U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

(b)(6)

DATE: SEP 0 5 2013 Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO FILE:

IN RE: Applicant:

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 (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at http://www.uscis.gov/forms for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements.** *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Mexico City, Mexico. An appeal of the denial was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the AAO on motion. The motion will be granted and the prior AAO decision is affirmed.

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 one year or more and seeking readmission within 10 years of her last departure from the United States. The applicant is the spouse of a lawful permanent resident and the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative. She seeks a waiver under 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 her lawful permanent resident husband.

The Field Office Director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and the application was denied accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated March 7, 2012.

The AAO, reviewing the applicant's Form I-601 on appeal, concurred with the Field Office Director that extreme hardship to a qualifying relative had not been established, as required by the Act. *Decision of the AAO*, dated March 8, 2013. Consequently, the appeal was dismissed. *Id.*

On motion, the applicant presents evidence of emotional hardship to the applicant's child, statements from the applicant and the applicant's spouse, and two letters from government administrators in Mexico. According to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2), a motion to reopen must state new facts to be proved and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. As the applicant has submitted new documentary evidence to support his claim, the motion to reopen will be granted.

The record contains the following documentation: statements by the applicant and the applicant's spouse; medical documentation for the applicant's daughter; statements from government officials in Mexico; financial documentation; and country conditions information. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the motion to reopen.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) 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.
>
> . . . .
>
> (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.

The record reflects that the applicant testified under oath during an application for her immigrant visa that that she previously entered the United States withour inspection in February of 2005 and remained until voluntarily departing in January 2011. The applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for having been unlawfully present in the United States for one year or more and seeking readmission within 10 years of her last departure from the United States. The applicant does not contest inadmissibility.

A section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. The applicant's lawful permanent resident spouse is the only qualifying relative in this case. Under this provision of the law, children are not deemed to be "qualifying relatives." However, although children are not qualifying relatives under this statute, USCIS does consider that a child's hardship can be a factor in the determination whether a qualifying relative experiences extreme hardship. 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-Moralez,* 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 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 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.

In the previous decision of the AAO, the AAO determined that the record does not sufficiently demonstrate that separation from the applicant has caused her spouse to suffer extreme hardship. The previous AAO decision noted that while the applicant's spouse asserted that he is experiencing financial hardship because he must support two households due to the applicant's inadmissibility, there was insufficient documentary evidence submitted to corroborate this assertion. The applicant

provided a tax return for 2011, but offered no further evidence regarding income or expenses, and there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the qualifying spouse is unable to meet his financial obligations in the applicant's absence. The previous decision of the AAO further determined that while the applicant stated that she and her daughters received psychological therapy and are experiencing difficulities coping with life away from the qualifying spouse, the evidence submitted does not sufficiently detail the harm experienced in order to make a determination of hardship. *Decision of the AAO*, dated March 8, 2013.

On motion, the applicant submitted letters from a pediatric surgeon and a psychologist, which indicate that the applicant's daughter is suffering from depression and anxiety. However, these letters fail to provide the type of detailed psychological analysis that typically supports a mental health diagnosis. Moreover, as stated above, under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, children are not deemed to be qualifying relatives, and a child's hardship will only be considered to be a factor if it affects whether a qualifying relative experiences extreme hardship. As with the previous decision of the AAO, in this particular case, no evidence has been submitted regarding any hardship to the qualifying relative based upon the emotional hardship to the applicant's daughter.

The AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse will endure hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. However, his situation, if he remains in the United States, is typical to individuals separated as a result of a relative being denied admission to the United States and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship based on the record.

The previous AAO decision determined that the applicant has not demonstrated that relocation would cause extreme hardship to the qualifying relative. While the applicant's spouse indicates that he cannot relocate to Mexico because he will be unable to find sufficient employment in order to support his family, no further evidence was provided in the record to corroborate this statement. The applicant's spouse was born and raised in the area of Mexico where the applicant currently resides, and therefore is familiar with the culture, customs and language of the country. In regard to the country conditions information submitted to the record, according to the State Department reports, although caution should always be taken during travel due to the possibility of crime and violence, no particular advisories are in effect for the state in which the applicant currently resides. *See U.S. Department of State Travel Warning* dated July 12, 2013.

On motion, the applicant submits a letter from the Guanajuato, Mexico, stating that the applicant does not have th necessary local resources to facilitate his family's well-being locally. The applicant also submitted a letter from the Guanajuato, Mexico, stating that the applicant does not own his own home in the community, and that his family lives with the maternal grandparents, which does not have adequate facilities for the well-being of the family. Although the statements of the government officials in Mexico 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)).

Based on the evidence on the record, the applicant has not established that her spouse would suffer hardship beyond the common results of removal if he were to relocate to Mexico to reside with the applicant.

The record, reviewed in its entirety and in light of the *Cervantes-Gonzalez* factors cited above, does not support a finding that the applicant's lawful permanent resident spouse will face extreme hardship if the applicant is unable to reside in the United States. Rather, the record demonstrates that he will face no greater hardship than the unfortunate, but expected, disruptions, inconveniences, and difficulties arising whenever a spouse is removed from the United States and/or refused admission. Although the AAO is not insensitive to the applicant's spouse's situation, the record does not establish that the hardship he would face rises to the level of extreme as contemplated by statute and case law.

In application proceedings, it is the applicant's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The motion to reopen is granted and the prior AAO decision is affirmed.