

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

H5

FILE:



Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO
(CIUDAD JUAREZ)

Date: **NOV 01 2010**

IN RE:

Applicant:



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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

Thank you,

Tariq Syed
for

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Mexico City, Mexico and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who was found to be 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 attempted to procure admission and having procured admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant is the spouse of a lawful permanent resident and seeks 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 spouse and children.

The District Director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed upon a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated February 6, 2008.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant states that her spouse would suffer extreme hardship should the waiver application be denied. *Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion*.

In support of the waiver, counsel submits a brief. The record also includes, but is not limited to, a statement from the applicant; statements from the applicant's spouse; employment letters for the applicant and her spouse; a telephone bill; bank statements; statements from the applicant's children's high school; tax statements; earnings statements for the applicant's spouse; a statement from a church; and medical letters and a medical record for the applicant's spouse. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.

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.

The record reflects that on February 3, 2001 the applicant attempted to gain admission to the United States by presenting another person's visa at Laredo, Texas. *Consular Memorandum, American Consulate General, [REDACTED] Mexico*, dated April 18, 2007. She was detained by immigration authorities and returned to Mexico. *Id.* She had several other attempted entries. *Id.* In 2005, the applicant was admitted to the United States with a V visa. *Id.* At the time of her V visa interview, she failed to disclose information about her previous immigration arrests. *Id.* Based on her presentation of a fraudulent visa at the port of entry and her failure to disclose her previous immigration arrests at the time of her visa interview, the applicant is inadmissible under Section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

- (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 waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(i) of the Act is dependent on a showing that the bar to admission imposes extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, which includes the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship to the applicant or children can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's spouse is the only qualifying relative in this case. If extreme hardship to a qualifying relative is established, the applicant is statutorily eligible for a waiver, and USCIS then assesses whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. *See Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996).

As a qualifying relative is not required to depart the United States as a consequence of an applicant's inadmissibility, two distinct factual scenarios exist should a waiver application be denied: either the qualifying relative will join the applicant to reside abroad or the qualifying relative will remain in the United States. Ascertaining the actual course of action that will be taken is complicated by the fact that an applicant may easily assert a plan for the qualifying relative to relocate abroad or to remain in the United States depending on which scenario presents the greatest prospective hardship, even though no intention exists to carry out the alleged plan in reality. *Cf. Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 885 (BIA 1994) (addressing separation of minor child from both parents applying for suspension of deportation). Thus, we interpret the statutory language of the various waiver provisions in section 212 of the Act to require an applicant to establish extreme hardship to his or her qualifying relative(s) under both possible scenarios. To endure the hardship of separation when extreme hardship could be avoided by joining the applicant abroad, or to endure the hardship of relocation when extreme hardship could be avoided by remaining in the United States, is a matter of choice and not the result of removal or inadmissibility. As the Board of Immigration Appeals stated in *Matter of Ige*:

[W]e consider the critical issue . . . to be whether a child would suffer extreme hardship if he accompanied his parent abroad. If, as in this case, no hardship would ensue, then the fact that the child might face hardship if left in the United States would be the result of parental choice, not the parent's deportation.

Id. See also *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996)

Extreme hardship is "not a definable term of fixed and inflexible content or meaning," but "necessarily depends upon the facts and circumstances peculiar to each case." *Matter of Hwang*, 10 I&N Dec. 448, 451 (BIA 1964). In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the Board provided a list of factors it deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999). The 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. *Id.* The Board added that not all of the foregoing factors need be analyzed in any given case and emphasized that the list of factors was not exclusive. *Id.* at 566.

