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

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] (CDJ 2004 752 035) Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO (CIUDAD JUAREZ) Date: **JAN 21 2010**

IN RE: [redacted]

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

Perry Rhew
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. She was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to 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 one year or more and seeking admission within ten years of her last departure. She is married to a United States citizen. 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).

The District Director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that the bar to her admission would impose extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, her U.S. citizen spouse, and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) on March 28, 2006.

On appeal, the applicant spouse states that he is experiencing severe depression due to his wife's absence, and asks that United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) approve his wife's visa application.

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 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.

The record indicates that the applicant entered the United States without inspection in 1985 and remained until she departed voluntarily in February 2006. Accordingly, the applicant accrued unlawful presence from April 20, 2003, the date of her 18th birthday, until she left the United States in 2006. As the applicant has resided unlawfully in the United States for over a year and is now

seeking admission within ten years of her last departure from the United States, she is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act.

A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) 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 is not directly relevant to a determination of extreme hardship in section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) proceedings and will be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. If extreme hardship to a qualifying relative is established, the Secretary then assesses whether an exercise of discretion is warranted. *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 *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).

The AAO notes that extreme hardship to a qualifying relative must be established whether he or she accompanies the applicant or remains in the United States, as a qualifying relative is not required to reside outside of the United States based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request.

The record includes, but is not limited to, statements from the applicant's spouse; statements from the applicant's pastor and a teacher and school psychologist at the high school from which the applicant graduated attesting to her character and work ethic; a copy of the applicant's high school diploma; and a copy of a residential property deed for the applicant and her spouse.

The entire record was reviewed and all relevant evidence considered in rendering this decision.

The applicant's spouse states that the applicant has resided in the United States her entire life and that she deserves an opportunity in the United States. He further states that it would be extremely

difficult for the applicant to return to Mexico as she does not read Spanish and has no relatives there. He further states that he has been unable to cope with their separation and is suffering from severe depression as a result.

While the AAO acknowledges the sentiment and statements of the applicant's spouse, it notes that hardship to the applicant is not directly relevant to a determination of extreme hardship in these proceedings. The record must establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative of the applicant, in this case her spouse.

The applicant's spouse asserts that he is experiencing severe depression as a result of the applicant's exclusion. The record, however, does not support this claim with documentary evidence, e.g., an evaluation of the applicant's spouse by a licensed mental health practitioner. Going on record without supporting documentation is not sufficient to meet the applicant's burden of proof in 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 lacks any documentary evidence of other hardships, such as financial or medical problems, which would result in hardship to the applicant's spouse in the absence of the applicant. Without any such documentary evidence, the AAO is unable to determine that the applicant's spouse would experience extreme hardship if the applicant is found to be inadmissible and he remains in the United States.

Extreme hardship to a qualifying relative must also be established if he or she relocates with the applicant. In this case, neither the applicant nor her spouse has articulated any impacts he would experience if he were to join her in Mexico. As such, the record fails to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative in the event of relocation.

The record, reviewed in its entirety and in light of the *Cervantes-Gonzalez* factors cited above, does not support a finding that the applicant's husband would face extreme hardship if his wife is refused admission. The AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse will experience hardship as a result of his wife's inadmissibility. The record, however, does not distinguish his hardship from that commonly associated with removal and exclusion, and it does not, therefore, rise to the level of "extreme" as informed by relevant precedent. U.S. court decisions 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). 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. 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. 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) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility rests 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.