

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

H6

[REDACTED]

Date: OCT 12 2012 Office: SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATIONS: 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:  
[REDACTED]

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,

  
Perry Rhea  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, San Francisco, California, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of France who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(I), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than 180 days but less than one year and seeking readmission within three years of his last departure from the United States. The record indicates that the applicant is married to a U.S. citizen and the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). 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 reside in the United States with his spouse.

The Field Office Director found that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on the applicant's qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated February 25, 2011.

On appeal, the applicant, through counsel, claims that he and his wife "will suffer extreme hardship if forced to separate or if they live in France." *Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion*, filed March 24, 2011. Counsel also submits new evidence of hardship on appeal.

The record includes, but is not limited to, counsel's appeal brief, statements from the applicant and his wife, letters of support, financial documents, school documents for the applicant, French health cards for the applicant's parents, French court documents, photographs, and country-conditions documents on France. The entire record was reviewed and considered in arriving at a decision on the appeal.

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

(B) Aliens Unlawfully Present.-

- (i) In general.-Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who-

(I) was unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than 180 days but less than 1 year, voluntarily departed the United States (whether or not pursuant to section 244(e)) prior to the commencement of proceedings under section 235(b)(1) or section 240, and again seeks admission within 3 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal

....

is inadmissible.

(iii) Exceptions.-

(I) Minors.-No period of time in which an alien is under 18 years of age shall be taken into account in determining the period of unlawful presence in the United States under clause (i).

....

(v) Waiver.-The [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.

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 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 United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) then assesses whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. See *Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (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 of Immigration Appeals (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*, 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.

In the present application, the record indicates that on July 3, 2006, the applicant entered the United States as a temporary visitor for pleasure under the Visa Waiver Program (VWP). On September 13, 2007, the applicant departed the United States. On January 16, 2009, the applicant reentered the United States as a temporary visitor for pleasure under the VWP, with authorization to remain in the United States until April 16, 2009. The applicant failed to depart the United States. The applicant accrued over 180 days but less than one year of unlawful presence between January 7, 2007, the date he turned eighteen years old, and September 13, 2007. The applicant is, therefore, inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) of the Act for being unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than 180 days but less than one year, and he seeks admission within three years of his last departure from the United States. The applicant does not contest his inadmissibility.

In a statement dated April 19, 2011, the applicant's aunt claims that the applicant's childhood in France was a "nightmare," partially because of the racism and violence he was subjected to as a bi-racial child. In his declaration dated November 25, 2010, the applicant states that he is half-Vietnamese, half-Lebanese, was raised Muslim, and was discriminated against in France. The applicant's aunt states that as a mixed race couple, the applicant and his wife would face racism in France. In her declaration dated November 4, 2010, the applicant's wife states she would be harassed for being black and an American, and the applicant would be harassed because he is Muslim. The applicant claims that because of his religion, he cannot find work or attend school in France. Additionally, he fears that his wife will be attacked because of her race.

The applicant claims that he had a hard life in France, with his mother being schizophrenic and his father being mentally disabled and an alcoholic; as a result he has no family support system there. His aunt describes his difficult childhood in detail. French health documents in the record establish that the applicant's parents suffer from mental-health issues. Additionally, the applicant's wife states that she has no family ties to France, all of her family is in the United States, and they told her that she would be disowned if she moved to France; they would not continue to provide any financial support to them. The applicant states that if they moved to France, they could only afford to live in dangerous neighborhoods.

The AAO acknowledges that the applicant's wife is a U.S. citizen, and that relocation abroad would involve some hardship. However, no evidence has been submitted showing that the applicant's wife does not speak French or that she would be unable to obtain employment in France. Further, though the applicant's concerns regarding harassment and discrimination based on his religion and race are corroborated by a U.S. government report, without more his concerns do not support a finding of hardship to the applicant's wife should she join him in France. Moreover, the record includes no evidence to corroborate claims that the distance from her family, were she to relocate to France temporarily, would cause the applicant's spouse emotional or financial hardship. Therefore, based on the record before it, the AAO finds that, considering the potential hardships in the aggregate, the applicant has failed to establish that his wife would suffer extreme hardship if she relocated to France.

In addition, the record fails to establish extreme hardship to the applicant's wife if she remains in the United States. The applicant's wife states that she and the applicant are "better people" together and that she becomes depressed when separated from him. The applicant's aunt claims that because the applicant's wife also had a difficult childhood, she understands the applicant, and they are "very good for each other." She claims that they would be devastated if separated. In a statement dated August 10, 2010, the applicant's wife states the applicant takes care of her, and when they moved to California, he became their primary support. The applicant states that he makes sure his wife eats when she forgets. Counsel claims that the applicant's wife could not afford to travel to France to visit the applicant.

The AAO acknowledges that the applicant's wife may suffer some emotional difficulties in being separated from the applicant for three years. While it is understood that the separation of spouses often results in significant psychological challenges, the applicant has not distinguished his wife's emotional hardship upon separation from that which is typically faced by the spouses of those deemed inadmissible.

The assertions of the applicant and his spouse are relevant evidence and have been considered. However, 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)). Moreover, though counsel refers to financial difficulties, the record does not contain evidence corroborating claims that the applicant’s wife would be unable to support herself in the applicant’s absence or travel to France to visit him. Based on the record before it, the AAO finds that the applicant has failed to establish that his wife would suffer extreme hardship if his waiver application is denied and she remains in the United States.

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. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, the AAO finds no purpose would be served in discussing whether he 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.