

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

*tlz*

FILE:

Office: NEWARK, NJ

Date:

**MAY 04 2009**

IN RE: Applicant:

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:

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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

John F. Grissom  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The record establishes that the applicant, a native and citizen of Jamaica, procured entry to the United States in August 2003 by presenting a passport and U.S. visa belonging to another individual. She was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to 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 entry to the United States by fraud and/or willful misrepresentation.<sup>1</sup> The applicant is applying for a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to reside in the United States with her U.S. spouse and child, born in 2001.

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 October 28, 2005.

In support of the appeal, counsel submits a brief, dated December 19, 2005 and articles about country conditions in Jamaica. The entire record was reviewed and considered in arriving at a decision on the appeal.

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

- (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:

- (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 immigrant 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...

---

<sup>1</sup> The applicant does not contest the district director's finding of inadmissibility. Rather, she is filing for a waiver of inadmissibility.

A section 212(i) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from a 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. Unlike waivers under section 212(h) of the Act, section 212(i) 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 spouse is the only qualifying relative, and hardship to the applicant and/or her child cannot be considered, except as it may affect the applicant's spouse.

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. 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 combination of hardships takes the case beyond those hardships ordinarily associated with deportation.

The applicant's U.S. citizen spouse contends that he will suffer emotional and financial hardship if the applicant is unable to reside in the United States. In a declaration, the applicant's spouse states that he will suffer emotional hardship due to the long and close relationship he has with his spouse. The applicant's spouse further notes that he was released from the U.S. Air Force due to depression, and he thus depends on his wife for support and encouragement. *See Letter from [REDACTED]* undated. In addition, counsel asserts that the applicant's spouse will suffer extreme financial hardship as the income from his job is not sufficient to maintain the household. *Brief in Support of Form I-601*, dated October 25, 2005.

It has not been established that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme emotional hardship were he to remain in the United States while the applicant relocates abroad. Although documentation has been provided from counsel confirming that the applicant's spouse was discharged from the U.S. Air Force due to a personality disorder, the AAO notes that said documentation is from 1994, more than fifteen years ago. *See Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty*, dated April 18, 1994. No documentation has been provided by a licensed mental health professional to establish the

applicant's spouse's current mental health situation, its gravity, its short and long-term treatment plan, and what, if any, specific impact the applicant's removal would have on her spouse. Nor has it been established that the applicant's spouse is unable to travel to Jamaica to visit the applicant on a regular basis. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

Although the depth of concern and anxiety over the applicant's inadmissibility is neither doubted or minimized, the fact remains that Congress provided for a waiver of inadmissibility only under limited circumstances. In nearly every qualifying relationship, whether between husband and wife or parent and child, there is a deep level of affection and a certain amount of emotional and social interdependence. While, in common parlance, the prospect of separation or involuntary relocation nearly always results in considerable hardship to individuals and families, in specifically limiting the availability of a waiver of inadmissibility to cases of "extreme hardship," Congress did not intend that a waiver be granted in every case where a qualifying relationship exists. The current state of the law, viewed from a legislative, administrative, or judicial point of view, requires that the hardship be above and beyond the normal, expected hardship involved in such cases.

As for the financial hardship referenced by counsel, the AAO notes that 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).

No documentation has been provided that outlines the applicant's and his spouse's current financial situation, including income, expenses, assets and liabilities, and their financial needs, to corroborate counsel's assertion that if the applicant relocates abroad, the applicant's spouse will experience extreme financial hardship. Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). Moreover, although references are made by counsel with respect to the problematic country

conditions in Jamaica, the information is general in nature and does not establish that the applicant specifically, a personal banking representative, would not be able to obtain gainful employment in Jamaica, thereby assisting the applicant's spouse financially should the need arise. As referenced above, assertions without supporting documentation do not suffice to establish extreme hardship

The AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse will endure hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. However, his situation, if he remains in the United States, is typical to individuals separated as a result of removal and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship based on the record. The AAO concludes that although the applicant's spouse may need to make alternate arrangements with respect to his own emotional and financial care were the applicant unable to reside in the United States, it has not been established that such arrangements would cause the applicant's spouse extreme hardship.

The AAO notes that extreme hardship to a qualifying relative must be established in the event that he or she relocates abroad based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request. The only documentation to establish extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse were he to relocate to Jamaica are newspaper articles describing the problematic country conditions in Jamaica. Although the AAO recognizes that Jamaica has been impacted by crime, the U.S. Department of State has not issued any type of warning against travel to the Jamaica; as such, it has not been established that the applicant's spouse would experience extreme hardship were he to relocate to Jamaica to reside with the applicant. *See Country Specific Information-Jamaica, U.S. Department of State*, dated February 26, 2009.

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 U.S. citizen spouse will face extreme hardship if the applicant is unable to reside in the United States. Rather, the record demonstrates that he will face no greater hardship than the unfortunate, but expected, disruptions, inconveniences, and difficulties arising whenever a spouse is removed from the United States and/or refused admission. There is no documentation establishing that his emotional and/or financial hardship would be any different from other families separated as a result of immigration violations. Although the AAO is not insensitive to the applicant's spouse's situation, the record does not establish that the financial strain and emotional hardship he would face rise to the level of "extreme" as contemplated by statute and case law. 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) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. 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. The waiver application is denied.