

**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:  Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ) Date: **JAN 08 2010**
CDJ 2005 533 065 (relates)

IN RE: Applicant: 

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



for 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 record reflects that 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 10 years of her last departure from the United States. The record indicates that the applicant is married to a United States citizen and she is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). The applicant 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 reside in the United States with her United States citizen husband and children.

The District Director found that the applicant failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on the applicant's spouse and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated February 16, 2007.

On appeal, the applicant's husband submits a letter detailing the hardship claim. *See Letter from* [REDACTED], dated February 26, 2007.

The record includes, but is not limited to, letters from the applicant's husband. 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:

(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 [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 application, the record indicates that the applicant initially entered the United States in November 1999 without inspection. On February 12, 2004, the applicant's husband filed a Form I-130 on behalf of the applicant. In December 2004, the applicant departed the United States. On January 13, 2005, the applicant's Form I-130 was approved. On March 17, 2006, the applicant filed a Form I-601. On February 16, 2007, the District Director denied the Form I-601, finding that the applicant accrued more than a year of unlawful presence and failed to demonstrate extreme hardship to her United States citizen spouse.

The applicant accrued unlawful presence from November 1999, the date the applicant entered the United States without inspection, until December 2004, the date the applicant departed the United States. The applicant is attempting to seek admission into the United States within 10 years of her December 2004 departure from the United States. The applicant is, therefore, 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.

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 to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship the applicant herself experiences upon removal is irrelevant to a section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver proceeding. The AAO also notes that the record contains several references to the hardship that the applicant's children would suffer if the applicant were denied admission into the United States. Section 212(a)(9)(B)(i) of the Act provides that a waiver, under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, is applicable solely where the applicant establishes extreme hardship to her citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent. Unlike a waiver under section 212(h) of the Act, Congress does not mention extreme hardship to United States citizen or lawful permanent resident children. In the present case, the applicant's husband is the only qualifying relative, and hardship to the applicant's children will not be considered, except as it may cause hardship to the applicant's spouse. 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 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 *Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) 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. The BIA has also held:

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).

U. S. courts have stated, “the most important single hardship factor may be the separation of the alien from family living in the United States,” and also, “[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.” *Salcido-Salcido v. INS*, 138 F.3d 1292, 1293 (9th Cir. 1998) (citations omitted); *Cerrillo-Perez v. INS*, 809 F.2d 1419, 1424 (9th Cir. 1987) (remanding to BIA) (“We have stated in a series of cases that the hardship to the alien resulting from his separation from family members may, in itself, constitute extreme hardship.”) (citations omitted). Separation of family will therefore be given appropriate weight in the assessment of hardship factors in the present case.

The AAO notes, however, that the courts have repeatedly held that the common results of removal or inadmissibility are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. *See Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991). The common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship as extreme hardship has generally been defined as hardship that is unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. *See Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996); *see also 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); *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. 810 (BIA 1968) (holding that separation of family members and financial difficulties alone do not establish extreme hardship). Only “in cases of great actual or prospective injury...will the bar be removed.” *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. 245, 246 (BIA 1984).

In a letter dated February 26, 2007, the applicant’s husband states his family needs the applicant in the United States. The applicant’s husband further states that his youngest daughter asks for the applicant “almost everyday” and his oldest daughter needs the applicant “for girl advice.” In a letter dated March 18, 2006, the applicant’s husband states that when their daughter, [REDACTED], joined the applicant in Mexico, she suffered from a medical condition and developed a rash. The AAO notes that other than the applicant’s husband’s statement, there is no evidence in the record establishing that the applicant’s daughter suffered from any medical conditions when she resided in Mexico. Additionally, the AAO notes that there is no medical documentation in the record establishing that the applicant’s daughter could not be treated for her medical conditions in Mexico or that she had to return to the United States to receive treatments. Although the applicant’s assertions are relevant and have been taken into consideration, little weight can be afforded them in the absence of supporting evidence that her spouse would experience extreme hardship in Mexico. *See Matter of Kwan*, 14 I&N Dec. 175 (BIA 1972) (“Information in an affidavit should not be disregarded simply because it appears to be hearsay; in administrative proceedings, that fact merely affects the weight to be afforded it.”). 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 AAO further notes that the applicant's children may experience some hardship in relocating to Mexico; however, the applicant's children are not qualifying relatives for a waiver under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act. The applicant's husband states he has to work two jobs to pay all the household bills. Although the loss of this employment may result in some hardship, the AAO notes that it has not been established that the applicant's husband has no transferable skills that would aid him in obtaining a job in Mexico, or that no employment opportunities exist for him there. The record lacks sufficient evidence showing the applicant's living conditions in Mexico and the conditions the applicant's husband will likely experience if he moves there. Additionally, the AAO notes that the applicant has not established that her husband does not speak Spanish or that he has no family ties in Mexico. The AAO finds that the applicant failed to establish that her husband would suffer extreme hardship if he joined her in Mexico.

In addition, the applicant does not establish extreme hardship to her husband if he remains in the United States, maintaining his employment. As a United States citizen, the applicant's husband is not required to reside outside of the United States as a result of denial of the applicant's waiver request. The applicant's husband states "[i]t's hard for [him] to raise two daughters by [him]self." The AAO notes that it has not been established that the applicant's spouse is unable to provide or obtain adequate care for their children in the applicant's absence or that this particular hardship is atypical of individuals separated as a consequence of removal or inadmissibility. The applicant's husband states he sends money to the applicant in Mexico but "only God knows how [he] [is] doing it." The AAO notes that the record fails to demonstrate that the applicant will be unable to contribute to her family's financial wellbeing from a location outside of the United States. Moreover, the United States Supreme Court has held that the mere showing of economic detriment to qualifying family members is insufficient to warrant a finding of extreme hardship. *INS v. Jong Ha Wang*, 450 U.S. 139 (1981).

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 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) 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.