



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

H2

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]
(CDJ 2004 813 137)

Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO
(CIUDAD JUAREZ)

Date:

DEC 02 2009

IN RE:

[REDACTED]

APPLICATION:

Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)

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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Mexico City, Mexico. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who was found to be inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year and seeking readmission within ten years of her last departure from the United States. The applicant is married to a United States citizen. She seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her spouse.

The District Director found that, based on the evidence in the record, the applicant had failed to establish extreme hardship to her qualifying relative. The application was denied accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated January 12, 2007.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant's qualifying family members will suffer great hardships. *Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)*.

In support of these assertions the record includes, but is not limited to, statements from the applicant's spouse and statements from the applicant's children. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

(B) Aliens Unlawfully Present.-

(i) In general. - Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who-

....

(II) has been unlawfully present in the United States for one year or more, and who again seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal from the United States, is inadmissible.

(v) Waiver. - The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary)] has sole discretion to waive clause (i) in the case of an immigrant who is the spouse or 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 such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such alien.

In the present case, the record indicates that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in June 1997 and voluntarily departed in February 2005, returning to Mexico. *Consular Notes, American Consulate General, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico*, dated February 13, 2006. The applicant, therefore, accrued unlawful presence from June 1997 until she departed the United States in February 2005. In applying for an immigrant visa, the applicant is seeking admission within ten years of her February 2005 departure from the United States. The applicant is, therefore, inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for being unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than one year.

A section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from a violation of section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act are dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. The plain language of the statute indicates that hardship that the applicant would experience as a result of her inadmissibility is not directly relevant to the determination as to whether she is eligible for a waiver. The only directly relevant hardship in the present case is hardship suffered by the applicant's spouse if the applicant is found to be inadmissible. Hardship to a non-qualifying relative will be considered to the extent that it affects the applicant's spouse. If 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).

Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, 22 I&N Dec. 560 (BIA 1999) provides a list of factors the Board of Immigration Appeals deems relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. These factors include the presence of a lawful permanent resident or United States citizen family ties to this country; the qualifying relative's family ties outside the United States; the conditions in the country or countries to which the qualifying relative would relocate and the extent of the qualifying relative's ties in such countries; the financial impact of departure from this country; and significant conditions of health, particularly when tied to an unavailability of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate.

The AAO notes that extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse must be established whether he resides in Mexico or the United States, as he is not required to reside outside 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.

If the applicant's spouse joins the applicant in Mexico, the applicant needs to establish that her spouse will suffer extreme hardship. The applicant's spouse was born in Mexico. *Form I-130, Petition for Alien Relative*. The record does not address how the applicant's spouse would be affected if he resided in Mexico. The record fails to indicate whether the applicant's spouse has familial and cultural ties to Mexico. The record does not address employment opportunities for the applicant's spouse in Mexico, nor does the record document, through published country conditions

reports, the economic situation in Mexico and the cost of living. The record makes no mention of whether the applicant's spouse suffers from any type of health condition, physical or mental, that would require treatment in Mexico and if so, whether he would be able to receive adequate care. When looking at the record before it, the AAO does not find that the applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to her spouse if he were to reside in Mexico.

If the applicant's spouse resides in the United States, the applicant needs to establish that her spouse will suffer extreme hardship. As previously noted, the applicant's spouse was born in Mexico. *Form I-130, Petition for Alien Relative*. The applicant's spouse notes that he has two stepdaughters in the United States. *Statement from the applicant's spouse, dated January 24, 2007*. The applicant's spouse states that he suffers from diabetes and takes medication for his heart. *Id.* He asserts that it is difficult to deal with his diabetes without the applicant. *Id.* His stepdaughter [REDACTED] states she worries about him because if he does not eat properly, his sugar levels can become imbalanced and he can get sick. *Statement from [REDACTED] dated January 19, 2007*. His stepdaughter [REDACTED] observes that his separation from the applicant has caused him to fall into a deep depression. *Statement from [REDACTED] dated January 24, 2007*. While the AAO acknowledges these assertions, it notes that the record fails to include documentation from a licensed healthcare professional regarding the physical and mental health conditions of the applicant's spouse. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence will not meet the burden of proof of this proceeding. *See Matter of Soffici, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998)(citing Matter of Treasure Craft of California, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972))*. The applicant's spouse notes that it has been difficult for him to perform his job duties, as his thoughts are with his family. *Statement from the applicant's spouse, dated February 10, 2006*. He states that supporting two households is also difficult. *Id.* While the AAO acknowledges these statements, it notes that the record does not include any documentation, such as rent/mortgage statements, credit card statements, bills related to household expenses for the applicant and his family, or receipts for money transfers sent to the applicant in Mexico, to support a claim of financial hardship. As previously noted, going on record without supporting documentary evidence will not meet the burden of proof of this proceeding. *See Matter of Soffici, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998)(citing Matter of Treasure Craft of California, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972))*. Furthermore, there is nothing in the record to show that the applicant would be unable to obtain employment in Mexico and thereby reduce the financial burden on her spouse.

The applicant's spouse asserts that he suffers immensely from being separated from the applicant. *Statement from the applicant's spouse, dated January 24, 2007*. The AAO acknowledges the difficulties faced by the applicant's spouse. However, U.S. 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, *Matter of Pilch, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996)*, held that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship. In addition, *Perez v. INS, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996)*, held that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship and defined extreme hardship as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. *Hassan v. INS, supra*, held further that the uprooting of family and separation from friends does not necessarily amount to extreme hardship but rather

represents the type of inconvenience and hardship experienced by the families of most aliens being deported. Separation from a loved one is a normal result of the removal process. The AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse will endure hardship as a result of his separation from the applicant. However, the record does not distinguish his situation, if he remains in the United States, from that of other individuals separated as a result of removal or exclusion. Accordingly, it does not establish that the hardship experienced by the applicant's spouse would rise to the level of extreme hardship. When looking at the aforementioned factors, the AAO does not find that the applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to her spouse if he were to reside in 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 application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B) 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.