



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



tl6

DATE **DEC 19 2012** OFFICE: ANAHEIM FILE:

IN RE: APPLICANT:

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the 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 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.

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Ciudad Juarez, 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 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 readmission within 10 years of his last departure from the United States. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with his U.S. Citizen spouse.

The Field Office 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 Field Office Director* dated October 24, 2011.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant submits a brief in support. Therein, counsel asserts the applicant's spouse has shown she suffers from extreme financial and psychological hardship without the applicant present.

The record includes, but is not limited to, statements from the applicant's spouse, letters from family and friends, medical, financial, and educational documents, evidence of birth, marriage, divorce, residence, and citizenship, evidence of employment, other petitions and applications, and photographs. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

Section 212(a)(9) 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.

(ii) Construction of unlawful presence.- For purposes of this paragraph, an alien is deemed to be unlawfully present in the United States if the alien is present in the United States after the expiration of the period of stay authorized by the Attorney General or is present in the United States without being admitted or paroled.

....

(v) Waiver.-The Attorney General 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 Attorney General 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. No court shall have jurisdiction to review a decision or action by the Attorney General regarding a waiver under this clause.

The applicant admitted under oath that he entered the United States without inspection in June 2000 and returned to Mexico in January 2011. Inadmissibility is not contested on appeal. The AAO therefore finds that the applicant accrued more than one year of unlawful presence and is inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act. The applicant's qualifying relative for a waiver of this inadmissibility is his U.S. Citizen spouse.

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 suffered from psychological issues before she met the applicant. She explains she was born in El Salvador, came from a poor background, graduated from high school, and had two years of undergraduate education. The spouse states the father of her two children was emotionally and physically abusive, as well as unfaithful, that she had to call the police for assistance during one argument, and left thereafter. She adds she had a difficult time emotionally, and that she had post-partum depression after her son was born in 1993. The spouse indicates she met the applicant in 2002 at church, and while they were together he has been a responsible and loving husband and father to her two children. She moreover states that the spouse paid for 60 percent of the household expenses, and that without him, she has been struggling to make ends meet. Documentation of household expenses is present in the record. The spouse contends she has had to work double shifts, and only sleeps for two to four hours per day, which is detrimental to her health and her employment as a home care aide. A letter from the spouse’s employer as well as paystubs for both the applicant and her spouse are submitted in support. The spouse asserts that without the applicant present, she suffers from severe emotional issues. An evaluation from a psychologist is submitted, which indicates that the applicant experiences major depressive disorder, insomnia, and generalized anxiety disorder. The spouse additionally claims she experiences medical difficulties, submitting evidence of two urgent care visits as documentation of her claims. She states that her son misses having the applicant present as a father figure in her life.

The spouse contends she cannot relocate to Mexico because she does not have health care there, she will not be able to find employment in that country, and her son's goal of attending college in the United States to pursue an electrical engineering degree will be put on hold if she relocates to Mexico. She moreover indicates that the applicant has been unable to find sufficient employment in Mexico, and that she has to send money to him.

The applicant has shown his spouse experiences financial difficulties without him present. Although the record does not contain evidence to indicate the spouse works more than 40 hours per week, documentation of record demonstrates that the spouse's household expenses exceed her income, and that she has had difficulties paying her bills on time. Furthermore, the record indicates that the applicant would be able to resume employment with his old employer in the United States if he were allowed to return. As such, documentation of record establishes that the spouse suffers from financial hardship given the current separation from the applicant. Furthermore, although assertions with respect to the spouse's prior abusive relationship are not documented in letters of support or other evidence, such as a police report, letters from family and friends as well as the psychological evaluation demonstrate that the applicant's spouse has suffered psychologically without the applicant present.

The AAO therefore finds there is sufficient evidence of record to demonstrate that the spouse's 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, 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 remains in Mexico without his spouse.

However, the spouse's assertions of financial, medical, family-related, and other hardship upon relocation to Mexico are unsupported by evidence of record. Although the spouse's 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 Obaighena*, 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 AAO notes that relocation to Mexico 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 Mexico.

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 qualifying relative 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(a)(9)(B)(v) 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 a 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. 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.