

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**

[REDACTED]

42

FILE: [REDACTED]  
(CDJ 2004 858 003)

Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO  
(CIUDAD JUAREZ)

Date: **SEP 17 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:

[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).

  
John F. Grissom  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Mexico City, 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 under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of 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 naturalized United States citizen. He seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with his spouse and their children.

The District Director found that, based on the evidence in the record, the applicant had failed to establish extreme hardship to his qualifying relative. The application was denied accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated October 30, 2006.

On appeal, counsel contends that the applicant's qualifying relative would suffer extreme hardship and United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) abused its discretion in denying the waiver application. *Form I-290B and attached brief*. Counsel also indicates that he will submit a brief in support of the appeal within 30 days. However, as of this date, the record does not contain counsel's brief. The record is, therefore, considered complete.

In support of these assertions, counsel submits a brief. The record also includes, but is not limited to, statements from the applicant's spouse; a statement from the applicant's child; and an offer of employment for the applicant. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering 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 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.

In the present case, the record indicates that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in October 1998 and voluntarily departed in February 2006, returning to Mexico. *Consular Notes, American Consulate General, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico*, dated February 23, 2006. The applicant, therefore, accrued unlawful presence from October 1998 until he departed the United States in February 2006. In applying for an immigrant visa, the applicant is seeking admission within ten years of his February 2006 departure from the United States. The applicant is, therefore, inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(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 a violation of 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. The plain language of the statute indicates that hardship that the applicant or his children would experience as a result of his inadmissibility is not directly relevant to the determination as to whether he is eligible for a waiver. The only directly relevant hardship in the present case is hardship suffered by the applicant's spouse if the applicant is found to be inadmissible. Hardship to a non-qualifying relative will be considered to the extent that it affects the applicant's spouse. If 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).

*Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560 (BIA 1999) provides a list of factors the Board of Immigration Appeals deems relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. These factors include the presence of a lawful permanent resident or United States citizen family ties to 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.

The AAO notes that extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse must be established whether she resides in Mexico or the United States, as she is not required to reside outside 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.

If the applicant's spouse joins the applicant in Mexico, the applicant needs to establish that his spouse will suffer extreme hardship. The applicant's spouse is a native of Mexico. *Form I-130, Petition for Alien Relative*. The record does not address how the applicant's spouse would be affected if she resides in Mexico. The record fails to indicate whether the applicant's spouse has familial and cultural ties in Mexico. The record does not address whether the applicant's spouse speaks Spanish and how her language abilities, or lack thereof, would affect her adjustment to Mexico. The record does not address employment opportunities for the applicant's spouse in Mexico, nor does the record document, through published country conditions reports, the economic situation in Mexico and the cost of living. The record also makes no mention of whether the applicant's spouse suffers from any type of health condition, physical or mental, that would require treatment in Mexico and, if so, whether she would be able to receive adequate care. When looking at the record before it, the AAO does not find that the applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to his spouse if she were to reside in Mexico.

If the applicant's spouse resides in the United States, the applicant needs to establish that her spouse will suffer extreme hardship. As previously noted, the applicant's spouse is a native of Mexico. *Form I-130, Petition for Alien Relative*. The applicant's spouse states that the applicant is a father to his two biological children and her two children from a previous relationship. *Statement from the applicant's spouse*, dated February 24, 2006. She reports that the children keep on asking for their father and cry for him. *Id.* One of the applicant's children states that not having her father with her is affecting her school and well-being. *Statement from the applicant's child*, undated. She notes that being separated from the applicant has been difficult for her and her siblings. *Id.* While the AAO acknowledges these statements, it notes that the applicant's children are not qualifying relatives for the purpose of this case and the record fails to document how any hardship the applicant's children may encounter affects the applicant's spouse, the only qualifying relative in this case. The applicant's spouse states that her family is going through very serious financial problems. *Statement from the applicant's spouse*, dated June 20, 2006. While the AAO acknowledges this assertion, it notes that the record fails to include any documentation, such as utility bills, rent or mortgage statements, or credit card bills, of the applicant's spouse's expenses. Furthermore, the record does not include any earnings statements or tax returns documenting the income the applicant's spouse receives. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence will not meet the burden of proof of this proceeding. See *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)). The record also fails to document, through published country conditions reports, the economic situation and employment availability in Mexico. There is nothing in the record to demonstrate that the applicant is unable to contribute to his family's financial well-being from outside the United States.

The applicant's spouse states that she needs her husband with her family. *Statement from the applicant's spouse*, dated February 24, 2006. The AAO acknowledges the difficulties faced by the applicant's spouse. However, 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. Separation from a loved one is a normal result of the removal process. The AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse will endure hardship as a result of her separation from the applicant. However, the record does not distinguish her situation, if she remains in the United States, from that of other individuals separated as a result of removal. Accordingly, it does not establish that the hardship experienced by the applicant's spouse rises to the level of extreme hardship. When looking at the aforementioned factors, the AAO does not find that the applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to his spouse if she resides in 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.