

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy


U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Room 3000  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

7/2



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: LOS ANGELES DISTRICT OFFICE Date: **AUG 20 2007**

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:

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 District Director, Los Angeles, 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)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for seeking to procure a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under the Act by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant is the spouse of a lawful permanent resident of the United States, and 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 her husband and children.

The District Director 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 her husband would suffer extreme hardship if the applicant were required to return to Mexico. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

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

- (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 that:

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.

Regarding the applicant's grounds of inadmissibility, the record reflects that she attempted to enter the United States, fraudulently, on April 25, 2000 by presenting a border crossing card issued to another individual. Thus, the applicant made a willful misrepresentation of a material fact (her identity) in order to procure entry into the United States. As the applicant attempted to enter the United States via fraud, she is 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). The applicant does not dispute her inadmissibility. Rather, she is filing for a waiver of her inadmissibility.

The record contains references to the hardship that the applicant's United States citizen child would suffer if the applicant were to depart the United States. However, section 212(i) of the Act provides that a waiver under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act is applicable solely where the applicant establishes extreme hardship to his or her citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent. Congress did not include

extreme hardship to a United States citizen or lawful permanent resident child in section 212(i) waivers. Nor is extreme hardship to the applicant herself a permissible consideration under the statute. In the present case, the applicant's United States lawful permanent resident husband is the only qualifying relative, and hardship to the applicant or her son cannot be considered, except as it may affect the applicant's husband.

Thus, the first issue to be addressed is whether the applicant's return to Mexico would impose extreme hardship on her husband. If extreme hardship is established, the AAO will then make an assessment as to whether it should exercise discretion in granting the waiver.

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 United States 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.

Additionally, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has held that "the most important single hardship factor may be the separation of the alien from family living in the United States," and, "[w]hen the BIA fails to give considerable, if not predominant, weight to the hardship that will result from family separation, it has abused its discretion." *Salcido-Salcido v. INS*, 138 F.3d 1292, 1293 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998) (citations omitted). See also *Cerrillo-Perez v. INS*, 809 F.2d 1419, 1424 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987) (remanding to the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA)) ("We have stated in a series of cases that the hardship to the alien resulting from his separation from family members may, in itself, constitute extreme hardship.") (citations omitted). The AAO notes that the present case arises within the jurisdiction of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Separation of family will therefore be given the appropriate weight under Ninth Circuit law in

the assessment of hardship factors in the present case. 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).

The record reflects that the applicant's husband is a thirty-seven-year-old lawful permanent resident of the United States. He has been a permanent resident since 1990. He and the applicant have been married since April 16, 1993 and have two sons who are four and ten years of age. The younger son is a citizen of the United States.

The record contains an October 4, 2005 letter from the applicant in which she states that her husband is the sole supporter of the family and that, if she were to relocate to Mexico, her husband and family would suffer hardship. She states that she is his wife, friend, and companion, and that he would have to care for their son himself, as their son does not speak or write Spanish and would not go to Mexico.

The applicant also submitted a letter on appeal. In her December 2, 2005 letter, the applicant states that her husband supports the entire family financially. The applicant also states the following:

I feel that it is very unfair that because he is a Legal Permanent Resident of this Country, and not a Citizen, that you are not considering the extreme hardship that [removal] can cause for him to separate from his wife and child.

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."); *Shoostary 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).

However, particularly in the Ninth Circuit, courts have recognized that, in certain cases, economic impact combined with related personal and emotional hardships may cause the hardship to rise to the level of extreme. "Included among these are the personal hardships which flow naturally from an economic loss decreased health care, educational opportunities, and general material welfare." *Mejia-Carrillo v. INS*, 656 F.2d 520, 522 (9th cir. 1981) (citations omitted); see also *Santana-Figueroa v. INS*, 644 F.2d 1354, 1358 (9th cir. 1981) ("Economic loss often accompanies deportation. Even a significant reduction in standard of living is not, by itself, a basis for relief. . . . But deportation may also result in the loss of all that makes life possible. When an alien would be deprived of the means to survive, or condemned to exist in life-threatening squalor, the "economic" character of the hardship makes it no less severe.")

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has stated that, "the most important single hardship factor may be the separation of the alien from family living in the United States," and also that, "[w]hen the BIA fails to

give considerable, if not predominant, weight to the hardship that will result from family separation, it has abused its discretion.” *Salcido-Salcido v. INS*, 138 F.3d 1292, 1293 (9th Cir. 1998) (citations omitted). *See also Cerrillo-Perez v. INS*, 809 F.2d 1419, 1424 (9th Cir. 1987) (remanding to the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA)) (“We have stated in a series of cases that the hardship to the alien resulting from his separation from family members may, in itself, constitute extreme hardship.”) (citations omitted). Separation of family will therefore be given the appropriate weight under Ninth Circuit law in the assessment of hardship factors in the present case.

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). 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.”); *Shoostary 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”).

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 return to Mexico, regardless of whether he would accompany her to Mexico or remain in the United States without her. The applicant’s statement that the District Director treated the case differently because her husband is a lawful permanent resident of the United States rather than a citizen is incorrect, as the AAO sees no evidence of such bias. Moreover, the fact that he has applied for U.S. citizenship is irrelevant, as the legal basis for the applicant’s waiver application will not change once her husband achieves citizenship.

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 returns to Mexico. If he remains in the United States without the applicant, the record fails to establish that he would face greater hardship than the unfortunate, but expected, disruptions, inconveniences, and difficulties arising whenever a spouse is removed from the United States or refused admission. As presently constituted, the record fails to establish that the financial strain and emotional hardship he would face would be any greater than that normally be expected upon separation. Nor has the applicant included any information that establishes that, if her husband were to join her in Mexico, he would experience hardship beyond that normally expected upon relocation to another country.

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 District Director 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 removal of a wife.

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