



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

(b)(6)

Date: **APR 15 2013**

Office: ANAHEIM CA

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

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

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 USCIS International Adjudications Support Branch on behalf of the Field Office Director, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico. The matter 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 Mexico who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year, and section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for willful misrepresentation of a material fact in order to procure an immigration benefit. The applicant is the son of a lawful permanent resident and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act and section 212(i) of the Act in order to reside with his father in the United States.

The field office director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and denied the waiver application accordingly.

On appeal, the applicant's father contends the decision denying his son's waiver application was unfair because the applicant has never been in trouble, was in the United States since childhood, and graduated from high school.

The record contains, *inter alia*: statements from the applicant's father, Mr. Rodriguez; copies of two prescriptions; documents from the applicant's school; letters of support; and an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130).¹ The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision on the appeal.

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.

....

¹ The record also contains numerous letters that are written in Spanish and have not been translated into English. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3) requires that any document containing foreign language submitted to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services 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. Consequently, these letters cannot be considered.

(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 Attorney General [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.

Section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act provides:

In general.—Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

Section 212(i) provides:

(1) The Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] may, in the discretion of the Attorney General [Secretary], waive the application of clause (i) of subsection (a)(6)(C) in the case of an immigrant who is the spouse, 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 the United States of such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully permanent resident spouse or parent of such an alien. . . .

The Act clearly places the burden of proving eligibility for entry or admission to the United States on the applicant. *See* Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361 (“Whenever any person makes application for a visa or any other document required for entry, or makes application for admission, or otherwise attempts to enter the United States, the burden of proof shall be upon such person to establish that he is eligible to receive such visa or such document . . .”). Furthermore, it is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the applicant submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

In this case, the field office director found the applicant inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for willful misrepresentation of a material fact in order to procure an immigration benefit because the applicant admitted under oath to a consular officer that he attempted to enter the United States in 2002 as an imposter by using an unknown person’s document/identity. According to the applicant’s Biographic Information form (Form G-325A), dated December 12, 2011, he entered the United States in August 2002. However, the record contains no evidence the applicant entered, or attempted to enter, the United States in 2002. Rather, notes in the record indicate the applicant

entered the United States in August 2003 using another person's visa that he rented and used at the port of entry when crossing the border in a car at Nuevo Laredo. In any event, the record shows, and the applicant does not contest, that he is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for willful misrepresentation of a material fact in order to procure an immigration benefit. In addition, the applicant accrued unlawful presence for over one year, beginning on June 30, 2007, when he turned eighteen years old, until his departure in August 2010. Therefore, the applicant is also inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for being unlawfully present in the United States for a period of one year or more and seeking admission to the United States within ten years of his last departure.

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*, 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 this case, the applicant's father, [REDACTED], states that he is sixty-nine years old and is depressed because of his son's immigration problem. He contends he cannot sleep and has trouble working and concentrating. According to [REDACTED] he has high blood pressure and is taking medication for it. He states he relies on his son to take him to see his doctor. Furthermore, [REDACTED] contends he cannot return to Mexico because the doctors there do not have the same up-to-date technologies for his medical problems. In addition, he states it would be very difficult to support himself in Mexico because he would never be able to obtain a job there. He also contends that he has financial obligations in the United States and that he would be unable to pay off these debts if he returned to Mexico. Moreover, he states that he has lived in the United States most of his life and that he would fear for his family's safety in Mexico.

After a careful review of the record, there is insufficient evidence to show that the applicant's father, [REDACTED] has suffered or will suffer extreme hardship if his son's waiver application were denied. If he decides to stay in the United States, their situation is typical of individuals separated as a result of inadmissibility or exclusion and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship based on the record. There is no evidence in the record to show that the applicant's situation is unique or atypical compared to other individuals in similar circumstances. See *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996) (holding that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship and defining extreme hardship as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected). Regarding financial hardship, there are no financial documents in the record to support this claim. There is no documentation addressing [REDACTED] wages or income and no documentation addressing the family's regular, monthly expenses. Regarding his purported depression, insomnia, and high blood pressure, although the record contains copies of two prescriptions for [REDACTED] there is no letter in plain language from any health care professional addressing the diagnosis, prognosis, treatment, or severity of [REDACTED] health issues. Without more detailed information, the AAO is not in the position to reach conclusions regarding the severity of any medical condition or the treatment and assistance needed. Even considering all of these factors cumulatively, there is

insufficient evidence showing that the hardship [REDACTED] has experienced or will experience amounts to extreme hardship.

Furthermore, the record does not show that [REDACTED] would suffer extreme hardship if he returned to Mexico, where he was born, to avoid the hardship of separation. Although [REDACTED] contends he has lived in the United States most of his life, the record does not show that his readjustment to living in Mexico would be any more difficult than would normally be expected under the circumstances. There is no evidence in the record to corroborate his claim that he would be unable to receive adequate monitoring and/or treatment for his medical issues in Mexico. To the extent Mr. [REDACTED] fears his family's safety in Mexico, the record shows that both the applicant and his father were born in Guanajuato, Mexico. Although the U.S. Department of State has issued a Travel Warning for some parts of Mexico, *U.S. Department of State, Travel Warning, Mexico*, dated November 20, 2012, there is no warning in effect for Guanajuato. Even considering all of the evidence cumulatively, the record does not show that Mr. Rodriguez's hardship would be extreme, or that his situation is unique or atypical compared to others in similar circumstances. *Perez v. INS, supra*.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's father caused by the applicant's inadmissibility to the United States. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, 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, 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.