

PUBLIC COPY

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

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

#12

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: MANILA, PHILIPPINES Date: **SEP 09 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:

SELF-REPRESENTED¹

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

¹ The AAO notes that a brief and a Form G-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance by Attorney or Representative, were submitted by Ana Sofia M. Orille of "the practice," a law firm in Manila. Neither Ms. Orille, nor "the practice" are accredited or authorized representatives in proceedings before USCIS.

DISCUSSION: The Officer-in-Charge, Manila, Philippines, 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 55-year-old native and citizen of the Philippines 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 unmarried. She is the beneficiary of an approved relative petition filed on her behalf by her U.S. citizen father. She presently seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to enter the United States as a lawful permanent resident.

The officer-in-charge determined that the applicant was inadmissible, and that the denial of a waiver would not result in extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen father. The waiver application was denied accordingly. On appeal, the applicant maintains that her inadmissibility results in extreme hardship to her elderly father.

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 officer-in-charge 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 officer-in-charge'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 . . .”

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 father. Hardship to the applicant's siblings, 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 father, _____ is 84 years old. He resides in Chicago with his son, the applicant's U.S. citizen brother. The applicant's sister, also a U.S. citizen, resides in Melrose Park, Illinois. The applicant's father suffers from heart, lungs, thyroid and prostate disease. *See* Physician's Letter dated April 17, 2006. The applicant's father takes medications daily and, according to his physician, "should be cared for his daily activities." *Id.* The applicant's father states that he is "very close" to the applicant, that the applicant looks after him because his other children "are busy working." *See* Statement by Applicant's Father, dated July 23, 2006. He claims that her absence makes him "sick and depressed." *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 father would face extreme hardship if the applicant is denied the waiver. The record does not contain any evidence establishing that the applicant's father's medical conditions require the applicant's care, that her siblings could not provide whatever care or support is needed, or that treatment for his conditions is unavailable in the Philippines. The AAO notes that the record does not establish that the applicant's father is financially dependent on the applicant. The AAO notes that the applicant's father resides with his son, and that he has not relied on the applicant for care since her departure in 2003. In sum, the record indicates that the applicant's father would face 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 family member is at issue. *See Shooshtary 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 father due to the potential separation from the applicant rises to the level of extreme.

The AAO further notes the applicant's father does not indicate whether he would consider relocating to the Philippines. In this regard, the AAO first notes that the statute does not require the applicant's father to relocate. The AAO notes that there is no evidence in the record suggesting that the applicant's father would face extreme hardship should he relocate to the Philippines. *See Ramirez-Durazo v. INS*, 794 F.2d 491, 499 (9th Cir. 1986) (holding that the "lower standard of living in Mexico and the difficulties of readjustment to that culture and environment . . . simply are not sufficient").

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).

The AAO therefore finds that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen father 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.