

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  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



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

*HLS*



FILE: [REDACTED]

Office: MEXICO CITY

Date: **FEB 02 2011**

IN RE: [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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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. The fee for a Form I-290B is currently \$585, but will increase to \$630 on November 23, 2010. Any appeal or motion filed on or after November 23, 2010 must be filed with the \$630 fee. 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,

*Michael Shumway*

*for* Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application for waiver of inadmissibility was denied by the Acting District Director, Mexico City, Mexico. The matter 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 was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to 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 more than one year and seeking admission within 10 years of her last departure from the United States. The applicant 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 to join her United States citizen parents and siblings.

The Director found that the applicant failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on her qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Acting District Director*, dated August 18, 2008.

On appeal, the applicant's father asserts that the applicant is "suffering a great deal in Mexico" as a result of her inadmissibility.

The record contains, but is not limited to, statements from the applicant's parents, siblings, grandparents and aunt; a supporting letter from the applicant's church; and the applicant's mother's medical documentation. 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.

....

(v) Waiver. - The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary)] 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 to the satisfaction of the [Secretary] 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.

In the present application, the record reflects that the applicant entered the United States from Mexico without inspection in 1989. The applicant resided in the United States until she voluntarily departed to Mexico in July 2007. The applicant accrued unlawful presence from the date she turned 18 years old, December 22, 2004, until her departure in July 2007. Consequently, the applicant accrued unlawful presence for a period of over two years prior to her departure from the United States. The applicant is seeking admission within ten years of her July 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.

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 can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's lawful permanent resident mother and U.S. citizen father are the only qualifying relatives 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.

On appeal, the applicant’s father asserts that his daughter is miserable and depressed in Mexico. He states that his daughter has resided in the United States almost her entire life and has no family to go to in Mexico. He states that his daughter was living with his wife’s cousin in Mexico, but his wife’s cousin’s son attempted to rape his daughter. He states that the authorities refused to take any action because they said there was insufficient proof. The applicant’s father states that his daughter now resides in a community housing project. He asserts that he has to pay for his daughter’s rent because she has been unable to find employment, and covering his daughter’s expenses has become a financial strain on him and his wife. The applicant’s father indicates that he and his wife are suffering emotionally because their daughter feels helpless and lost and “does not value even her own life.” The applicant’s father asserts that his wife cries herself to sleep and is going into a state of depression. He contends that he and his wife worry about the growing violence in Mexico. The applicant’s father notes that the applicant is his eldest child and has been like a second mother to her younger siblings. *Letter from* [REDACTED] dated September 18, 2008.

The applicant's sister, [REDACTED] states that the applicant helps her parents around the house and with caring for her siblings. She notes that as four sisters they are very close to each other. *Letter from [REDACTED] dated September 28, 2007.* The applicant's two younger sisters, [REDACTED] state that the applicant cares for them when their parents are working and always helps them with their school work. *Letters from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] undated.*

The AAO has reviewed the record in its entirety and finds that the applicant has not established that the denial of her waiver will result in extreme hardship to her parents.

The AAO acknowledges that the applicant has a close relationship with her sisters and parents. The separation of family members often results in significant psychological hardship. The statements from the applicant's parents and sisters demonstrate their strong family bond and their interests in keeping their family unified. As noted, 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. However, this case involves the separation of a 25-year-old adult child from her parents. As stated, 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*, 12 I&N Dec. 810, 813 (BIA 1968), 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. Accordingly, the applicant's status as an adult will be given consideration when assessing the hardship of separation from her parents.

The applicant has not presented any evidence, such as a psychological report, to show that the applicant's parents are experiencing emotional hardship that rises to the level of extreme. The record contains a note from [REDACTED], a family practice physician, stating that the applicant's mother is suffering depression because of her "daughter's situation." Attached to the note is a referral form for mental health services for "depression and family situation." *Resurrection Health Care Preferred Referral/Recertification Form For Mental Health Services*, dated August 19, 2008. However, there is no evidence in the record that the applicant's mother has been diagnosed and treated by a mental health professional. The AAO is not in a position to make an assessment of the applicant's mother's mental health without supporting documentation from a mental health professional.

The applicant's father has indicated that he is suffering "a financial strain" from supporting the applicant, but has failed to provide evidence of his income, expenses, and remittances, to demonstrate his assertion. The applicant's father has also noted the increasing "kidnapping, assault and murder in Mexico." However, he has not stated or provided evidence to show where the applicant resides and whether she has been a target of such violence in Mexico. The AAO notes that 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)). The applicant has not presented any other hardship factors in this case to distinguish the hardship her

parents are suffering upon separation from the common hardships suffered by family members of inadmissible aliens. While the AAO gives significant weight to the emotional hardship of separation, the applicant has not shown that this hardship is atypical and rises to the level of extreme hardship. Based on the foregoing, the applicant has not shown that her parents will suffer extreme hardship should they remain separated from the applicant.

All presented elements of hardship to the applicant's parents, should they remain in the United States, have been considered in aggregate. Based on the foregoing, the applicant has not established that her parents would suffer extreme hardship should they decide to remain in the United States separated from the applicant.

Furthermore, the applicant has not established extreme hardship to her parents if they relocate to Mexico to maintain family unity for the duration of her inadmissibility. The applicant's father stated that he brought the applicant to the United States when she was 3 years old because there was only "extreme poverty" in Mexico. He states that there "was no work, no chance for education, no medical care and sometimes no food to eat." *Letter from [REDACTED]*, dated September 18, 2008. However, he has not stated or presented evidence to demonstrate that if he and his wife now returned to Mexico they would suffer the same hardships they were concerned about when they brought the applicant to the United States in 1989. Therefore, the AAO cannot find that the applicant's parents would suffer extreme hardship in Mexico should they decide to relocate there.

Accordingly, the applicant has not established that denial of the present waiver application "would result in extreme hardship" to her parents, as required for a waiver under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) 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.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed. The waiver application is denied.