

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Room 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

H2

[REDACTED]

FILE:

Office: ACCRA, GHANA

Date: APR 15 2008

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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Acting Officer-in-Charge (AOIC), Accra, Ghana, and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed. The waiver application will be denied.

The applicant, a citizen of Nigeria, was found 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 seeking to procure a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under the Act by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant is the spouse of a United States citizen, and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to return to the United States and join her husband.

The AOIC concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on her husband, the qualifying relative, and denied the Form I-601, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility.

On appeal, counsel contends that the applicant's husband would suffer extreme hardship if the applicant is required to remain in Nigeria. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

Regarding the applicant's grounds of inadmissibility, the AOIC found that the applicant entered the United States, fraudulently, in 2000 by presenting the passport and tourist visa of another person in order to gain entry. Thus, the applicant attempted to enter the United States by making a willful misrepresentation of a material fact (her identity) in order to procure entry into the United States. Accordingly, 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).

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

- (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:

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 a violation of section 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 applicant or her child would experience upon denial of the application is irrelevant to section 212(i) waiver proceedings; the only relevant hardship in the present case is that 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).

The applicant is required to demonstrate that her husband would face extreme hardship in the event the waiver application is denied, regardless of whether he joins her in Nigeria or remains in New York without her.

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, in *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996), the BIA held that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship. In *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit defined “extreme hardship” as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. The Ninth Circuit emphasized that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. The United States Supreme Court additionally 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.

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 United States 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. In *Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996) (citations omitted), the BIA held that:

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.

The record reflects that the applicant’s husband is a forty-three-year-old citizen of the United States. He and the applicant have been married since February 22, 2002. They have one child together: a son, born on March 16, 2001, who is a citizen of the United States.

At her March 29, 2006 waiver interview, the applicant stated that her husband is sick; that the educational system in Nigeria is not as good as that in the United States; and that her son misses his father. Counsel also notes that the applicant’s husband sends money to the applicant in order to keep her and their son from financial destitution.

The record also contains a letter from the Bronx-Lebanon Hospital Center, dated November 17, 2006, which states that the applicant’s husband suffers from diabetes, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and mild non-proliferative eye disease.

The record also contains a letter from the S.S. Memorial Clinic and Maternity Home, dated November 15, 2006, which states that the applicant and her son “have been on prolonged, though intermittent attack of Typhoid and Malaria fever.”

Courts considering the impact of financial detriment on a finding of extreme hardship have repeatedly held that, while it must be considered in the overall determination, “[e]conomic disadvantage alone does not constitute “extreme hardship.” *Ramirez-Durazo v. INS*, 794 F.2d 491, 497 (9th Cir. 1986) (holding that “lower standard of living in Mexico and the difficulties of readjustment to that culture and environment . . . simply are not sufficient.”); *Shoostary v. INS*, 39 F.3d 1049 (9th Cir. 1994) (stating, “the extreme hardship requirement . . . was not enacted to insure that the family members of excludable aliens fulfill their dreams or continue in the lives which they currently enjoy. The uprooting of family, the separation from friends, and other normal processes of readjustment to one’s home country after having spent a number of years in the United States are not considered extreme, but represent the type of inconvenience and hardship experienced by the families of most aliens in the respondent’s circumstances.”); *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. 810 (BIA 1968) (holding that separation of family members and financial difficulties alone do not establish extreme hardship); *INS v. Jong Ha Wang*, 450 U.S. 139 (1981) (upholding BIA finding that economic detriment alone is insufficient to establish extreme hardship).

As noted previously, the applicant is required to demonstrate that her husband would face extreme hardship in the event the applicant is required to remain in Nigeria, regardless of whether he joins her in Nigeria or remains in New York without her. In limiting the availability of the waiver to cases of “extreme hardship,” Congress provided that a waiver is not available in every case where a qualifying family relationship exists.

The record, reviewed in its entirety and in light of the *Cervantes-Gonzalez* factors, cited above, does not support a finding that the applicant’s husband will face extreme hardship if the applicant remains in Nigeria without him. The record does not establish that he faces greater hardships than the unfortunate, but expected, disruptions, inconveniences, and difficulties arising whenever a wife is refused entry into the United States. No evidence was submitted to establish that he would experience financial or emotional hardship that would rise to the level of “extreme” as contemplated by statute and case law. The costs of separation, both financial and emotional, are faced by everyone in the applicant’s wife’s situation, and the record fails to establish that the hardships he would face would be greater than those faced by others facing separation from a wife.¹ While the AAO notes the applicant’s husband’s medical conditions, the record does not indicate whether he is taking medication to manage these conditions. Nor has the applicant explained how these conditions impact her husband’s daily life, or how he managed these conditions before they were married. She has not established that, as a result of these conditions, her husband requires her presence to manage his daily affairs.

Nor has the applicant established that her husband would face extreme hardship if he joined her in Nigeria: again, the record fails to demonstrate that he would face hardship beyond that normally faced by others in his situation. Diminished standards of living, separation from family, and cultural adjustment

¹ Although the couple’s son is not a qualifying member, and therefore hardship that would accrue to him cannot be considered here, the AAO notes nonetheless that he is an American citizen and, therefore, is not required to remain in Nigeria with the applicant.

are to be expected in such a situation. The applicant's spouse is a native of Nigeria and it has not been established that he would be unable to work or receive treatment for his medical conditions.

In nearly every qualifying relationship, there is a deep level of affection and a certain amount of emotional and social interdependence. While the prospect of separation nearly always results in considerable hardship to individuals and families, in specifically limiting the availability of a waiver of inadmissibility to cases of "*extreme* hardship," Congress did not intend that a waiver be granted in every case where a qualifying relationship, and thus the familial and emotional bonds, exist. The point made in this and prior decisions on this matter is that the current state of the law, viewed from a legislative, administrative, or judicial point of view, requires that the hardship, which meets the standard in INA § 212(i), be above and beyond the normal, expected hardship involved in such cases. In adjudicating this appeal, the AAO finds that the record fails to demonstrate that the applicant's husband would suffer hardship beyond that normally expected upon the inadmissibility of a spouse.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, reflects that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that her United States citizen husband would suffer hardship that is unusual or beyond that normally expected upon the inadmissibility or removal of a spouse. As noted previously, the common results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship; the emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties and the financial hardship that results from separation are common results of deportation and do not constitute extreme hardship. "Extreme hardship" has been defined as hardship that is unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether the applicant merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(i), the burden of establishing that the application merits approval remains entirely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The applicant has sustained not that burden. Accordingly, the AAO will not disturb the director's denial of the waiver application.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The waiver application is denied.