


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

H2



FILE:



Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

JAN 23 2008

IN RE:

Applicant:



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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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 cursive script, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, denied the Form I-601, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i). The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record reflects that the applicant is a 45-year-old native and citizen of Guyana who was found 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). The record reflects that the applicant is the spouse of a U.S. citizen. She seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to remain in the United States with her spouse and adjust her status to that of a lawful permanent resident under section 245 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255, as the beneficiary of an approved relative petition filed on her behalf by her spouse.

The director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen spouse and denied the application accordingly. On appeal, the applicant contends that her spouse would face extreme hardship if she were not permitted to remain in the United States and continue to care for her spouse's father. The applicant's spouse submits a statement on appeal, as well as a letter from a physician relating to his father's medical condition.

Section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act provides:

In general.—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.

8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i). The director found the applicant to be inadmissible based on the fact that she entered the United States in 1997 by presenting a fraudulent passport. The applicant does not dispute this finding. The director's determination of inadmissibility is therefore affirmed. The question remains whether the applicant qualifies for a waiver.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

(1) The Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] may, in the discretion of the Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security], waive the application of clause (i) of subsection (a)(6)(C) in the case of an immigrant 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 [Secretary] that the refusal of admission to the United States of such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully permanent resident spouse or parent of such an alien”

8 U.S.C. § 1182(i)(1). A section 212(i) waiver is therefore dependent upon a showing that the bar to admission imposes an extreme hardship on the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship to the applicant herself is not a permissible consideration under the statute.

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).

The applicant’s spouse, _____ is a 52-year-old U.S. citizen. He is a native of Guyana who naturalized as a U.S. citizen in 1985. The applicant and her spouse were married in 2001 in New York. The applicant and her spouse have no children, and claim to have no family or friends in the United States. *See* Statement of the Applicant’s Spouse on Appeal. The applicant’s father-in-law resides with the couple. He is in his 90s, and suffers from Alzheimer’s and dementia. *Id.* His condition requires 24-hour care, which to date has been provided by the applicant. *Id.*

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 spouse would face extreme hardship if the applicant is denied the waiver. The AAO notes that hardship to the applicant’s father-in-law is not a permissible consideration under the statute. Therefore, the AAO focuses its analysis on the claimed hardship to the applicant’s spouse should his father no longer be cared for by the applicant.

The AAO notes that the record does not contain evidence relating to the onset date of the applicant’s father’s medical condition, or explanation regarding who cared for him before the applicant and her spouse were married in 2001. The record also does not contain evidence, other than the applicant’s spouse’s statement, relating to his family and community ties in the United States, or in Guyana. The AAO recognizes that, as a U.S. citizen, the applicant’s spouse is not required to relocate with the applicant. Still, the applicant’s spouse does not explain whether he could relocate to Guyana, or whether medical treatment and care would be available to his father should they decide to relocate to Guyana. The applicant’s spouse also does not provide any evidence to corroborate his claim that he would face financial hardship should the applicant be denied the waiver. The applicant’s spouse does not detail what, if any, other care-arrangement could be made for his father. His father’s immigration status is not stated in the record, and there is no evidence relating to any assistance he may be qualified to receive. In sum, the applicant has not met her burden to prove that her

spouse would face greater hardship than the unfortunate, but expected, disruptions, inconveniences, and difficulties arising whenever a spouse is removed from the United States.

Congress provided for a waiver of inadmissibility, but under limited circumstances. In limiting the availability of the waiver to cases of "extreme hardship," Congress did not intend that a waiver be granted in every case where a qualifying relationship exists. U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of removal are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. *See Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991); *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996); *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996) (holding that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship); *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). Further, demonstrated financial difficulties alone are generally insufficient to establish extreme hardship. *See INS v. Jong Ha Wang*, 450 U.S. 139 (1981) (upholding BIA finding that economic detriment alone is insufficient to establish extreme hardship).

While the AAO has carefully considered the impact of separation resulting from the applicant's inadmissibility, a waiver is nevertheless not to be granted in every case where possible separation from a spouse is at issue. *See Shoostary v. INS*, 39 F.3d 1049 (9th Cir. 1994) (stating that "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"). In this case, the record does not contain sufficient evidence to show that the hardship faced by the applicant's spouse due to the potential separation from the applicant rises to the level of extreme.

The AAO therefore finds that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen spouse as required under section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i).

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(i) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility rests with the applicant. 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.