


identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

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



H6

FILE [Redacted]

Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ)

Date:

DEC 13 2010

IN RE:

Applicant: [Redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v)

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,

Perry Rhew

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Acting 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)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for a period of one year or more. The applicant is married to a U.S. Citizen and is the beneficiary of an approved petition for alien relative. He seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), in order to return to the United States and reside with his wife and children.

The acting district director concluded that the applicant 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 Acting District Director* dated June 4, 2008.

On appeal, the applicant's representative asserts that the applicant did not understand his burden of proof of establishing extreme hardship to his wife and submits evidence with the appeal to support the claim that she and their children will suffer extreme hardship if the applicant is denied admission to the United States. *See Notice of Appeal to the AAO (Form I-290B)*. The applicant's representative asserts that the applicant's wife is suffering emotional and financial hardship due to separation from the applicant and the effects of their separation on her two children, and would also suffer extreme hardship if she relocated to Mexico and were separated from her family members in the United States and had to adjust to conditions there. *Brief in Support of Appeal* at 5-8. In support of the appeal counsel submitted letters from the applicant's wife, birth certificates and naturalization certificates for the applicant's wife's relatives in the United States, copies of paystubs and documentation of medical insurance and other benefits, medical records for the applicant's children, a note from the applicant's wife's doctor, letters from the applicant's daughter's preschool, an order from the U.S. Bankruptcy Court discharging the applicant's wife's debt, and letters from the applicant's wife's parents and from friends and relatives. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

- (i) In general. - Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who –
- (II) Has been unlawfully present in the United States for one year or more, and who again seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal from the United States, is inadmissible.

Section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act provides for a waiver of section 212(a)(9)(B)(i) inadmissibility as follows:

The Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] has sole discretion to waive clause (i) in the case of an immigrant who is the spouse or son or daughter of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if it is established . . . that the refusal of admission to such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such alien.

A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) 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 his children can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's 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-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).

Although 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 the 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 record reflects that the applicant is a thirty-six year-old native and citizen of Mexico who resided in the United States from September 1997, when he entered without inspection, to July 2007, when he returned to Mexico. He is therefore inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year. The record further reflects that the applicant’s wife is a thirty year-old native and citizen of the United States. The applicant currently resides in Mexico and his wife resides in Aurora, Colorado.

The applicant’s wife states that she had to leave her son in Mexico with the applicant because she could not afford to support both her children in the United States and that due to the loss of the applicant’s income she has fallen behind on their bills. *Letter from* [REDACTED] dated September 17, 2007. She states,

Emotionally I try to remain strong to not worry my husband and kids, but it’s hard as I see my family falling [apart]. I am now taking Zoloft for depression to help with the insomnia and anxiety. . . . Day in and day out I am

questioned by our daughter [REDACTED] why her father and brother are not around, why they don't love us anymore, or want to be around. . . . She has lost interest in daycare; [REDACTED] is no longer outgoing and is developing behavior issues.

In a letter submitted with the appeal the applicant's wife states that she has suffered from depression for a year and a half and the applicant had helped her cope with her insecurities caused by abuse she experienced during her first marriage. *Letter from [REDACTED]* dated June 19, 2008. She further states that she had to file for bankruptcy in January 2008.

In support of the assertions made by the applicant's wife, her representative submitted a note from the applicant's wife's doctor stating that she was being treated with Zoloft for depression. The record also contains letters from friends and family members stating that she had to leave her son in Mexico with the applicant due to financial stress and to reduce her childcare expenses and she has appeared depressed since the separation began. Letters from the applicant's daughter's school state that she has changed since being separated from her father and brother and she seems depressed and interacts with the other children differently. The record also contains an order from the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Colorado discharging the applicant's wife's debt in Chapter 7 bankruptcy proceedings. *See Order of U.S. Bankruptcy Judge* dated April 16, 2008.

Documentation on the record indicates that the applicant's wife is experiencing depression as a result of separation from the applicant and their son and her daughter has also been affected by the separation. As noted above, separation from close family members is a primary concern in assessing extreme hardship. *Salcido-Salcido v. INS*, 138 F.3d 1292, 1293 (9th Cir. 1998). Letters from several friends and relatives state that the applicant's wife had to leave her son in Mexico because she could not afford to pay for childcare for him and describe the emotional and financial difficulties she is experiencing since the applicant's departure. Further documentation indicates that the applicant's wife has suffered financial hardship due to loss of the applicant's income and had to file for bankruptcy in 2008. When considered in the aggregate, the emotional and financial hardships to the applicant's wife caused by separation from the applicant rise to the level of extreme hardship if she remains in the United States without him.

The AAO additionally finds that relocating to Mexico would pose other hardships for the applicant's wife, a native and citizen of the United States who has no ties to Mexico. The record indicates that her parents, siblings, and extended family members live in Colorado and she has lived in the United States her entire life. When considered in the aggregate, the factors of hardship to the applicant's wife should she relocate to Mexico, including separation from her family members and loss of her employment in the United States and having to adjust to conditions in Mexico, constitute extreme hardship.

Based on the forgoing, the AAO finds that the applicant's wife would face extreme hardship if the applicant's waiver application is denied. Thus, the applicant has shown that a qualifying relative would suffer extreme hardship if she is denied admission to the United States. The AAO additionally finds that the applicant merits a waiver of inadmissibility as a matter of discretion. In *Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (BIA 1996), the BIA held that establishing

extreme hardship and eligibility for relief does not create an entitlement to that relief, and that extreme hardship, once established, is but one favorable discretionary factor to be considered. 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 Attorney General (now Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security) has the authority to consider all negative factors in deciding whether or not to grant a favorable exercise of discretion. *See Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, supra*, at 12.

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). *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 negative factor in this case is the fact that the applicant entered the United States without inspection and unlawfully remained in the United States for more than one year. The positive factors in this case include the applicant's family and community ties in the United States, extreme hardship to the applicant's wife and children if he is denied admission to the United States, and his lack of a criminal record.

The AAO finds that applicant's violation of the immigration laws cannot be condoned. Nevertheless, the AAO finds that taken together, the favorable factors in the present case outweigh the adverse factor, such that a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. Accordingly, the appeal will be sustained.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.