

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:

Office: MEXICO CITY (CIUDAD JUAREZ) Date: **JAN 22 2010**

IN RE:

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(a)(9)(B)(v)
of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 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).

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael Shumway".

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The District Director, Mexico City, denied the instant waiver application. The matter 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.

In a decision dated December 7, 2006 the district director found that the applicant accrued unlawful presence in the United States from 2000 until October 2005. The district director therefore found the applicant 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 longer than one year and seeking admission within ten years of her last departure.

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 husband and children. The district director also concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that the bar to admission would impose extreme hardship on the applicant's spouse and denied the waiver application accordingly. On appeal, the applicant submitted additional evidence.

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-

(I) was unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than 180 days but less than 1 year, voluntarily departed the United States . . . prior to the commencement of proceedings under section 235(b)(1) or section 240, and again seeks admission within 3 years of the date of such alien's departure of removal, or

(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 shows that the applicant entered the United States without inspection on April 19, 2000 and remained in the United States from that date until she voluntarily departed during October 2005. The applicant is seeking admission to the United States. The applicant has not disputed her inadmissibility on appeal. The AAO therefore affirms the district director's finding that the applicant is inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act.

The record contains many letters and other documents in Spanish without the required English translation. Any document containing foreign language submitted to [USCIS] shall be accompanied by a full English language translation which the translator has certified as complete and accurate, and by the translator's certification that he or she is competent to translate from the foreign language into English. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3). Because the documents were submitted without the required translations, their contents shall not be considered.

In addition, the record contains a letter from the applicant's husband, two discharge receipts and a letter from a medical doctor.

The discharge receipts show that on June 18, 2007, the applicant's husband consulted a doctor for palpitations and on June 21, 2007 he was fitted with a Holter monitor. The medical doctor's letter is dated October 31, 2007. In it, [REDACTED] states that he is the applicant's husband's primary care physician and that the applicant's husband has a history of palpitations, low back pain, insomnia, and stress.

In his letter the applicant's husband stated that his children are with the applicant in Mexico. He further stated that his daughter, then four years old, was falling behind in school, and his son, then two years old, was having health problems. The applicant's husband did not further describe those health problems.

A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act 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 or her children is not directly relevant under the statute and will be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative in the application. The applicant's husband is the only qualifying relative in this case. If extreme hardship to a qualifying relative is established, the Secretary then assesses whether an exercise of discretion is warranted. *See Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 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 (BIA) set forth a nonexclusive list of factors relevant to determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. 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 also held that:

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). “[O]nly in cases of great actual or prospective injury . . . will the bar be removed.” *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. 245, 246 (BIA 1984).

An analysis under *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez* is appropriate. The AAO notes that extreme hardship to the applicant’s husband must be established in the event that he joins the applicant in Mexico and in the event that he 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, reviewed in its entirety and in light of the *Cervantes-Gonzalez* factors, cited above, does not support a finding that, if the applicant remains in Mexico, and the applicant’s husband remains in the United States, the applicant’s husband will experience extreme hardship as a consequence of his separation from the applicant. Further, the record does not support a finding that the applicant’s husband will face extreme hardship if he relocates to Mexico to live with the applicant.

The medical documentation establishes that the applicant's husband has had back pain, insomnia, stress, and at least one incident of palpitations. It does not demonstrate the seriousness of those conditions, whether they are chronic, or whether they are is likely to recur. The documentation does not indicate that the applicant's husband requires continuing treatment. It does not establish that the applicant's husband will be at greater risk if he remains separated from his wife or if he joins the applicant in Mexico, rather than being joined by his wife in the United States.

No documentation at all was provided to describe or to demonstrate the gravity of the applicant's son's alleged medical conditions, and, as was noted above, hardship to the applicant's son is not directly relevant. The gravity of the applicant's daughter missing school at age four has not been established and, again, her hardship is not directly relevant to any material issue.

The AAO acknowledges that the applicant's husband is suffering some hardship. Separation from one's spouse or child is, by its very nature, a hardship. The point made in this and prior decisions on this matter, however, is that the law requires that, in order to meet the standard in INA § 212(i), the hardship must be greater than the normal, expected hardship involved in such cases.

In this case, the record does not contain sufficient evidence to show that, whether the applicant's husband joins the applicant in Mexico or remain in the United States, he faces hardships which, 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 failed to establish extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen husband 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.