

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC

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



H2

FILE:



Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ)

Date:

SEP 25 2009

IN RE:



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, 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, 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 resided in the United States from November 1997, when she entered the country without inspection, to January 2006, when she returned to Mexico to apply for an immigrant visa. She 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 for a period of one year or more. The applicant is the spouse of a U.S. citizen and the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative. She 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 return to the United States and reside with her husband.

The district director concluded that the applicant failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. *See Decision of the District Director* dated November 13, 2006.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that her husband is suffering emotional and financial hardship as a result of being separated from her. Specifically, the applicant's husband states that he has difficulty sleeping and cannot concentrate at work, which has caused his work performance to suffer. *See undated letter from [REDACTED]* He further states that he has lost two jobs since the applicant has been in Mexico and is suffering financial hardship due to his frequent travel to Mexico to visit her. *Id.* He additionally states that he began drinking heavily due to the situation and sought treatment for his alcohol abuse. *Id.* In support of the waiver application and appeal the applicant submitted letters from her husband and from the pastor of her church. 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:

- (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 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.

Section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act provides that a waiver of the bar to admission is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship on a qualifying family member. 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 (BIA 1999), the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) provided a list of factors it deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship. These factors included 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 addition, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals case, *Salcido-Salcido v. INS*, 138 F.3d 1292, 1293 (9th Cir. 1998), held that, "the most important single hardship factor may be the separation of the alien from family living in the United States," and that, "[w]hen the BIA fails to give considerable, if not predominant, weight to the hardship that will result from family separation, it has abused its discretion." (Citations omitted.)

U.S. court decisions have additionally 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 BIA 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, in *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), the court 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 *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. 810 (BIA 1968), the BIA held that separation of family members and financial difficulties alone do not establish extreme hardship. Moreover, the U.S. Supreme Court held in *INS v. Jong Ha Wang*, 450 U.S. 139 (1981), that the mere showing of economic detriment to qualifying family members is insufficient to warrant a finding of extreme hardship.

In the present case, the record reflects that the applicant is a forty-three year-old native and citizen of Mexico who resided in the United States from November 1997, when she entered without inspection, until January 2006. The applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year. The applicant's husband is a forty-nine year-old native and citizen of the United States. The applicant currently resides in Mexico and her husband resides in Aliso Viejo, California.

The applicant's husband states that he is suffering emotional hardship due to separation from the applicant and that his performance at work is suffering because he cannot concentrate. *See undated letter from [REDACTED]* He states that his work is dangerous and because he is distracted, some co-workers do not want to work with him out of safety concerns. *Id.* He further states that he began drinking heavily and entered a treatment center because of the difficulties he is having, he is having health problems, and he believes he also needs to seek psychological treatment. *Id.* He additionally states that his son, who lives in a different state, used to come and visit him during the summers, but now he cannot because he cannot arrange for childcare and the applicant is not there to help care for him while he works. *Id.*

Significant conditions of physical or mental health, particularly when tied to an unavailability of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate, are relevant factors in establishing extreme hardship. The evidence on the record is insufficient to establish, however, that the applicant's husband suffers from such a condition. He states that his health is declining, he is losing weight, he has sought treatment for alcohol abuse, and he needs psychological help. No documentation was submitted, however, to support these assertions. 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)). The applicant's husband also states that his son cannot visit him while the applicant is not there to help care for him, but no further information or documentation was provided to support this assertion.

The applicant's husband states that he is suffering emotional hardship due to separation from the applicant and states that he has been distracted, his mental and physical health have declined, and he has sought treatment for alcohol abuse caused by the separation. As noted above, no evidence was submitted concerning his mental health or the effects of separation from the applicant, and the record is insufficient to establish that any emotional difficulties he is experiencing are more serious than the type of hardship a family member would normally suffer when faced with the prospect of his spouse's exclusion or removal. Although the depth of his distress caused by separation from his wife is not in question, a waiver of inadmissibility is available only where the resulting hardship would be unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation or exclusion. The prospect of separation or involuntary relocation nearly always results in considerable hardship to individuals and families. But in specifically limiting the availability of a waiver of inadmissibility to cases of "extreme hardship," Congress did not intend that a waiver be granted in every case where a qualifying relationship exists.

The applicant's husband asserts that he has lost two jobs due to his frequent travel to Mexico to visit the applicant, he is earning less money because of this travel, and has additional expenses because he now must maintain two households. *Undated letter from [REDACTED]*. He further states that he owned a timeshare in Las Vegas that is now in foreclosure and he is "starting to lose everything." The AAO notes however, that no documentation of the applicant's husband's income and expenses was submitted, and the record does not establish that he is experiencing financial hardship due to separation from the applicant. As noted above, 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 the expense associated with travel to Mexico and having to maintain

two households is likely to have a negative impact on her husband's financial situation, there is no indication on the record that there are any unusual circumstances that would prevent the applicant's husband from supporting himself financially. The evidence on the record is insufficient to establish that the financial impact of the applicant's departure rises to the level of extreme hardship for the applicant's husband. See *INS v. Jong Ha Wang, supra* (holding that the mere showing of economic detriment to qualifying family members is insufficient to warrant a finding of extreme hardship).

The evidence on the record is insufficient to establish that any emotional or financial hardship the applicant's husband is experiencing is other than the type of hardship that a family member would normally suffer as a result of deportation or exclusion. U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. See *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996) (defining "extreme hardship" as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation); *Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991); *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996) (holding that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship).

In this case, the record does not contain sufficient evidence to show that any hardships faced by the qualifying relative, considered in the aggregate, rise beyond the common results of removal or inadmissibility to the level of extreme hardship. The AAO therefore finds that the applicant has failed to establish extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen spouse as required under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. 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.