

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: 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, 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 his last departure from the United States. The record indicates that the applicant is married to a United States citizen and he 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 his United States citizen wife, son, and grandchildren.

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 January 2, 2007.

On appeal, the applicant's wife states "[t]he reason [she] [is] appealing this decision is because [she] [does not] agree with it." *Form I-290B*, filed February 2, 2007.

The record includes, but is not limited to, letters from the applicant's wife, pay stubs, household bills and statements, and the applicant's marriage certificate. 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 son and grandchildren 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 his 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 and/or grandchildren. In the present case, the applicant's wife is the only qualifying relative, and hardship to the applicant's son and grandchildren will not be considered, except as it may cause hardship to the applicant's wife.

In the present application, the record indicates that the applicant entered the United States in 1995 without inspection. On October 31, 2001, the applicant's United States citizen wife filed a Form I-130 on behalf of the applicant. On December 29, 2003, a Notice to Appear (NTA) was issued against the applicant. On July 29, 2004, the applicant's Form I-130 was approved. On August 10, 2004, an immigration judge granted the applicant voluntary departure to depart the United States by December 8, 2004. On December 8, 2004, the applicant departed the United States. On April 1, 2005, the applicant filed an Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission into the United States after Deportation or Removal (Form I-212). On August 31, 2005, the District Director, San Antonio, Texas, found that a Form I-212 was not required for the applicant's case. On February 3, 2006, the applicant filed a Form I-601. On January 2, 2007, 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 his United States citizen spouse.

The applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the date of enactment of unlawful presence provisions under IIRIRA, until August 10, 2004, the date an immigration judge granted the applicant voluntary departure. The applicant is attempting to seek admission into the United States within 10 years of his December 8, 2004 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 himself 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 an undated letter, the applicant's wife states "[t]he added stress of [the applicant] not being here has taken it's [sic] toll on [her] health and livelihood [sic]." The AAO notes that the applicant's wife may be suffering some hardship by being separated from the applicant; however, other than this statement from the applicant's wife, there is no medical documentation in the record establishing that she currently suffers from any medical conditions. In a letter dated February 23, 2006, the applicant's wife states her son had to get a job and put his "college education on hold" to help with the household expenses. The applicant's wife further states their grandchildren miss the applicant. The AAO notes that the applicant's son and grandchildren may be experiencing some hardship in being separated from the applicant; however, they are not qualifying relatives for a waiver under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act. The applicant's wife states she is "at the point of losing [her] job due to the travel to be with [the applicant]." The AAO notes that the applicant's wife is a native and citizen of the United States and she may experience some hardship in relocating to Mexico; however, it has not been established that she has no transferable skills that would aid her in obtaining a job in Mexico and that there are no employment opportunities for her in Mexico. Additionally, the AAO notes that it has not been established that the applicant's wife does not speak Spanish or that she has no family ties in Mexico. The AAO finds that the applicant failed to establish that his wife would suffer extreme hardship if she joined him in Mexico.

In addition, the applicant does not establish extreme hardship to the applicant's wife if she remains in the United States, maintaining her employment and in close proximity to her family. The AAO notes that as a United States citizen, the applicant's wife is not required to reside outside of the United States as a result of denial of the applicant's waiver request. The applicant's wife states that since the applicant departed the United States, she has "had five different employers just to maintain [their] household." The AAO notes that the applicant's wife's son is working to help with the household expenses. Additionally, the AAO notes that the applicant is employed in Mexico and the record fails to demonstrate that he will be unable to contribute to his wife'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 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) 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.