





**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

(b)(6)




DATE: FEB 01 2013 OFFICE: NEW YORK, NEW YORK

FILE: 

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:**

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.

If you believe the AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Rosentberg".

Ron Rosentberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant is a native and citizen of Jamaica who has resided in the United States since October 2, 1998 when he was admitted pursuant to a nonimmigrant visa. He was later 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 a visa, other documentation, admission to the United States, or another benefit provided under the Act through fraud or misrepresentation. The applicant is the spouse of a U.S. Citizen and is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative. 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 U.S. Citizen spouse.

The District Director concluded that the applicant failed to demonstrate the existence of extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. See *Decision of District Director* dated April 21, 2012.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief in support, a letter from the applicant's spouse, letters from the spouse's physicians, documentation related to a foreclosure, and evidence on the applicant's driver's license. In the brief, counsel claims the applicant's spouse would experience severe psychological, financial, and medical hardship upon separation from the applicant. Counsel moreover asserts the spouse would also experience extreme hardship upon relocation to Jamaica due to the country's inadequate medical facilities, the spouse's inability to support herself in Jamaica, and her lack of ties there.

The record includes, but is not limited to, the documents listed above, other statements from the applicant and his spouse, financial and medical records, documentation on the applicant's admission, other applications and petitions, evidence of birth, marriage, divorce, and citizenship, and photographs. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

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 [Secretary] may, in the discretion of the [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 [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 the present case, the record reflects that the applicant obtained passport stamps indicating he re-entered Jamaica on October 6, 1998 and on October 16, 1999, when he claimed that he had never left the United States since his October 2, 1998 admission. The applicant admitted he obtained the stamps to falsely show he did not remain in the United States past his date of authorized stay. Inadmissibility is not contested on appeal. The applicant is therefore inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for having attempted to procure a visa, other documentation, admission to the United States, or a benefit under the Act through fraud or misrepresentation. The applicant's qualifying relative is her U.S. Citizen spouse.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides that a waiver of the bar to admission is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship on a qualifying family member. 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).

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 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. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996); *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 883 (BIA 1994); *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.*

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., *Matter of 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). For example, though family separation has been found to be a common result of inadmissibility or removal, separation from family living in the United States can also be the most important single hardship factor in considering hardship in the aggregate. See *Salcido-Salcido v. I.N.S.*, 138 F.3d 1292 (9th Cir. 1998) (quoting *Contreras-Buenfil v. INS*, 712 F.2d 401, 403 (9th Cir. 1983)); but see *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. at 247 (separation of spouse and children from applicant not extreme hardship due to conflicting evidence in the record and because applicant and spouse had been voluntarily separated from one another for 28 years). Therefore, we consider the totality of the circumstances in determining whether denial of admission would result in extreme hardship to a qualifying relative.

The applicant’s spouse claims she will suffer medical, financial, and psychological hardship if the applicant returned to Jamaica without her. She explains that she has medical conditions which require the applicant’s assistance, and the applicant himself had heart surgery. A letter from a surgeon confirms that the applicant underwent coronary artery bypass surgery in 2012, and is being followed by a cardiologist. The spouse’s physician states in a letter that she was diagnosed with hypertension, pleurisy, and COPD, and that she relies on the applicant for psychological and emotional support. The applicant’s spouse additionally contends that she would suffer psychologically if she were separated from the applicant. A letter from another physician indicates the applicant’s spouse was diagnosed with major depressive disorder, single episode, moderate, and is being treated with Lexapro, Xanax, and Ambien. The applicant’s spouse moreover states that she is unemployed, and that the applicant supports her financially. Copies of federal income tax returns are submitted, indicating the applicant earned \$14,765 in 2012, and the applicant’s employer states in a letter that the applicant earns \$8 an hour, working 40 hours per week in the busy season. Foreclosure documents are also submitted in support of assertions of financial hardship.

The spouse moreover asserts that she will not be able to live in Jamaica. She explains that she has lived in the United States for over 20 years, and she does not think she will be able to survive in Jamaica based on the economic and political situation there. Counsel contends the spouse's life expectancy will be shortened if she relocates to Jamaica, since health care in that country is inadequate.

Documentation submitted establishes the applicant's spouse would experience extreme hardship without the applicant present. The record indicates that the applicant is the sole income earner in the family, and that, even with the applicant's income, foreclosure proceedings were instituted against the spouse for failure to make sufficient payments on the mortgage. Furthermore, evidence of record demonstrates that the applicant's spouse, who is 63 years old, has some medical problems which may require the applicant's assistance. Her financial difficulties, along with her health problems, add to the psychological difficulties established by the letter from her physician.

The AAO therefore finds there is sufficient evidence of record to demonstrate that her hardship would rise above the distress normally created when families are separated as a result of inadmissibility or removal. In that the record establishes that the financial, medical, psychological / emotional or other impacts of separation on the applicant's spouse are cumulatively above and beyond the hardships commonly experienced, the AAO concludes that she would suffer extreme hardship if the waiver application is denied and the applicant returns to Jamaica without his spouse.

However, the record does not establish that the spouse would experience extreme hardship upon relocation to Jamaica. Although counsel and the spouse assert that medical facilities in Jamaica are insufficient to treat the spouse's medical conditions, the applicant submits no evidence to substantiate those assertions. Although these assertions are relevant and have been taken into consideration, little weight can be afforded them in the absence of supporting evidence. See *Matter of Kwan*, 14 I&N Dec. 175 (BIA 1972) ("Information in an affidavit should not be disregarded simply because it appears to be hearsay; in administrative proceedings, that fact merely affects the weight to be afforded it."). 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)). Similarly, without supporting evidence, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the applicant's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. See *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 n.2 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1, 3 n.2 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). The record similarly lacks evidence to support assertions on country conditions and the economy. Without such supporting evidence, the AAO cannot evaluate the hardship the applicant's spouse would experience upon relocation to Jamaica.

The AAO notes that relocation to Jamaica would entail separation from family members who live in the United States as well as other difficulties. However, we do not find evidence of record to show that the spouse's difficulties would rise above the hardship commonly created when families

relocate as a result of inadmissibility or removal. In that the record lacks sufficient evidence to demonstrate the emotional, financial, medical, or other impacts of relocation on the applicant's spouse are in the aggregate above and beyond the hardships normally experienced, the AAO cannot conclude that she would experience extreme hardship if the waiver application is denied and the applicant's spouse relocates to Jamaica.

We can find extreme hardship warranting a waiver of inadmissibility only where an applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to a qualifying relative in the scenario of separation *and* the scenario of relocation. A claim that a qualifying relative will remain in the United States and thereby suffer extreme hardship as a consequence of separation can easily be made for purposes of the waiver even where there is no intention to separate in reality. *See Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 886 (BIA 1994). Furthermore, to separate and suffer extreme hardship, where relocating abroad with the applicant would not result in extreme hardship, is a matter of choice and not the result of inadmissibility. *Id.*, see also *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996). As the applicant has not demonstrated extreme hardship from relocation, we cannot find that refusal of admission would result in extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse in this case.

In this case, the record does not contain sufficient evidence to show that the hardships faced by the qualifying relative, considered in the aggregate, rise beyond the common results of removal or inadmissibility to the level of extreme hardship. The AAO therefore finds that the applicant has failed to establish extreme hardship to his U.S. Citizen spouse as required under section 212(i) of the Act. As the applicant has not established extreme hardship to a qualifying family member no purpose would be served in determining 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.