

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Rm. A3042  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

H2

FILE:

Office: SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Date: JUN 10 2003

IN RE:

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the District Director, San Francisco, California. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen. The motion will be granted and the previous decisions of the district director and the AAO will be affirmed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Trinidad who was admitted to the United States on August 28, 1993, as a nonimmigrant visitor with authorization to remain until February 27, 1994. The applicant was found to be inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having procured a visa and admission to the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant is the spouse of a naturalized United States citizen and the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). She seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to reside 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. *Decision of the District Director*, dated May 22, 2001. The decision of the district director was affirmed on appeal by the AAO. *Decision of the AAO*, dated May 9, 2003.

On motion to reopen and reconsider, counsel asserts that the applicant's husband would face extreme hardship if the applicant were forced to return to Trinidad. *Brief in Support of Appeal of Denial of I-601 Application*, dated June 5, 2003.

In support of these assertions, counsel submits a brief. The entire record was considered in rendering this decision.

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

- (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:

- (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.

8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) (2002) states in pertinent part:

A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be provided in the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence.

8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3) (2002) states in pertinent part:

A motion to reconsider must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or Service [now Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS)] policy. A motion to reconsider a decision on an application or petition must, when filed, also establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision.

Counsel states that the applicant's spouse relies on the applicant to manage their household and care for their children. *Brief in Support of Appeal of Denial of I-601 Application* at 2. Counsel contends that without the applicant, the applicant's spouse could not care for the children and maintain his employment, leaving the family with no means of financial support. *Id.* The AAO finds that the record fails to establish that the applicant's spouse is unable to find suitable care for his children during the periods when he is at work and they are not in school. The assertions of counsel in the absence of substantiating documentation do not form the basis for a finding of extreme hardship.

The applicant fails to provide evidence that was not available previously and could not have been discovered during the prior proceedings under this application. Further, the applicant fails to establish that the prior decision of the AAO was based on an incorrect application of law or Citizenship and Immigration Services policy.

The applicant has failed to identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in her appeal. In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(6)(C) 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 previous decisions of the district director and the AAO will not be disturbed.

**ORDER:** The motion is granted. The decision of May 9, 2003 dismissing the appeal is affirmed.