identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

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: [redacted] Office: VIENNA, AUSTRIA Date: JAN 22 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, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

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).

Ellen C. Johnson

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Officer in Charge, Vienna, Austria, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Albania who resided in the United States from October 9, 2000, when she was admitted after presenting a fraudulent Croatian passport and U.S. visa, to July 4, 2006, when she returned to Albania. She was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) Immigration and Nationality Act (The Act), 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having procured admission to the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation of a material fact and 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 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 sections 212(a)(9)(B)(v) and 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182(a)(9)(B)(v) and (i), in order to return to the United States and reside with her husband.

The officer in charge 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 Officer in Charge* dated June 14, 2007.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant asserts that the applicant's husband is suffering emotional hardship since the applicant departed the United States and is experiencing depression and anxiety as a result of their separation. *See Notice of Appeal to the AAO (Form I-290B).* Counsel further asserts that the applicant's husband would suffer extreme hardship if he relocated to Albania because he and his family were persecuted under the Communist regime and because of dangerous and volatile conditions there and the lack of adequate employments opportunities. *See Notice of Appeal to the AAO.* In support of the waiver application and appeal, counsel submitted an affidavit from the applicant's husband, a letter offering employment to the applicant, and letters from friends and family members in the United States. The entire record was reviewed and considered in arriving at a decision on the appeal.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

> (i) Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides:

> **(1)** The [Secretary] may, in the discretion of the [Secretary], waive the application of clause (i) of subsection (a)(6)(C) in the case of an alien who is the spouse, 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 the United States of such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such an alien.

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.

Sections 212(a)(9)(B)(v) and 212(i) of the Act provide 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.

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 twenty-seven year-old native and citizen of Albania who resided in the United States from October 9, 2000, when she was admitted after presenting a fraudulent Croatian passport and U.S. visa, to July 4, 2006, when she returned to Albania.. The applicant's husband is a thirty-one year-old native of Albania and citizen of the United States. The applicant currently resides in Albania with their seven year-old daughter and her husband resides in State Hill, New York.

Counsel asserts that the applicant's husband would suffer extreme hardship if he relocated to Albania with the applicant because he experienced persecution there in the past, conditions there are dangerous and volatile, and he would be unable to find employment and support their family. The applicant's husband further states that it was his dream to raise his kids in the United States and it is not safe in Albania. *See Affidavit of* dated February 7, 2007. No documentation concerning conditions in Albania or the persecution of the applicant's husband and his family was submitted. 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 record is insufficient to establish that the applicant's husband would suffer extreme hardship if he relocated to Albania.

Counsel further asserts that the applicant's husband is suffering emotional hardship due to separation from the applicant, and the applicant's husband states that the separation is very difficult for both of them. He further states that the applicant and their daughter are living in a village where conditions are poor which places them in danger and causes him to suffer fearing that they are in danger and living in horrible conditions. *See Affidavit of* Letters from friends and relatives of the applicant's husband further state that he is feeling lonely and depressed and is under stress out of fear for the safety of his wife and daughter.

The applicant's husband states that he is suffering emotional hardship due to separation from the applicant and worries about the safety of his wife and child in Albania. No evidence concerning his mental health or the potential psychological effects of the separation was submitted, and the evidence on 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. Further, no evidence was submitted to support assertions that the applicant and her daughter are in danger in Albania. 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.*

The evidence on the record is insufficient to establish that any 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 sections 212(a)(9)(B)(v) and 212(i) of the Act.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under sections 212(a)(9)(B)(v) and 212(i) 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.