The Board has also held that the common or typical results of deportation, removal and inadmissibility do not constitute extreme hardship, and has listed certain individual hardship factors considered common rather than extreme. These factors include: economic disadvantage, loss of current employment, inability to maintain one's present standard of living, inability to pursue a chosen profession, separation from family members, severing community ties, cultural readjustment after living in the United States for many years, cultural adjustment of qualifying relatives who have never lived outside the United States, inferior economic and educational opportunities in the foreign country, or inferior medical facilities in the foreign country. *See generally Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. at 568; *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. at 631-32; *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 883; *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. 245, 246-47 (Comm'r 1984); *Matter of Kim*, 15 I&N Dec. 88, 89-90 (BIA 1974); *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. 810, 813 (BIA 1968).

However, though hardships may not be extreme when considered abstractly or individually, the Board has made it clear that "[r]elevant factors, though not extreme in themselves, must be considered in the aggregate in determining whether extreme hardship exists." *Matter of O-J-O*, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996) (quoting *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 882). The adjudicator "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." *Id.*

We observe that the actual hardship associated with an abstract hardship factor such as family separation, economic disadvantage, cultural readjustment, et cetera, differs in nature and severity depending on the unique circumstances of each case, as does the cumulative hardship a qualifying relative experiences as a result of aggregated individual hardships. *See, e.g., In re Bing Chih Kao and Mei Tsui Lin*, 23 I&N Dec. 45, 51 (BIA 2001) (distinguishing *Matter of Pilch* regarding hardship faced by qualifying relatives on the basis of variations in the length of residence in the United States and the ability to speak the language of the country to which they would relocate).

Family separation, for instance, has been found to be a common result of inadmissibility or removal in some cases. *See Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. at 813. Nevertheless, family ties are to be considered in analyzing hardship. *See Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. at 565-66. The question of whether family separation is the ordinary result of inadmissibility or removal may depend on the nature of family relationship considered. For example, in *Matter of Shaughnessy*, the Board considered the scenario of parents being separated from their soon-to-be adult son, finding that this separation would not result in extreme hardship to the parents. *Id.* at 811-12; *see also U.S. v. Arrieta*, 224 F.3d 1076, 1082 (9th Cir. 2000) ("Mr. Arrieta was not a spouse, but a son and brother. It was evident from the record that the effect of the deportation order would be separation rather than relocation."). In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the Board considered the scenario of the respondent's spouse accompanying him to Mexico, finding that she would not experience extreme hardship from losing "physical proximity to her family" in the United States. 22 I&N Dec. at 566-67.

The decision in *Cervantes-Gonzalez* reflects the norm that spouses reside with one another and establish a life together such that separating from one another is likely to result in substantial hardship. It is common for both spouses to relocate abroad if one of them is not allowed to stay in the United States, which typically results in separation from other family members living in the United States. Other decisions reflect the expectation that minor children will remain with their parents, upon whom they usually depend for financial and emotional support. *See, e.g., Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 886 (“[I]t is generally preferable for children to be brought up by their parents.”). Therefore, the most important single hardship factor may be separation, particularly where spouses and minor children are concerned. *Salcido-Salcido*, 138 F.3d at 1293 (quoting *Contreras-Buenfil v. INS*, 712 F.2d 401, 403 (9th Cir. 1983)); *Cerrillo-Perez*, 809 F.2d at 1422.

Regardless of the type of family relationship involved, the hardship resulting from family separation is determined based on the actual impact of separation on an applicant, and all hardships must be considered in determining whether the combination of hardships takes the case beyond the consequences ordinarily associated with removal or inadmissibility. *Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. at 383. Nevertheless, though we require an applicant to show that a qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship both in the event of relocation and in the event of separation, in analyzing the latter scenario, we give considerable, if not predominant, weight to the hardship of separation itself, particularly in cases involving the separation of spouses from one another and/or minor children from a parent. *Salcido-Salcido*, 138 F.3d at 1293.

