



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services



H7

Date: **NOV 06 2012** Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO FILE:

IN RE: Applicant:

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B); and Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(d)(11) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(11)

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,

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The record reflects that the applicant, a native and citizen of Mexico, entered the United States without authorization on February 22, 2005 and remained in the United States until October 14, 2010. The applicant was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to 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. The applicant does not contest this finding of inadmissibility. Rather, she seeks a waiver of inadmissibility 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 U.S. citizen spouse. In addition, the applicant was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(E)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(E)(i), for assisting her daughter to enter the United States on February 22, 2005 without inspection, and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(d)(11) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(11).

The field office director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Ground of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated June 8, 2011.

The record contains the following documentation: a statement by the applicant on the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion; statements by the applicant and the applicant's spouse; and financial documentation. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

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

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 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...

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. 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. The applicant's U.S. Citizen husband 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 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 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, 1293 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993), (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 contends that her husband will suffer economic hardship if the waiver application is not approved. The record includes a letter from the employer of the applicant’s spouse, indicating that the applicant’s spouse is gainfully employed, and earns \$17.00 per hour and is available to work extra hours when the need arises. The record further includes copies of Internal Revenue Service Forms W-2 for the applicant’s spouse, indicating that he earned \$15,682.89 in 2009, and \$31,603.55 in 2010. The record also includes statements from the Arizona Department of Economic Security, Unemployment Insurance Administration, indicating that the applicant’s spouse received \$1,590 in unemployment compensation in 2009, and \$1,700 in unemployment compensation in 2010. The applicant’s spouse states that he has to support a family of four. The record includes copies of remittances of funds that the applicant’s spouse sent to the applicant in Mexico. The applicant’s spouse also states that he has to help his brothers and sisters to provide support for their parents in the United States. However, there is no evidence in the record regarding the support that the applicant provides to his parents. The evidence in the record is insufficient to conclude that the qualifying spouse would be unable to meet his financial obligations in the applicant’s absence.

The applicant states that her husband has to work in the United States, and if he has to maintain two households, that this will wear her husband down. Courts considering the impact of financial detriment on a finding of extreme hardship have repeatedly held that, while it must be considered in the overall determination, “[e]conomic disadvantage alone does not constitute “extreme hardship.” *Ramirez-Durazo v. INS*, 794 F.2d 491, 497 (9th Cir. 1986).

The applicant states that her husband is experiencing emotional breakdowns. The applicant also states that their separation has caused stress for her husband, and he states that he is suffering stress due to his financial situation. However, there is no evidence in the record concerning any emotional hardship the applicant's husband is experiencing as a result of being separated from the applicant. 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)).

Both the applicant and her husband state that they want their two daughters to be educated in the United States. As noted above, under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act, children are not deemed to be qualifying relatives under this statute, and USCIS only considers a child's hardship to be a factor if the hardship causes the qualifying relative to experience hardship. In this case, there is no indication that any hardship to the applicant's two daughters is causing hardship to the applicant's husband.

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 an alien being denied admission to the United States and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship based on the record.

The applicant's husband states that he cannot relocate to Mexico as he needs to stay in the United States for employment purposes. However, the AAO notes that the applicant's husband was born in Mexico, and that he is familiar with the language and customs of that country. There is no evidence in the record that the applicant's spouse would experience hardship were he to relocate to Mexico to be 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 U.S. citizen 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.

The applicant was also found to be inadmissible section 212 (a)(6)(E)(i) of the Act. Section 212(a)(6) of the Act states, in pertinent part:

(E) Smugglers – (i) in General. – Any alien who at any time knowingly has encouraged, induced, assisted, abetted, or aided any other alien to enter or to try to enter the United States in violation of law is inadmissible.

The applicant is eligible for consideration for a waiver under section 212(d)(11) of the Act. However, the AAO has found that the applicant has not established eligibility for a waiver under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v), of the Act as she has not established extreme hardship to a qualifying

relative. As the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act, no purpose would be served in granting the applicant a waiver under section 212(d)(11) of the Act.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility, 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. The waiver application is denied.*