


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



H₂

FILE:

Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ) Date: NOV 05 2009

IN RE:

Applicant:



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

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.

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, and is before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant, [REDACTED] 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 Immigration and Nationality Act (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. The applicant's spouse, [REDACTED] is a citizen of the United States. The applicant sought a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), of the Act so as to immigrate to the United States. The director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that his bar to admission would impose extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated December 6, 2006. The applicant filed a timely appeal.

In her letter submitted on appeal, which is dated December 14, 2006, [REDACTED] states that during the first years of her marriage she had a boy, who is now three years old, and was supported by her husband while she was in school. [REDACTED] states that while in Mexico in February 2006 she learned that she was pregnant with her second child. She states that she returned to the United States in June 2006 because her brother was hospitalized and states that she was devastated by his death. [REDACTED] indicates that she needs her husband and is worried about being able to support her children. She indicates that she lives with her in-laws and is supported by them because she cannot work as her second child, who was born on October 1, 2006, is not yet three months old. [REDACTED] states that she cannot live in Mexico because she never lived there before and would not know what to work in or how life would be there for her children.

The AAO will first address the finding of inadmissibility.

Inadmissibility for unlawful presence is found under section 212(a)(9) of the Act. That section provides, in part:

(B) Aliens Unlawfully Present

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

(I) was unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than 180 days but less than 1 year, voluntarily departed the United States . . . and again seeks admission within 3 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal, or

(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.

....

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records reflect that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in March 1996 and remained until December 2005. The applicant accrued seven years of unlawful presence from April 1, 1997 until December 2005, and triggered the ten-year-bar when he left the country, rendering him inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(9)(B)(i)(II).

The waiver for unlawful presence is found under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v) which provides:

- (v) Waiver. – The Attorney General [now Secretary, 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.

The waiver under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act is dependent upon a showing that the bar to admission imposes an extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, *i.e.*, the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship to an applicant and to his or her child are not a consideration under the statute, and unlike section 212(h) of the Act where a child is included as a qualifying relative, children are not included under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act. Thus, hardship to the applicant and his U.S. citizen children will be considered only to the extent that it results in hardship to a qualifying relative, who in this case is the applicant’s U.S. citizen spouse. Once extreme hardship is established, it is but one favorable factor to be considered in determining whether the Secretary should exercise discretion. *See Matter of Mendez-Moralez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996).

“Extreme hardship” is not a definable term of “fixed and inflexible meaning”; establishing extreme hardship is “dependent upon the facts and circumstances of each case.” *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999). *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez* lists the factors considered relevant in determining whether an applicant has established extreme hardship pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. The factors relate to an applicant’s qualifying relative and include the presence of a lawful permanent resident or United States citizen spouse or parent in 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. *Id.* at 565-566.

The factors to consider in determining whether extreme hardship exists “provide a framework for analysis,” and the “[r]elevant factors, though not extreme in themselves, must be considered in the aggregate in determining whether extreme hardship exists.” *Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996). The trier of fact considers the entire range of hardship factors in their totality and then determines “whether the combination of hardships takes the case beyond those hardships ordinarily associated with deportation.” (citing *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 882 (BIA 1994).

The evidence in the record consists of a death certificate, birth certificates, a marriage certificate, letters, and other documentation.

In rendering this decision, the AAO has carefully considered all of the evidence in the record.

Applying the *Cervantes-Gonzalez* factors here, extreme hardship to the applicant’s spouse must be established in the event that she remains in the United States without the applicant, and alternatively, if she joins the applicant to live in Mexico. A qualifying relative is not required to reside outside of the United States based on the denial of the applicant’s waiver request.

██████████ indicates that she needs the financial support of her husband. On appeal, she conveys that she worries about being able to support her two children. In her letter dated January 16, 2006, prior to the birth of her second child, she states that she was financially supported by her husband while she studied to become a nurse. In view of the fact that ██████████ lives with her in-laws and is financially supported by them, the AAO cannot conclude that she would experience extreme financial hardship if she were to remain in the United States without her husband.

The record conveys that ██████████ is concerned about separation from her husband. Family separation must be considered in determining hardship. *See, e.g., Salcido-Salcido v. INS*, 138 F.3d 1292, 1293 (9th Cir. 1998) (“the most important single hardship factor may be the separation of the alien from family living in the United States”).

However, courts have found that family separation does not conclusively establish extreme hardship. In *Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991), the Ninth Circuit upheld the finding that deporting the applicant and separating him from his wife and child was not conclusive of extreme hardship as it “was not of such a nature which is unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected from the respondent’s bar to admission.” (citing *Patel v. INS*, 638 F.2d 1199, 1206 (9th Cir.1980) (severance of ties does not constitute extreme hardship). *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390, 392 (9th Cir. 1996), states that “[e]xtreme hardship” is hardship that is “unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected” upon deportation and “[t]he common results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship.” (citing *Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir.1991).

The AAO is mindful of and sympathetic to the emotional hardship that is endured as a result of family separation. However, the record before the AAO fails to establish that the situation of ██████████ ██████████ if she remains in the United States without her husband, rises to the level of extreme hardship as ██████████ is provided with financial and emotional support by her in-laws. The

record is therefore insufficient to show that the emotional hardship to be endured by [REDACTED] as a result of separation from her husband, is unusual or beyond that which is normally to be expected from an applicant's bar to admission. *See Hassan and Perez, supra.*

Having carefully considered the hardship factors raised collectively, the AAO finds that in this case those factors are not sufficient to establish extreme hardship to [REDACTED] if she were to remain in the United States without her husband.

With regard to joining her husband to live in Mexico, [REDACTED] conveys that she cannot live in Mexico because she has never lived there, and does not know what to work in or how life would be for her children. Although [REDACTED] has reservations about living in Mexico, her concerns do not describe any hardship that is extreme in nature.

The applicant fails to establish extreme hardship to his spouse in event that she remains in the United States without him, and alternatively, if she were to join him to live in Mexico. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether he merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v), the burden of establishing that the application merits approval remains entirely with the applicant. *See* section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

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