

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

[REDACTED]

H5
H5

FILE: [REDACTED]

Office: HIALEAH

Date: OCT 21 2010

IN RE: Applicant: [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:

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,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Hialeah, Florida, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained. The waiver application will be approved. The matter will be returned to the field office director for continued processing.

The applicant, a native and citizen of [REDACTED] 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 attempted to procure numerous immigration benefits, including employment authorization and permanent residency, by fraud or willful misrepresentation. Specifically, in April 2002, the applicant filed a Form I-485, Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status (Form I-485), claiming eligibility for an immigrant visa based on marriage to a U.S. citizen. A fraudulent marriage certificate was submitted with the underlying Form I-130, Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). Both the Form I-130 and Form I-485 were ultimately denied, in June 2003, due to the applicant's failure to appear for her permanent residency interview. It was later determined that the applicant had never been married to the individual who petitioned for the applicant on the Form I-130, and who was referenced as the applicant's spouse in the Form I-485 application.¹ The applicant is applying for a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to

¹ The record indicates that the applicant has previously asserted that she did not intend to defraud the government and that the applicant was unaware that an application for permanent residency based on marriage to a U.S. citizen had been filed on her behalf. As stated by the applicant:

At the time that the adjustment of status application was filed and throughout the pendency of that application, I was unaware that any misrepresentations of fact were made on the application, or in any documents supporting the application. I did not know that the preparer had put inaccurate information in the application..... I was told by the document preparer that I qualified for residency. I was unaware that the document preparer who prepared and filed the April 15, 2002 filing had provided information that I was married to [REDACTED] or that he provided any other inaccurate information.....

Affidavit of [REDACTED] dated August 16, 2009.

The Department of State Foreign Affairs Manual states, in pertinent part, that in order to find an alien ineligible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, it must be determined that:

- (1) There has been a misrepresentation made by the applicant;
- (2) The misrepresentation was willfully made; and
- (3) The fact misrepresented is material; or
- (4) The alien uses fraud to procure a visa or other documentation to receive a benefit....

DOS Foreign Affairs Manual, § 40.63 N2. Although the AAO is not bound by the Foreign Affairs Manual, it finds its analysis to be persuasive.

section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to remain in the United States with her U.S. citizen spouse and child, born in 2004.

The field office 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 Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated July 20, 2009.

In support of the appeal, counsel submits a brief, dated August 18, 2008, and referenced exhibits. In addition, counsel submitted supplemental documentation in support of the instant appeal in April and August of 2010. 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.

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...

In visa petition proceedings, the burden is on the petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit sought. See *Matter of Brantigan*, 11 I&N Dec. 493 (BIA 1966). The petitioner must prove by a preponderance of evidence that the beneficiary is fully qualified for the benefit sought. *Matter of Martinez*, 21 I&N Dec. 1035, 1036 (BIA 1997); *Matter of Patel*, 19 I&N Dec. 774 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Soo Hoo*, 11 I&N Dec. 151 (BIA 1965). In this case, it has not been established, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the applicant did not attempt to obtain multiple immigration benefits by fraud or misrepresentation. As the record indicates, the applicant signed her name, under penalty of perjury, on numerous forms, including the Form I-485 and the Form G-325A, Biographic Information, which contained fraudulent information regarding her marriage to a U.S. citizen. The applicant had the duty and the responsibility to review the forms prior to submission. As such, the AAO concurs with the field office director that the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act.

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 and/or their child can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's U.S. citizen 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.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Secretary, Janet Napolitano, has determined that an 18-month designation of Temporary Protected Status (TPS) for Haiti is warranted because of the devastating earthquake and aftershocks which occurred on January 12, 2010. As a result, Haitians in the United States are unable to return safely to their country. Even prior to the current catastrophe, Haiti was subject to years of political and social turmoil and natural disasters. In a travel warning issued on January 28, 2009 the U.S. Department of State noted the extensive damage to the country after four hurricanes struck in August and September 2008 and the chronic danger of violent crime, in particular kidnapping. *U.S. Department of State, Travel Warning - Haiti*, January 28, 2009. Based on the designation of TPS for Haitians and the disastrous conditions which have compounded an already unstable environment, and which will affect the country and people of Haiti for years to come, the AAO finds that requiring the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse to join the applicant in Haiti would result in extreme hardship.

For the same reasons, the AAO finds that the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse would also experience extreme hardship were he to remain in the United States without the applicant. This finding is based on the extreme emotional harm the applicant's spouse will experience due to concern about the applicant's well-being and safety in Haiti, a concern that is beyond the common results of removal or inadmissibility.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, reflects that the applicant has established that her U.S. citizen spouse would suffer extreme hardship were the applicant unable to reside in the United States. Moreover, it has been established that the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse would suffer extreme hardship were he to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant. Accordingly, the AAO finds that the situation presented in this application rises to the level of extreme hardship. However, the grant or denial of the waiver does not turn only on the issue of the meaning of "extreme hardship." It also hinges on the discretion of the Secretary and pursuant to such terms, conditions and procedures as she may by regulations prescribe.

The favorable factors in this matter are the hardships the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse and child would face if the applicant's waiver is not granted, regardless of whether they relocate to [REDACTED] or remain in the United States, the applicant's procurement of an Associate of Applied Science degree from Kirkwood Community College in August 2000, certificates of appreciation issued to the applicant from her church, the apparent lack of a criminal record, payment of taxes and gainful employment. The unfavorable factors in this matter are the applicant's fraud or willful misrepresentation and periods of unauthorized presence and employment in the United States.

While the AAO does not condone the applicant's actions, the AAO finds that the favorable factors outweigh the unfavorable factors in this application. Therefore, a favorable exercise of the Secretary's discretion is warranted.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility, 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 that burden. Accordingly, this appeal will be sustained and the application approved.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained. The waiver application is approved. The field office director shall reopen the denial of the Form I-485 application on motion and continue to process the adjustment application accordingly.²

² Electronic USCIS records indicate that the applicant's Form I-612, Application to Waive Foreign Residence Requirement (Form I-612), filed in February 2009, was approved by the USCIS on September 7, 2010, based on a favorable recommendation from the U.S. Department of State, dated August 12, 2010. As such, the applicant is no longer subject to the two-year foreign residence requirement under section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(e).

In addition, the record indicates that counsel for the applicant submitted a combined motion to reopen and reconsider the denial of the applicant's Form I-485, Application to Adjust Status or Register Permanent Residence (Form I-485). See *Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal*, dated August 18, 2009. The Field Office Director noted that an appeal of the Form I-601 had been received prior to the combined motion relating to the applicant's Form I-485 denial and consequently, the field office director did not have jurisdiction over the combined motion and as such, no action on the motion would be taken. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated September 10, 2009. The field office director's decision is in error.

Pursuant to section 103.5(a)(ii) of Title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations, the official having jurisdiction over motions is the official who made the latest decision in the proceedings, in the instant case the field office director that issued the Form I-485 denial, dated July 28, 2009, irrespective of the fact that the applicant filed an appeal of the Form I-601 prior to filing the above-referenced combined motion relating to the denied Form I-485. As such, the AAO does not have the jurisdiction to review and/or adjudicate the applicant's combined motion with respect to her denied Form I-485.