

identifying data deleted to
prevent invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

HA




FILE: [Redacted] Office: LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA Date:

IN RE: [Redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under § 212(i) of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant is a native and citizen of El Salvador who was found to be inadmissible to the United States under § 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having attempted to procure entry into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant is married to a U.S. citizen and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to § 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to remain in the United States with her spouse.

The district 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 Grounds of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. On appeal, counsel contends that the applicant's husband would suffer extreme emotional hardship if the applicant is removed. In support of this assertion, counsel submits a psychological report prepared by Dr. Jorge Garcia.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act provides, in pertinent part, that:

- (i) 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) of the Act provides that:

- (1) The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary)] 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 alien 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 Attorney General [Secretary] that the refusal of admission to the United States of such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such an alien.

The record reflects that the applicant made a willful misrepresentation of a material fact by using a passport and U.S. visa in the name of another individual in order to obtain entry into the United States. A § 212(i) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from violation of § 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship the alien herself or her child experiences upon removal is irrelevant to § 212(i) waiver proceedings; the only relevant hardship in the present case is hardship suffered by the applicant's husband. Once extreme hardship is established, it is but one favorable factor to be considered in the determination of whether the Secretary should exercise discretion. *See Matter of Mendez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (BIA 1996).

Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565-566 (BIA 1999) provides a list of factors the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) deems relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship pursuant to § 212(i) of the Act. These 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.

Counsel contends that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme emotional hardship as a result of the applicant's removal. In a psychological report submitted on appeal, [REDACTED] who apparently met with the applicant, her husband, and their three-year-old son on one occasion, wrote that the applicant's husband "would suffer an extreme traumatic psychological blow if indeed his 'American Dream' were taken from him." [REDACTED] also stated that the applicant's husband "would likely fall into a deep state of depression, resulting in withdrawn and isolative behaviors." [REDACTED] does not appear to have treated the applicant's husband prior to their January 27, 2004 meeting, nor did he recommend any psychological or psychiatric therapy to treat the applicant's husband's emotional distress. [REDACTED] report does not indicate that the applicant's husband will become incapacitated or unable to care for himself or to look after others in the event that the applicant is removed. Although [REDACTED] acknowledged that the applicant's husband might suffer permanent emotional effects from the applicant's removal, nothing in his report establishes that the applicant's husband would experience more emotional hardship than that which is normally attendant in similar situations.

In a statement submitted with the original waiver application, the applicant's husband indicated that if the applicant is removed, it will be very difficult for him to handle working and caring for his ill parents and his young son. He also expressed concern that, without the applicant's income, he would be unable to afford paying for their home. Regarding his ability to care for his family members, it is noted that, according to the record, the applicant's husband's brother, two sisters, and mother (who does not appear to be incapacitated by her diabetic condition) all live near him. According to the evidence, the applicant's husband sees his family regularly, and there is nothing in the record to indicate that his family members could not assist him in caring for his son, for example, if the applicant is removed. Moreover, the record does not indicate that the applicant's husband would be unable to make budgetary or household adjustments, should these become necessary. It is noted that the U.S. Supreme Court held in *INS v. Jong Ha Wang*, 450 U.S. 139 (1981), that the mere showing of economic detriment to qualifying family members is insufficient to warrant a finding of extreme hardship. Finally, the AAO points out that the applicant does not claim that her husband would suffer extreme hardship if he chooses to accompany her to El Salvador.

The AAO recognizes that the applicant's husband will endure hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. However, his situation is typical to individuals separated as a result of removal and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship based on the record. U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. See *Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991). For example, *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996), held that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship. In addition, *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), held that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship and defined extreme hardship as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. *Hassan v. INS*, *supra*, held further that the uprooting of family and separation from friends does not necessarily amount to extreme hardship but rather represents the type of inconvenience and hardship experienced by the families of most aliens being deported.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse 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 she merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under § 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. *See* § 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.