



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**

**PUBLIC COPY**

H2

FILE:

Office: LOS ANGELES, CA

Date: MAY 09 2006

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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant is a native and citizen of the Philippines who was found to be inadmissible to the United States (U.S.) 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 admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation in October 1994. The applicant is married to a lawful permanent resident. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i).

The district director concluded that the applicant did not establish that her U.S citizen spouse would suffer extreme hardship as a result of her removal from the United States. The application was denied accordingly. *District Director's Decision*, dated October 18, 2004.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the director's decision did not provide any meaningful consideration of the applicant's application and that taking the significant factors in the aggregate the applicant has established that her spouse would suffer extreme hardship as a result of her removal from the United States. *Counsel's Appeal's Brief*, dated November 15, 2004.

The record includes, but is not limited to six employment advertisements from the Philippines and a State Department public announcement concerning the Philippines.

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 indicates that in October 1994 the applicant entered the United States by presenting a fraudulent visitor's visa bearing an assumed name. A section 212(i) of the Act provides that a waiver of the bar to admission resulting from section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship on a qualifying family member. Hardship the alien herself experiences due to separation is irrelevant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver proceedings unless it causes hardship to the applicant's spouse. 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).

The AAO notes that extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse must be established in the event that he resides in the Philippines or in the event that he resides in the United States, as he is not required to reside outside of the United States based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request. The AAO will consider the relevant factors in adjudication of this case.

The first part of the analysis requires the applicant to establish extreme hardship to her spouse in the event that he resides in the Philippines. In his brief, counsel asserts that the applicant's spouse cannot move to the Philippines because after living in the United States for 10 years he has significant family, community, property and business ties to the United States. In addition, counsel states that the applicant's spouse is sixty years old and has a pension plan with his employer and because of age discrimination in the Philippines he would be unable to find employment. Counsel also asserts that the only family the applicant has is his U.S. citizen daughter and grandson who both reside in the United States. To support these claims counsel submitted six different employment advertisements showing that for each job opening there was an age requirement of under 35 years old or sometimes younger. Taking into consideration the applicant's age, the fact that it would be nearly impossible for him to find employment in the Philippines, and that all of the applicant's immediate family lives in the United States, the AAO finds that the applicant has established that he would suffer extreme hardship as a result of relocating to the Philippines.

Although the applicant's spouse has established that he would suffer extreme hardship as a result of relocating to the Philippines, he has not established that he would suffer extreme hardship if he remains in the United States. Counsel asserts that the applicant's spouse will suffer emotionally if his wife is removed from the United States because they have been married for forty years. The record does not indicate that the applicant's spouse will be unable to maintain his well-being or even his current lifestyle if the applicant is removed from the United States. 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 deportation or exclusion and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship.

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 section 212(a)(9)(B) 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 appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.