


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), MEXICO
CDJ2004 727 559 (relates)

Date:
SEP 01 2009

IN RE: [REDACTED]

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

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, as required by 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

John F. Grissom
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Mexico City (Ciudad Juarez), Mexico. The matter 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 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 ten years of his last departure from the United States. The applicant is married to a U.S. citizen, has a U.S. citizen son, and a U.S. citizen step-son. He seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States.

In a decision, dated August 31, 2006, the district director found that the record failed to establish extreme hardship to his U.S. citizen spouse as a result of his inadmissibility. The application was denied accordingly.

In a Notice of Appeal to the AAO (Form I-290B), dated September 11, 2006, the applicant's spouse states that she does not agree with the district director's decision and that she needs her husband back. The applicant's spouse also submits a brief and a letter on appeal.

The record indicates that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in August 1998. The applicant remained in the United States until November 6, 2005. Therefore, the applicant accrued unlawful presence from August 1998, the date he entered the United States until November 2005, when he departed the United States. In applying for an immigrant visa, the applicant is seeking admission within ten years of his November 2005 departure from the United States. Therefore, the applicant is 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.

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 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.

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 on the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse and/or parent of the applicant. Hardship the applicant or his children experience due to separation is not considered under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver proceedings unless it causes hardship to the applicant's U.S. citizen or lawfully permanent resident spouse and/or parent.

The concept of extreme hardship to a qualifying relative “is not . . . fixed and inflexible,” and whether extreme hardship has been established is determined based on an examination of the facts of each individual case. *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999). In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the Board of Immigration Appeals set forth a list of non-exclusive factors relevant to determining whether an applicant has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. These factors include, with respect to the qualifying relative, the presence of family ties to U.S. citizens or lawful permanent residents in the United States, family ties outside the United States, country conditions where the qualifying relative would relocate and family ties in that country, the financial impact of departure, and significant health conditions, particularly where there is diminished availability of medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate. *Id.* at 566.

Relevant factors, though not extreme in themselves, must be considered in the aggregate in determining whether extreme hardship exists. In each case, the trier of fact must consider the entire range of factors concerning hardship in their totality and determine whether the combination of hardships takes the case beyond those hardships ordinarily associated with deportation.

Matter of O-J-O-, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996) (citations omitted). 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).

The AAO notes that extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse must be established in the event that she resides in Mexico and in the event that she resides in the United States, as she is not required to reside outside of the United States based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request. The AAO will consider the relevant factors in adjudication of this case.

The record of hardship includes a letter from the applicant's spouse, and a brief from the applicant's spouse.

In a brief, dated September 11, 2006, the applicant's spouse states that she, her children, and her husband have been suffering financially, emotionally, and psychologically. She states that their home has been destroyed and her sons are constantly suffering and always asking for their father. She states that they all miss the applicant very much. She states that she also feels depressed and suffers when she sees her children crying for their father. She states that she is also suffering knowing that the applicant is suffering in Mexico. She states that the family has never been apart for this long and her oldest son has had such a hard time adapting that he is now receiving counseling through his school. The applicant's spouse also states that she has to work even longer hours to pay the family's bills. She states that working longer hours keeps her away from her children more, so not only does she not see her husband, but she also does not spend as much time with her children. Finally, the applicant's spouse states that they are not able to visit the applicant in Mexico because they do not have the financial ability to do so.

In a letter, dated October 23, 2006, the applicant's spouse again states that her sons are constantly suffering from the absence of their father and that she is dealing with depression and sadness.

The AAO notes, as stated above, hardship the applicant's children experience due to separation is not considered under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver proceedings unless it is shown that hardship to the applicant's children is causing hardship to the applicant's spouse.

Furthermore, the applicant's spouse does not address the possibility of the family relocating to Mexico to be with the applicant. Again, as stated above, to qualify for a waiver of inadmissibility under 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, the applicant must show extreme hardship to his spouse in the event that she resides in Mexico and in the event that she resides in the United States.

The AAO also notes that the applicant's spouse did not submit documentation to support her assertions regarding extreme hardship. 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)). Thus, the current record does not show that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility.

U.S. 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, *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996), 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. *Hassan v. INS*, *supra*, 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.