

**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: [REDACTED] Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ)

Date: NOV 27 2009

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

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:

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

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to 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 and seeking readmission within 10 years of her last departure from the United States. The record indicates that the applicant is married to a United States citizen and she is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), in order to reside in the United States with her United States citizen husband and children.

The District Director found that the applicant failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on the applicant's spouse and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated December 29, 2006.

On appeal, the applicant, through counsel, claims that the applicant's husband "is suffering extreme hardship if [the applicant] is unable to return to the United States." *Appeal Brief*, dated February 26, 2007.

The record includes, but is not limited to, counsel's brief; letters from the applicant's husband, children, friends, and family; and medical test results for the applicant's husband. The entire record was reviewed and considered in arriving at 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 [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 AAO notes that the record contains references to the hardship that the applicant's children would suffer if the applicant were denied admission into the United States. Section 212(a)(9)(B)(i) of the Act provides that a waiver, under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, is applicable solely where the applicant establishes extreme hardship to her citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent. Unlike a waiver under section 212(h) of the Act, Congress does not mention extreme hardship to United States citizen or lawful permanent resident children. In the present case, the applicant's spouse is the only qualifying relative, and hardship to the applicant's children will not be considered, except as it may cause hardship to the applicant's spouse.

In the present application, the record indicates that the applicant entered the United States in November 1984 without inspection. On January 4, 2002, the applicant's naturalized United States citizen husband filed a Form I-130 on behalf of the applicant. On July 12, 2002, the applicant's husband filed another Form I-130 on behalf of the applicant. On the same day, the applicant filed an Application to Register Permanent Resident or Adjust Status (Form I-485). On January 13, 2003, the applicant's second Form I-130 was approved. On June 12, 2004, the applicant's first Form I-130 was denied. On August 6, 2004, the Interim District Director, Los Angeles, California, denied the applicant's Form I-485. In January 2006, the applicant departed the United States. On February 3, 2006, the applicant filed a Form I-601. On December 29, 2006, the District Director denied the Form I-601, finding that the applicant accrued more than a year of unlawful presence and failed to demonstrate extreme hardship to her United States citizen spouse.

The applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the date of enactment of unlawful presence provisions under IIRIRA, until January 2006, the date the applicant departed the United States. The applicant is attempting to seek admission into the United States within 10 years of her January 2006 departure from the United States. The applicant is, therefore, inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(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 section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship the applicant herself experiences upon removal is irrelevant to a section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver proceeding. Once 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).

In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565-66 (BIA 1999), the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) provided a list of factors it deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. The factors 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.

In a brief dated February 26, 2007, counsel states “[t]he evidence shows that [the applicant’s husband] is physically ill and also suffering an extreme depression and anxiety.” In a letter dated February 23, 2007, the applicant’s husband states his doctor “told [him] that [his] symptoms showed that [he] had entered into a state of depression.” The AAO notes that the applicant’s husband may be suffering some emotional and psychological hardship through his separation from the applicant; however, there are no professional psychological evaluations for the AAO to review to determine if the applicant’s husband is suffering from any depression and anxiety or whether any depression and anxiety is beyond that typically experienced as a result of the removal and/or inadmissibility of a family member. The applicant’s husband states he has liver damage and the record establishes that he has high cholesterol; however, there was nothing from a doctor explaining what the applicant’s husband’s medical condition is, and what assistance is needed and/or given by the applicant. Furthermore, the AAO notes that there was no documentation submitted establishing that the applicant’s husband cannot receive treatment in Mexico or that he has to remain in the United States to receive any medical treatments.

In a letter dated February 13, 2007, the applicant’s sister, [REDACTED], states the applicant’s children are suffering. In a letter dated December 19, 2008, the applicant’s son, [REDACTED] states “[a]ll of [them] have been hurt and depressed about being separated from [the applicant]... Without [the applicant’s] guidance, [he] just felt lost and depressed.” In a letter dated December 19, 2008, the applicant’s daughter, [REDACTED], states she “had become quite depressed, feeling hopeless and frustrated.” The AAO notes that the applicant’s children may experience some hardship in relocating to Mexico; however, the applicant’s children are not qualifying relatives for a waiver under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act.

The AAO notes that the record establishes that the applicant’s husband is employed as a salesman in the United States, and it has not established that he has no transferable skills that would aid him in obtaining a job in Mexico. Furthermore, the AAO notes that the applicant’s husband is a native of Mexico who speaks Spanish, he spent his formative years in Mexico, and it has not been established that he has no family ties in Mexico. In fact, the AAO notes that the applicant’s husband’s parents reside in Mexico. The AAO finds that the applicant failed to establish that her husband would suffer extreme hardship if he joined her in Mexico.

In addition, counsel does not establish extreme hardship to the applicant’s husband if he remains in the United States, maintaining his employment. The applicant’s husband states “[he] cannot go back to Mexico to be with [the applicant].” The AAO notes that as a United States citizen, the applicant’s husband is not required to reside outside of the United States as a result of denial of the applicant’s waiver request. Counsel states the applicant’s husband “is caring for his 2 United States citizen children, as a single father” and “[t]he burden of caring for his children has become immense.” In a letter dated February 24, 2006, the applicant’s husband states he is trying to take care of the children by himself, because he has “no relatives near by that can help [him].” The AAO notes that all of the applicant’s children are adults except their youngest son, who is 15 years old. Additionally, the AAO

notes that the applicant has not established that her husband is unable to provide or obtain adequate care for their son in the applicant's absence or that this particular hardship is atypical of individuals separated as a consequence of removal or inadmissibility. The applicant's husband states he "provide[s] [the applicant] with monetary help to pay for her living expenses in Mexico." The AAO notes that the record fails to demonstrate that the applicant will be unable to contribute to her family's financial wellbeing from a location outside of the United States. Moreover, the United States Supreme Court has held that the mere showing of economic detriment to qualifying family members is insufficient to warrant a finding of extreme hardship. *INS v. Jong Ha Wang*, 450 U.S. 139 (1981).

United States 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, in *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996), the Board 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. In *Hassan, supra*, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals 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.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse caused by the applicant's inadmissibility to 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.