U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: LOS ANGELES, CA Date: OCT 0 8 2004

IN RE: [redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[redacted]

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, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Los Angeles, California, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of the Philippines who was found inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having procured admission to the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant is the spouse of a naturalized United States citizen. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to remain in the United States with his spouse.

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 for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated September 17, 2003.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant's United States citizen spouse would suffer extreme hardship if the waiver were denied. *Appeal of Denial of I-601 Application*, dated October 10, 2003.

In support of these assertions, counsel submits a brief, dated October 10, 2003. The record also contains an affidavit of the applicant's spouse, dated August 20, 2003. The entire record was considered in rendering this decision.

The record reflects that on or about July 3, 1984, the applicant presented a Philippine passport and United States visa under an assumed name in order to obtain admission to the United States.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

> (i) Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides:

> (1) The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary)] may, in the discretion of the Attorney General [Secretary], waive the application of clause (i) of subsection (a)(6)(C) in the case of an alien who is the spouse, 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 the United States of such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such an alien.

A section 212(i) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from violation of section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship the alien himself experiences upon deportation is irrelevant to section 212(i) 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 (BIA) 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.

Counsel fails to establish that the applicant's wife would suffer extreme hardship if she remains in the United States in the absence of the applicant. The AAO notes that, as a U.S. citizen, the applicant's spouse is not required to reside outside of the United States as a result of denial of the applicant's waiver request. Counsel contends that the applicant and his spouse have been married for 16 years and have two United States citizen children. *Appeal of Denial of I-601 Application*, dated October 10, 2003. Counsel asserts that the applicant's spouse will suffer hardship in raising the children in the absence of the applicant. *Id.* Counsel states that the applicant's spouse would be unable to afford the mortgage on the family home and the costs of the children's private education in the absence of the applicant. *Id.* Counsel contends that although the applicant's spouse earns an income, her overtime pay will be diminished if the applicant leaves and she assumes increased parental duties. *Id.* The AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse will endure hardship as a result of separation from her spouse of 16 years and that her children will likewise suffer as a result of separation from the applicant. The AAO notes, however, that the assertions of counsel fail to amount to extreme hardship. The situation of the applicant's spouse, 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. The record fails to establish that the income of the applicant's spouse is insufficient to cover the cited expenses. Further, the record does not demonstrate that the applicant will be unable to earn an income from a location outside of the United States in order to financially provide for himself and contribute to the expenses of his family. Moreover, 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. In addition, the AAO reiterates that the children of the applicant are not considered qualifying relatives for purposes of waiver proceedings under section 212(i) of the Act.

Counsel fails to make any assertions regarding extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse if she relocates to the Philippines in order to remain with 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.

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 he merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(i) 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.