



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

tl6

DATE: **DEC 31 2012** OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [REDACTED]

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 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 Ciudad Field Office Director. Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and a citizen of Mexico who was found to be inadmissible to the United States under 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 admission within ten years of her last departure. The applicant is the spouse of a U.S. citizen and is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to sections 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), in order to reside in the United States with her spouse and child.

The director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that the bar to her admission would impose extreme hardship on a qualifying relative and denied the Form I-601, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility, accordingly. *See Field Office Director's Decision*, dated November 3, 2011.

On appeal, the applicant's spouse raises new hardship factors for consideration. *See Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion*, dated November 29, 2011.

The evidence of record includes, but is not limited to: statements from the applicant and her spouse, letters from the applicant's spouse's pastor and employers, financial evidence, medical evidence, family photographs, copies of relationship and identification documents, and documents in Spanish.

8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b) states:

(3) Translations. Any document containing foreign language submitted to USCIS shall be accompanied by a full English language translation which the translator has certified as complete and accurate, and by the translator's certification that he or she is competent to translate from the foreign language into English.

As such, the Spanish-language documents without English translations cannot be considered in analyzing this case. However, the rest of the record was reviewed and all relevant evidence was considered in reaching a decision on the appeal.

Section 212(a)(9) of the Act provides:

(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.

The record reflects that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in April 2005 and remained in the United States until October 2009, when she voluntarily departed the United States.¹ As the applicant accrued unlawful presence of more than one year and is seeking admission within 10 years of her 2009 departure, she is inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act. The applicant does not contest her inadmissibility.

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 other family members can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. 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).

The record contains references to hardship the applicant's child would experience if the waiver application were denied. It is noted that Congress did not include hardship to an alien's children as factors to be considered in assessing extreme hardship. In the present case, the applicant's spouse is the only qualifying relative for the waiver under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, and hardships to the applicant's child will not be separately considered, except as they may affect the applicant's 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

¹ The record contains conflicting information regarding the applicant's departure date, which was either in October 2009 or October 2010. These inconsistencies are inconsequential to the unlawful presence determination, because relying on either date, the applicant has accrued more than one year of unlawful presence.

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, 631-32 (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, "[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., 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). 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*, 138 F.3d at 1293 (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 AAO now turns to the question of whether the applicant in the present case has established that her qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship as a result of her inadmissibility.

On appeal, the applicant's spouse states that not being able to provide his family with housing, medical coverage, education, and security is extreme hardship for him. Moreover, he fears for his safety if he relocates to Mexico. He also is concerned about their daughter, who has medical issues. Their daughter's physician states that after one year of treatment, the child's asthma is in remission; additionally, she should be seen by an allergist, but none are available where the applicant lives. Her physician recommends that the applicant's daughter return to the United States.

In his April 2011 statement, the applicant's spouse states that he is unable to afford childcare for his daughter and because he needs to care for his daughter, he is not able to "work the hours [he] used to." He borrows money from family and friends. Evidence in the record corroborates his claim that his truck was repossessed in June 2011. An employment letter for the applicant's spouse indicates that he works full time as a landscaper and earns \$10 hourly. However, the applicant's spouse states that he became a "seasonal worker" and he took leave of absence from his full-time employment because of their daughter's illness. The applicant's spouse also submits medical evidence showing that in October 2009, he sought treatment for side effects of a diet drug.

The AAO concludes that the applicant has failed to demonstrate extreme hardship to her spouse resulting from their separation. The AAO acknowledges that the applicant and her spouse have a loving relationship, and nothing in this decision should be interpreted as suggesting otherwise. However, other than repossession of his truck, the record lacks documentary evidence to corroborate the financial hardship claims that the applicant's spouse makes. The applicant has failed to submit financial evidence demonstrating their household expenses, such as rent or mortgage obligations, utility expenses, other debt obligations, and her spouse's financial support for her and their daughter. Moreover, it is unclear whether the applicant's spouse has full-time employment and what his total income is. Though the assertions of the applicant's spouse are relevant evidence and have been considered, absent supporting documentation, these assertions are insufficient proof of hardship. *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 generally is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *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)). Without accurate financial evidence regarding household income and expenses, the AAO cannot determine whether the applicant's spouse is experiencing financial hardship. Regarding the applicant's spouse's medical issues, the record lacks evidence demonstrating that he has residual problems from the medication's side effects and requires on-going treatment, or that he needs the applicant's assistance for his care. The AAO concludes that the evidence submitted, considered in the aggregate, is insufficient to demonstrate that the applicant's absence has caused her spouse extreme hardship.

The AAO finds that the applicant also has failed to demonstrate that her spouse would experience extreme hardship if he joins her in Mexico. The AAO notes that the applicant's spouse is a native of Mexico and speaks Spanish. The record fails to establish that the applicant and her spouse are unable to obtain employment there. The applicant's spouse raises safety concerns about relocating to Mexico. The AAO notes that the U.S. Department of State has issued a travel warning for Mexico, updated on November 20, 2012, which indicates crime and violence are serious problems throughout the country. However, the report specifically states that no travel advisory is in effect for Guanajuato, where the applicant lives. Although the general country-conditions evidence is of concern, it does not, in and of itself, establish extreme hardship, and the record contains no other evidence to demonstrate that the applicant's spouse would face danger in Mexico.

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. Accordingly, the applicant has not established eligibility for a waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act.

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. 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.