

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000  
Washington, DC 20529-2090  
MAIL STOP 2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

H2

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: CHICAGO, IL

Date: NOV 05 2008

IN RE:

Applicant:

[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 Interim District Director, Chicago, Illinois, 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 Mexico 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 married to [REDACTED], a native-born U.S. citizen. She is the beneficiary of an approved relative petition filed on her behalf by her U.S. citizen spouse. The applicant presently seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to adjust her status to that of lawful permanent resident and remain in the United States with her family.

The interim district director determined that the applicant was inadmissible, and that the denial of a waiver would not result in extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen spouse. The waiver application was denied accordingly. On appeal, the applicant maintains that the denial of a waiver would cause extreme hardship to her husband, and that she merits a waiver in the exercise of discretion.

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 her fraudulent attempt to gain admission to the United States. The applicant does not dispute this finding. The AAO therefore affirms the director's determination of inadmissibility. 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 . . . ." (emphasis added).

A section 212(i) waiver is therefore dependent upon a showing that the bar to admission imposes an extreme hardship on the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse. Hardship to the applicant's child, or to the applicant herself, is not a relevant consideration.

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. 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, [REDACTED] is a 45-year-old U.S. citizen. He and the applicant have been married since 1998. The applicant has a U.S. citizen child from a previous relationship who resides with the couple. The applicant’s spouse states that he would experience hardship should he be separated from the applicant. *See Affidavit by Applicant’s Spouse*. He explains that he would not relocate to Mexico because he would be unlikely to find adequate employment there. *Id.* at ¶ 4. The applicant’s spouse states that he does not speak Spanish. He further explains that he suffers from back pain, and that he is concerned about his family’s history of Diabetes. *Id.* at ¶ 10. The applicant’s spouse has extended family ties in the United States. He states that being separated from his wife and step-child would “bring enormous emotional, psychological and financial devastation.” *Id.* at ¶ 6.

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 the record does not contain sufficient evidence of the applicant or her spouse’s financial circumstances. The record includes statements from the applicant’s family members and friends, verifying their relationship and concluding that the applicant’s spouse would experience hardship should the family be separated. The record does not include any medical documentation of the applicant’s spouse’s claimed back pain or other medical conditions. The record also does not include evidence to support the claim that the applicant’s spouse would experience extreme financial hardship should the waiver be denied. Given the applicant’s spouse’s employment history and extended family ties in the United States, the AAO cannot find that the separation from the applicant would amount to hardship beyond the unfortunate, but expected, disruptions, inconveniences, and difficulties that arise whenever a family member is removed from the United States.

Although the AAO recognizes that separation from the applicant would cause hardship, such hardship is common to all individuals in the applicant's circumstances and does not rise to the level of "extreme." While the AAO has carefully considered the emotional 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 further notes the applicant's spouse indicates that he would not consider relocating to Mexico. The statute does not require the applicant's spouse to relocate. The AAO further notes that a "lower standard of living in Mexico and the difficulties of readjustment to that culture and environment . . . simply are not sufficient" to demonstrate extreme hardship. *Ramirez-Durazo v. INS*, 794 F.2d 491, 499 (9th Cir. 1986).

**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 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991); *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9<sup>th</sup> 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).

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.