If the applicant’s spouse joins the applicant in Mexico, the applicant needs to establish that her spouse will suffer extreme hardship. The applicant’s spouse is a native of Mexico. *Permanent Resident Card*. The applicant’s spouse states his entire family is in the United States, including his parents, nephews and nieces. *Statement from the applicant’s spouse*, dated March 4, 2008. The record includes numerous copies of lawful permanent residence cards and naturalization certificates for the applicant’s spouse’s family members. The applicant’s spouse has been a lawful permanent resident since December 1, 1990. *Permanent Resident Card*. Counsel states that the applicant’s spouse would have to effectively abandon his lawful permanent resident status of over 20 years. *Brief in Support of Appeal*, undated. The applicant’s spouse states he has significant health problems such as anxiety and depression and would be unable to receive treatment in Mexico. *Statement from the applicant’s spouse*, dated March 4, 2008. Documentation included in the record states that the applicant’s spouse is under the care of a licensed healthcare professional for high blood pressure, depression and anxiety. *Statement from [REDACTED]* dated May 2, 2007; *Medical record for the applicant’s spouse*, dated March 31, 2007. His licensed healthcare professional requests that the applicant’s spouse remain under her care and not travel to Mexico. *Id.* The applicant’s spouse states there is a lack of educational and employment opportunities in Mexico. *Statement from the applicant’s spouse*, dated March 4, 2008. While the AAO acknowledges this statement, it notes that the record fails to include documentation, such as published country conditions reports, regarding the educational and employment opportunities in Mexico. Nevertheless, the AAO acknowledges that the applicant’s spouse has been employed by [REDACTED] in Fort Worth, Texas since 1996. *Employment letter for the applicant’s spouse*, dated February 20, 2008. When looking at the aforementioned factors, particularly the health conditions of the applicant’s spouse as documented by a licensed healthcare professional, the consistent healthcare he is receiving in the United States, the separation from his large family, his abandonment of his lawful permanent status that he has held for 20 years, and the loss of his 14 year place of

employment, the AAO finds that the applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to her spouse if he were to reside in Mexico.

If the applicant's spouse resides in the United States, the applicant needs to establish that her spouse will suffer extreme hardship. As previously noted, the applicant's spouse is a native of Mexico. *Lawful Permanent Resident Card*. The applicant and her spouse have four children. *Attorney's brief*. According to counsel, all four children reside in Mexico with the applicant. *Attorney's brief*. Counsel states that the children are derivative beneficiaries on the applicant's case, and without the applicant's grant of a visa the children will not be granted visas. *Attorney's brief*. The applicant's spouse's Form I-130 petition for the applicant lists the four children. The AAO notes counsel's claim. The applicant and his spouse have been married since August 29, 1981. *Marriage certificate*. The applicant's spouse states that it hurts him very much that his family cannot be with him in the United States. *Statement from the applicant's spouse*, dated March 4, 2008. The record includes a statement from a licensed healthcare professional diagnosing the applicant's spouse with high blood pressure, depression and anxiety. *Statement from [REDACTED] D.O.*, dated May 2, 2007. Counsel asserts that the mental condition of the applicant's spouse has started to affect his job performance and his everyday social interactions. *Attorney's brief*. These assertions are not supported with documentary evidence. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaighbena*, 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). Nevertheless, when looking at the aforementioned factors, particularly the health conditions of the applicant's spouse as documented by a licensed healthcare professional, the separation from his spouse of nearly 30 years, and the separation from his four children in Mexico, the AAO finds that the applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to her spouse if he were to reside in the United States.

The AAO additionally finds that the applicant merits a waiver of inadmissibility as a matter of discretion. In discretionary matters, the alien bears the burden of proving eligibility in terms of equities in the United States which are not outweighed by adverse factors. See *Matter of T-S-Y-*, 7 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1957).

The adverse factors in the present case are the applicant's misrepresentation for which she now seeks a waiver and period of unauthorized employment. The favorable and mitigating factors are her United States citizen spouse, extreme hardship to her spouse if she were refused admission and lack of a criminal record.

The AAO finds that, although the immigration violations committed by the applicant are serious and cannot be condoned, when taken together, the favorable factors in the present case outweigh the adverse factors, such that a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted.

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 met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be sustained.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.