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

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

PUBLIC COPY

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ) Date: OCT 01 2009
CDJ 2005 202 121

IN RE: Applicant: [redacted]

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

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, and 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 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 father and mother are lawful permanent residents 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 and live with his parents. 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 September 14, 2006. The applicant filed a timely appeal.

On appeal, counsel states that the applicant is 20 years old and his father and mother and four of his siblings are lawful permanent residents of the United States. She states that the applicant has U.S. citizen nephews and nieces who live in the United States. Counsel states that the applicant's parents are concerned about the applicant's depression and that the applicant sought treatment for his mental health. According to counsel, the applicant's parents cannot afford to travel back and forth to Mexico and excluding the applicant from family members has resulted in extreme hardship to the applicant and his parents and siblings.

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.

(iii) Exceptions.-

> (I) Minors.-No period of time in which an alien is under 18 years of age shall be taken into account in determining the period of unlawful presence in the United States under clause (I).

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records reflect that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in March 2004 and remained in the country until November 2005. The applicant's 18th birthday was on March 18, 1986. He therefore accrued more than one year of unlawful presence from March 19, 2004, the day after his 18th birthday, to November 2005, when he left the United States. The applicant 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). That section provides that:

> (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 is not a consideration under the statute, and will be considered only to the extent that it results in hardship to a qualifying relative, who in this case are the applicant's lawful permanent resident father and mother. 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).

Applying the *Cervantes-Gonzalez* factors here, extreme hardship to the applicant's father or mother must be established in the event that he or she remains in the United States without the applicant, and alternatively, if he or 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.

With regard to the evidence in the record, the psychological evaluation of the applicant, the two letters accompanying the waiver application and seven affidavits are written entirely in Spanish. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3) states:

> Translations. Any document containing foreign language submitted to the Service [now U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, "USCIS"] shall be accompanied by a full English language translation which the translator has certified as complete and accurate, and by the translator's certification that he or she is competent to translate from the foreign language into English.

In accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3), the documents submitted without an English translation, which are the psychological evaluation, letters in support of the waiver application, and the seven affidavits, will carry no weight in this decision.

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).

Collectively, the affidavits by , and commend the applicant's character and his close relationship with family members. Counsel states that the applicant sought treatment for his mental health. She states that the applicant's parents are concerned about their son's depression. In the absence of documentation of the applicant's mental health and an explanation of how the applicant's mental health has impacted his father and mother, the AAO cannot conclude that the applicant father or mother would experience extreme hardship as a result of remaining in the United States without their son.

Other than separation from their four of their lawful permanent resident children in the United States, the record does not indicate any other hardship that the applicant's parents would experience if they were to join their son to live in Mexico. Separation from family members is a hardship consideration; however, it alone is not sufficient to establish extreme hardship in the absence of other hardship factors. *See, Hassan* and *Perez, supra.*

Consequently, the factors presented do not in this case constitute extreme hardship to a qualifying family member for purposes of relief under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v).

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.