

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

H2



FILE:



Office: LIMA, PERU

Date: FEB 02 2007


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 Officer-in-Charge, Lima, Peru, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Peru who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for procuring admission in to the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant's stepmother (mother) and father are U.S. citizens and he 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 his family.

The officer-in-charge concluded that the applicant failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Officer-in-Charge*, dated July 12, 2005.

On appeal, the applicant's representative details the difficulties that the applicant's parents would confront without the applicant. *Representative's Letter*, undated.

The record includes, but it not limited to, the applicant's representative's letter, financial documents for the applicant's father and the applicant's father's affidavit.

The record reflects that on March 20, 1992, the applicant was admitted to the United States with a photo-substituted passport. As a result of this prior misrepresentation, the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act.

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.

A section 212(i) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from violation of section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to a U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. 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 (BIA 1999) provides a list of factors the Board of Immigration Appeals deems relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. These factors include, but are not limited to, the presence of lawful permanent resident or United States citizen family ties to 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.

Therefore, an analysis under *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez* is appropriate in this case. The AAO notes that extreme hardship to the applicant's parents must be established in the event that they relocate to Peru or in the event that they remain in the United States, as they are not required to reside outside of the United States based on denial of the applicant's waiver request.

The first part of the analysis requires the applicant to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative upon relocation to Peru. The applicant's representative states that the applicant's three siblings are in the United States and that there are no more family members in Peru. *Representative's Letter*, at 2. The record does not include any other statements or evidence regarding this prong of the analysis.

The second part of the analysis requires the applicant to establish extreme hardship in the event that a qualifying relative remains in the United States. The applicant's father states that he is retired and is seeking his son's economic assistance. *Applicant's Father's Affidavit*, at 1, dated August 2, 2005. The applicant's father details the difficulties he is facing without the applicant, stating that if his son is not admitted to the United States, he may not see him again because of his age and health. *Id.* The AAO notes that separation entails inherent emotional stress and financial and logistical problems which are common to those involved in the situation.

After a thorough review of the record, the AAO finds that extreme hardship has not been established in the event that a qualifying relative relocates to Peru or remains in the United States.

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. Moreover, the AAO notes 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.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to a qualifying relative 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 he merits a waiver as a matter of discretion. Therefore, counsel's contentions in regard to this aspect of the application will not be addressed.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(i) 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.