

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

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



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

PUBLIC COPY

Hr



FILE: Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ) Date: **OCT 01 2009**
CDJ 2004 744 213

IN RE: Applicant:



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:



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).

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "John F. Grissom".

John F. Grissom,
Acting 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, [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 naturalized 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 her 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 January 12, 2007. The applicant filed a timely appeal.

On appeal, counsel states that the wrong standard of extreme hardship was used, and that neither the submitted evidence nor its totality was considered in assessing hardship. Counsel states that Ms. [REDACTED] has three U.S. citizen sons who are 5, 7, and 9 years old. Counsel indicates that the family spends time together, as shown in the submitted photographs. Counsel states that [REDACTED] owns a small business, which allows his wife to be a full-time mother. She states that the [REDACTED] own a home, have established roots in the United States of relatives and friends, have successfully learned English and integrated into the community, and have reference letters from their children's school. Separating [REDACTED] from her husband, counsel asserts, would result in **extreme hardship** to [REDACTED]. Counsel states that there is no family network in Mexico, and [REDACTED] has lived in the United States since 1972 and adjusting to life in Mexico would be difficult, especially in view of its political and economic conditions. Counsel states that Mr. [REDACTED] would not be able to financially support his wife and children in Mexico.

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.

....

Unlawful presence accrues when an alien remains in the United States after period of stay authorized by the Attorney General has expired or is present in the United States without being admitted or paroled. Section 212(a)(9)(B)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(ii). For purposes of section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act, time in unlawful presence begins to accrue on April 1, 1997.¹

The three- and ten-year bars of sections 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) and (II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) and (II), are triggered by a departure from the United States following accrual of the specified period of unlawful presence. If someone accrues the requisite period of unlawful presence but does not subsequently depart the United States, sections 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) and (II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(I) and (II), would not apply. *See* Memo, note 1.

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records reflect that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in September 1996 and remained until January 2006. The applicant accrued nine years of unlawful presence from April 1997 until January 2006, and triggered the ten-year-bar when she left the country, rendering her 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 the applicant and her children will be

¹ Memorandum by Lori Scialabba, Assoc. Director, Refugee, Asylum and International Operations Directorate and Pearl Chang, Acting Chief, Office of Policy and Strategy, Consolidation of Guidance Concerning Unlawful Presence for Purposes of Sections 212(a)(9)(B)(i) and 212(a)(9)(C)(i)(I) of the Act; AFM Update AD 08-03; May 6, 2009.

considered only to the extent that it results in hardship to a qualifying relative, who in this case is the applicant's naturalized 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-Morales*, 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.

Counsel is correct in that 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 photographs, income tax records, birth and marriage certificates, school records and a letter by a school teacher, a seller's permit, property tax invoices, a bank statement, undated statements by [REDACTED], a declaration by [REDACTED] dated February 1, 2007, 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 he remains in the United States without the applicant, and alternatively, if he 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.

[REDACTED] and his wife indicate in their separate statements that [REDACTED]'s absence from the United States would create an extreme hardship on her husband and children. The letter dated February 24, 2006, by [REDACTED] a third grade teacher, indicates that [REDACTED] the applicant's son, is living with his mother in Mexico. [REDACTED] states that [REDACTED] became one of her students in July 2005. She states that he has gifted abilities in all academic areas, scoring above state and national levels for third graders. In his statement, [REDACTED] conveys that he owns a business. Income tax records show [REDACTED] had income of \$32,000 in 2005. [REDACTED] states that he is lost

without his wife's companionship and that he needs her return for their children's sake. He indicates that Mexico is not the best place for his children and they have had illnesses and allergies. In his declaration [REDACTED] conveys, "I will not be able to raise our sons on my own." Mr. [REDACTED] children are now 12, 8, and 7 years old.

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).

[REDACTED] is very concerned about separation from his wife and children. The AAO is mindful of and sympathetic to the emotional hardship that is endured as a result of separation from a loved one. The record before the AAO, however, fails to establish that the situation of [REDACTED], if he remains in the United States without his wife, rises to the level of extreme hardship. The record is insufficient to show that the emotional hardship to be endured by [REDACTED] is "unusual or beyond that which is normally to be expected" from an applicant's bar to admission. *See Hassan and Perez, supra*.

When considered in its totality, the AAO finds that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate that Mr. [REDACTED] would experience extreme hardship if he were to remain in the United States without his wife.

With regard to joining his family to live in Mexico, [REDACTED] conveys that he would experience extreme hardship in Mexico because all of his family members reside in the United States. However, other than the applicant's U.S. citizen children, the record contains no documentation of relatives living in the United States. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *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).

No evidence has been furnished of the political or economic conditions in Mexico in order to show that [REDACTED] would be unable to financially support his family and would have difficulties adjusting to life. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici, supra*.

Although hardship to the applicant's children is not a consideration under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, the hardship endured by the applicant's husband, as a result of his concern about the well-being of his children, is a relevant consideration.

indicates that "Mexico is not the best place" for his children, and that they have had illnesses and allergies while there. however, has not explained why Mexico's "not being the best place" for his sons or why his son's illnesses and allergies would result in extreme hardship to

When considered in the aggregate, the AAO finds that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate that would experience extreme hardship if he were to join his wife to live in Mexico.

Based on the record, 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).

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)(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.