illness is partially due to the applicant's absence. The applicant also submits a letter stating that he is the only sibling able to care for his mother. In a letter of support submitted by the applicant's U.S. citizen sister, the sister states that due to distance, time and ifamily obligations, she is unable to care for her mother. The isister states that her mother is emotionally distressed and asks that the applicant be allowed to return to the United States to care for her.

The record reflects that the applicant was previously inspected and admitted as a temporary visitor for pleasure on January 2, 1988. He failed to depart upon expiration of his authorized period of stay and remained unlawfully in the United States until his departure for Thailand in January 2000.

Section 212(a) CLASSES OF ALIENS, INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS OR ADMISSION. -Except as otherwise provided in this Act, aliens who are ineligible under the following paragraphs are ineligible to receive visas and ineligible to be admitted to the United States:

(9) ALIENS PREVIOUSLY REMOVED.-

(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 from the United States, *is* inadmissible.

(v) WAIVER. -The Attorney General 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 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. No court shall have jurisdiction to review a decision or action by the Attorney General regarding a waiver under this clause.

Section 212(a) (9) (B) of the Act was amended by the Illegal Immigration- Reform and Immigrant "Responsibility Act (IIRIRA), of 1996 {IIRIRA}. After reviewing the IIRIRA, amendments to the Act relating to fraud, misrepresentation and unlawful presence in the United States, and after noting the increased penalties Congress has placed on such activities, including the narrowing of the parameters for, eligibility, the re-inclusion of the perpetual bar in some instances, eliminating children as, a consideration in determining the presence of extreme hardship, and providing a ground inadmissibility for unlawful presence (entry without inspection) after April 1, 1997, it is concluded that Congress has placed a high priority on reducing and/or stopping fraud, misrepresentation and unlawful presence of aliens in the United States.

The Board has held that extreme hardship is not a definable term of fixed and inflexible meaning, and that the elements to establish extreme hardship are dependent upon the facts and circumstances of each case. These factors should be viewed in light of the Board's statement, that a restrictive view of extreme hardship is not mandated either by the Supreme Court or by its own case law. See Matter of L-O-G-, 21 I&N Dec. 413 (BIA 1996).

It is noted that the requirements to establish extreme hardship in the present waiver proceedings under § 212(a) (9) (B) (v) of the Act do not include a showing of hardship to the alien as, did former cases involving suspension of deportation or present cases involving battered spouses. Present waiver proceedings require a showing of extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such alien. This requirement is identical to the extreme hardship requirement stipulated in the amended fraud waiver proceedings under § 212(i) of the Act; 8 U.S.C. 1182(i).

In Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, Interim Decision 3380 (BIA 1999), the Board recently stipulated that the factors deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established "extreme hardship" in

waiver proceedings under § 212(i) of the Act include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) the presence of a lawful permanent resident or United States citizen spouse or parent in this country; (2) the qualifying relative's family ties outside the United States; (3) the conditions in the country or countries to which the qualifying relative would relocate and the extent of the qualifying relative's ties *in* such countries; (4) the financial impact of departure from this country; (5) 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.**

The record is clear. The applicant remained unlawfully in the United States for twelve years. He is, therefore, ineligible to receive a visa and ineligible for admission under § 212(a)(9)(B)(II) of the Act.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, fails to establish the existence of hardship to the applicant's mother (the only qualifying relative) caused by separation that reaches the level of extreme as envisioned by Congress if the applicant *is* not allowed to reside in the United States. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether he merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under § 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. See Matter of T--S--Y--, 7 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1957). Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal *is* dismissed.