




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

Identity information deleted to
prevent identity unwarranted
release of personal information
FOIA(b)(7)(C)

H4



FILE:



Office: MADRID, SPAIN

Date: SEP 26 2005

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.


Robert P. Wismann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Officer in Charge, Madrid, Spain. 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 Spain who was determined 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. 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 reside in the United States with her spouse.

The officer in charge concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Officer in Charge*, dated December 17, 2003.

On appeal, the applicant states that she previously failed to indicate the improvement to her spouse's life afforded by her medical experience and neglected to indicate her spouse's poor ability in Spanish. *Form I-290B*, dated January 7, 2004.

In support of these assertions, the applicant submits a letter from her spouse, dated January 7, 2004. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision.

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.

In the present application, the record indicates that the applicant accrued unlawful presence from February 1998, when she failed to comply with the terms of her authorized stay under the Visa Waiver Pilot Program, until February 2000, the date of her departure from the United States. The applicant is, therefore, inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for being unlawfully present in the United States for a period of one year or more. Pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), the applicant is barred from again seeking admission within ten years of the date of her departure.

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 upon deportation is irrelevant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver proceedings; the only relevant hardship in the present case is that suffered by 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).

Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, 22 I&N Dec. 560 (BIA 1999), provides a list of factors the Board of Immigration Appeals deems relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. These factors include the presence of a lawful permanent resident or United States citizen spouse or parent in this country; the qualifying relative's family ties outside the United States; 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; the financial impact of departure from this country; and 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 applicant contends that her spouse would suffer hardship as a result of relocation to Spain in order to reside with the applicant. The applicant's spouse indicates that he is unable to adequately speak Spanish and that his health problems would be adversely affected by the cold weather in Pamplona. *Letter from* [REDACTED] dated January 7, 2004.

The applicant fails to establish that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship if he remains in the United States in order to maintain residence in a temperate climate and continue in the ability to communicate in his native language. The applicant's spouse asserts that he suffers from health problems and that the applicant's prior experience working with patients in hospitals enables her to assist him in coping with his condition. *Id.* The record contains a letter from the applicant's spouse listing several surgeries he has undergone. [REDACTED] dated November 22, 2003. The AAO notes, however, that the record fails to establish the nature and extent of the continuing medical condition(s) of the applicant's spouse. Therefore, the AAO is unable to make a determination of extreme physical hardship imposed on the applicant's spouse as a result of the inadmissibility of the applicant. While the applicant's spouse states that the applicant assists in his care, he does not state that he is unable to function in her absence. To the contrary, the applicant's spouse indicates that an offer of employment awaits the applicant in the United States and therefore, the applicant's spouse would not receive full-time care from the applicant upon her return. *Letter from* [REDACTED] dated January 7, 2004. Further, the record fails to demonstrate that the applicant's spouse is unable to obtain care from other sources in the absence of the applicant.

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. Moreover, the AAO notes that the U.S. Supreme Court 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 AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse endures hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. However, his situation, based on the record, is typical to individuals separated as a result of deportation or exclusion and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship.

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.