





U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services


(b)(6)



Date: **FEB 26 2013**


Office: TUCSON

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.

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Tucson, Arizona. The matter 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 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 procuring admission to the United States through fraud or misrepresentation. The record reflects that during an interview with a USCIS officer on August 24, 2011, the applicant testified under oath that on his application for a Border Crossing Card in 2010, the applicant misrepresented that he resided in Mexico with his parents, when in fact he had been residing in the United States since February 2000. The applicant does not contest the finding of inadmissibility, but rather seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act in order to reside in the United States with his U.S. Citizen spouse.

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 Ground of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated March 30, 2012.

The record contains the following documentation: a statement by the applicant's attorney; statements by the applicant, the applicant's spouse, and the applicant's step-son; medical documentation for the applicant's spouse; a psychological report for the applicant's spouse; and financial documentation. 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 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 or, in the case of an alien granted classification under clause (iii) or (iv) of section 204(a)(1)(A) or clause (ii) or (iii) of section 204(a)(1)(B), the alien demonstrates extreme hardship to the alien or the alien's United States citizen, lawful permanent resident, or qualified alien parent or child.

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. The applicant's U.S. citizen wife 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-Moralez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (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. INS*, 138 F.3d 1292, 1293 (9th Cir. 1993), (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.

Counsel contends that the applicant's spouse will suffer psychological hardship if the applicant's waiver is not approved, noting that the applicant's spouse has a history and diagnosis of depression, including one suicide attempt in 2008 as well as incidents of suicidal ideation. The record includes a report from a psychologist which states that the applicant's spouse was referred for therapy by her physician because she was depressed, and that the psychologist treated her for a period of two years. The report states that the applicant's spouse has a longstanding history of depression, with one suicide attempt in 2008 and incidents of suicidal ideation, and that her physical state of depression has limited her mood, ability to socialize, and mental resilience. The psychologist concluded that the clinical profile of the applicant's spouse is consistent with that of an individual who is experiencing major depression and symptoms of anxiety. The record further includes evidence that the applicant's spouse is taking medication for her depression.

The record further indicates that the applicant's spouse will suffer financial hardship if the applicant's waiver application is not approved. The psychologist's report states that the applicant's spouse was gainfully employed until April 2007, when her employment ceased due to a work-related injury. The record indicates that the applicant's spouse had no income in 2008 and 2009. The record further indicates that the applicant's spouse began receiving social security benefits in 2010, which is her sole source of income. The psychologist's report states that the social security benefits are not sufficient to cover the rent and month expenses of the applicant's spouse, as well as her credit card debt which began to accrue after being unemployed. The record indicates that the qualifying spouse would be unable to meet her financial obligations in the applicant's absence.

Counsel further asserts the applicant's wife is experiencing medical hardship. The record includes medical documentation for the applicant's spouse which indicate that she is suffering from medical disorders, including fibromyalgia, chronic headaches, chronic sinusitis, chronic low back pain, and pain in her arms and neck. The applicant states that his spouse receives injections every three months in her back, which require several days to recuperate. Medical records indicate that the applicant's spouse is doing reasonably well with the medications that she is taking, but that she is always in pain.

The record establishes that if the waiver application were denied, the applicant's spouse would experience psychological, financial and medical hardship as a result of the applicant's separation. These hardships, when considered in the aggregate, are beyond the common results of removal and would rise to the level of extreme hardship if she remained in the United States without the applicant.

The record further indicates that the applicant's spouse would experience hardship were she to relocate to Mexico to be with the applicant. The record indicates that the applicant's spouse was born in Guatemala, and has never resided in Mexico. The applicant's spouse has lived in the United States since 1988, a period of 25 years. The applicant's spouse has one son who resides in the United States, and three grandchildren. Counsel states that relocating would be detrimental to the applicant's spouse's ability to obtain medical treatment in a country without her regular physicians who are familiar with her conditions. Counsel further notes that while she would continue to receive her social security disability benefits, the applicant's spouse would no longer be eligible for Medicare benefits were she to relocate to Mexico. The applicant has established that his spouse would suffer hardship beyond the common results of removal if she were to relocate to Mexico to reside with the applicant.

The AAO thus 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. 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).

In evaluating whether . . . relief is warranted in the exercise of discretion, the factors adverse to the alien include the nature and underlying circumstances of the exclusion ground at issue, the presence of additional significant violations of this country's immigration laws, the existence of a criminal record, and if so, its nature and seriousness, and the presence of other evidence indicative of the alien's bad character or undesirability as a permanent resident of this country. The favorable considerations include family ties in the United States, residence of long duration in this country particularly where alien began residency at a young age), evidence of hardship to the alien and his family if he is excluded and deported, service in this country's Armed Forces, a history of stable employment, the existence of property or business ties, evidence of value or service in the community, evidence of genuine rehabilitation if a criminal record exists, and other evidence attesting to the alien's good character (e.g., affidavits from family, friends and responsible community representatives).

See Matter of Mendez-Morales, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996). The AAO must then, "balance the adverse factors evidencing an alien's undesirability as a permanent resident with the social and humane considerations presented on the alien's behalf to determine whether the grant of relief in the

exercise of discretion appears to be in the best interests of the country. “ *Id.* at 300. (Citations omitted).

The favorable factors in this matter are the extreme hardships the U.S. citizen spouse would face if the applicant were to reside in Mexico, regardless of whether she accompanied the applicant or remained in the United States; the applicant’s residing in the United States for more than 10 years; the applicant’s apparent lack of a criminal record; and a reference letter on behalf of the applicant submitted by the son of the applicant’s spouse. The unfavorable factor in this matter is the applicant’s misrepresentation to procure admission into the United States.

The immigration violations committed by the applicant are serious in nature and cannot be condoned. Nonetheless, the AAO finds that the applicant has established that the favorable factors in her application outweigh the unfavorable factors. 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.