


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**



H6

FILE:



Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO  
(CIUDAD JUAREZ)


Date:  
**NOV 24 2010**

IN RE:

Applicant:

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

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 law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

*Tariq Syed*  
for

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The 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 dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who is inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year and seeking readmission within ten years of her last departure from the United States. The applicant is married to a United States citizen. She seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her U.S. citizen spouse and children.

The Acting District Director found that, based on the evidence in the record, the applicant had failed to establish extreme hardship to her qualifying relative. The application was denied accordingly. *Decision of the Acting District Director*, dated June 4, 2008.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant asserts that the applicant's family has suffered extreme hardship caused by their separation. *Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion; Attorney's Statement*.

In support of these assertions, counsel submits a statement. The record also includes, but is not limited to, a statement from the applicant's spouse; statements from the applicant's children; a medical letter for the applicant's spouse; a statement from the applicant's church; a statement from a friend; medical prescriptions for the applicant's spouse; and tax statements. The AAO notes that the record also includes several documents in the Spanish language unaccompanied by certified translations. Accordingly, the AAO will not consider these documents. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3). The entire record, with the exception of the Spanish language documents, was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

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

(B) Aliens Unlawfully Present.-

(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.

In the present case, the record indicates that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in March 1994 and voluntarily departed in August 2007, returning to Mexico. *Consular Memorandum, American Consulate General, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico*, dated September 5, 2007. Additionally, the applicant was previously in the United States from November 1988 to December

1992. *Id.* The applicant, therefore, accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the effective date of the unlawful presence provisions under the Act, until she departed the United States in August 2007. In applying for an immigrant visa, the applicant is seeking admission within ten years of her August 2007 departure from the United States. The applicant is, therefore, inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for being unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than one year.

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 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-Moralez*, 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. *Naturalization Certificate*. The record fails to indicate whether the applicant’s spouse has familial ties in Mexico. The record does not address whether the applicant’s spouse speaks Spanish and how his language abilities, or lack thereof, would affect his adjustment to Mexico. The record does not address employment opportunities for the applicant’s spouse in Mexico, nor does the record document, through published country conditions reports, the economic situation in Mexico and the cost of living. A medical letter included in the record states that the applicant’s spouse has had the same physician since May 16, 2007, he has been treated mainly for cholesterol and reflux related issues, during his last few visits he has been experiencing signs of depression, and his depression is caused by the applicant’s absence. *Statement from [REDACTED] MD*, dated June 19, 2008. The record is not clear as to the severity of his medical issues, whether he would experience mental health issues if he relocated to Mexico, and whether he could receive adequate treatment in Mexico. The AAO notes that the record indicates that the applicant has six United States citizen children, five of whom

were from a previous relationship. *Birth certificates*. Although tax records show the applicant and her spouse to have six dependents, the record makes no mention as to what would happen to these children if the applicant's spouse were to relocate to Mexico and how the applicant's spouse would be affected. The AAO also notes that three of the applicant's children are over the age of eighteen. *Id.* When looking at the record before it, the AAO does not find that the applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to his spouse if she 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. *Naturalization Certificate*. The record does not address whether the applicant's spouse has family members in the United States. The applicant's spouse notes that being separated from the applicant has been very difficult and that he feels very depressed. *Statement from the applicant's spouse*, dated June 23, 2008. He notes that he does not want to do anything without her and that he really needs to have her back. *Id.* A medical letter included in the record states that the applicant's spouse has had the same physician since May 16, 2007, he has been treated mainly for cholesterol and reflux related issues and during his last few visits, he has been experiencing signs of depression. *Statement from [REDACTED] MD*, dated June 19, 2008. The applicant's spouse was started on antidepressant medication on June 10, 2008, and his depression is caused by the applicant's absence. *Id.*; *Medical prescriptions*. One of the applicant's children states that the applicant's spouse is not working and has a lot of bills to pay while sending his mother money to eat. *Statement from [REDACTED]*, dated June 15, 2008. While the AAO acknowledges these statements, it notes that the record fails to include supporting documentary evidence that he is no longer employed. The record also fails to include documentation, such as mortgage/rent statements, credit card statements, and utility bills, regarding the various expenses of the applicant's spouse. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence will not meet the burden of proof of this proceeding. *See 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)). Nevertheless, the AAO notes that the record includes tax statements for the applicant and her spouse showing their support of six dependents with a joint salary consistently under \$55,000.00. *Tax statements*. As such, the AAO recognizes the financial difficulties of being a single parent with several dependents. When looking at the aforementioned factors, particularly the psychological conditions of the applicant's spouse as documented by a licensed healthcare professional and the financial difficulties of being a single parent of several dependents, the AAO finds that the applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to her spouse if he were to reside in the United States.

However, as the record has failed to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's qualifying relative caused by the applicant's inadmissibility to the United States if he relocates to Mexico, the applicant is not eligible for a waiver of her inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether she merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) 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 not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

[REDACTED]

Page 7

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.