



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

1-12

**PUBLIC COPY**

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: LOS ANGELES, CA

Date: JAN 18 2007

IN RE:

[REDACTED]

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:

[REDACTED]

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, Chief  
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 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 on December 11, 1989. The applicant is married to a U.S. citizen and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i).

The district director concluded that there was no evidence in the record to support a finding that the applicant's spouse would experience any extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's removal from the United States. The application was denied accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated April 15, 2005.

On appeal, counsel states that the director's decision constituted an abuse of discretion, is arbitrary and capricious, violates the right to due process of the applicant's spouse and should be reversed. *Counsel's Appeal Brief*, dated June 7, 2005.

As Constitutional issues are not within the appellate jurisdiction of the AAO, counsel's assertion regarding a violation of due process will not be addressed in the present decision.

The AAO also notes that in his appeal brief counsel frequently references the applicant's spouse's hardship statement, however the record does not contain any such statement. In addition, the record contains no supporting documentation in regards to the hardships faced by the applicant's spouse.

The record does indicate that on December 11, 1989 the applicant presented a passport and I-551 stamp under the assumed name of [REDACTED] to gain entry into the United States.

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.

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 not considered in section 212(i) waiver proceedings unless it causes hardship to the applicant's spouse.

The concept of extreme hardship to a qualifying relative "is not . . . fixed and inflexible," and whether extreme hardship has been established is determined based on an examination of the facts of each individual case. *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999). In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the Board of Immigration Appeals set forth a list of non-exclusive factors relevant to determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. These factors include, with respect to the qualifying relative, the presence of family ties to U.S. citizens or lawful permanent residents in the United States, family ties outside the United States, country conditions where the qualifying relative would relocate and family ties in that country, the financial impact of departure, and significant health conditions, particularly where there is diminished availability of medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate. *Id.* at 566. The BIA has held:

Relevant factors, though not extreme in themselves, must be considered in the aggregate in determining whether extreme hardship exists. In each case, the trier of fact 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.

*Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996) (citations omitted). In addition, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has held, "the most important single hardship factor may be the separation of the alien from family living in the United States," and, "[w]hen the BIA fails to give considerable, if not predominant, weight to the hardship that will result from family separation, it has abused its discretion." *Salcido-Salcido v. INS*, 138 F.3d 1292, 1293 (9th Cir. 1998) (citations omitted). See also *Cerrillo-Perez v. INS*, 809 F.2d 1419, 1424 (9th Cir. 1987) (remanding to the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA)) ("We have stated in a series of cases that the hardship to the alien resulting from his separation from family members may, in itself, constitute extreme hardship.") (citations omitted). The AAO notes that the present case arises within the jurisdiction of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Separation of family will therefore be given the appropriate weight under Ninth Circuit law in the assessment of hardship factors in the present case. 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 only evidence in the record with regards to extreme hardship is counsel's appeal's brief. In his brief, counsel states that the applicant's spouse will suffer extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility because he would then be forced to choose between remaining in the United States and being separated from the applicant or moving to the Philippines with his two children where they would be subject

to abject poverty, diminished employment and educational opportunities, racial discrimination and great danger on account of his membership in the U.S. Armed Forces. The AAO notes that without documentary evidence to support these claims, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). In the applicant's case, counsel submitted no documentary evidence to support his assertions. No country condition reports were submitted to support a finding that African-Americans suffer racial discrimination in the Philippines nor was there any evidence submitted to show that the applicant would not be able to find employment or that he would face great danger as a result of his membership in the U.S. military. Without supporting documentation, the AAO cannot find that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility.

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 an 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.