

**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 26 2010**

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).


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 ten years of his last departure from the United States. The record indicates that the applicant is married to a United States citizen and he 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 his United States citizen wife and son.

The District Director found that the applicant had 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 March 28, 2007.

On appeal, the applicant's wife states that since she has been separated from the applicant, it "has been so hard and difficult for both of [them]." *Letter from* [REDACTED] *dated April 14, 2007.*

The record includes, but is not limited to, letters from the applicant's wife. 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 entered the United States in April 1997 without inspection. On August 12, 2004, the applicant's naturalized United States citizen wife filed a Form I-130 on behalf of the applicant. On September 10, 2004, the applicant's Form I-130 was approved. In February 2006, the applicant voluntarily departed the United States. On February 15, 2006, the applicant filed a Form I-601. On March 28, 2007, the District Director denied the Form I-601, finding that the applicant had accrued more than a year of unlawful presence and had failed to demonstrate extreme hardship to his United States citizen spouse.

The applicant accrued unlawful presence from December 17, 2000, the date the applicant turned eighteen (18) years old, until February 2006, the date the applicant departed the United States. The applicant is seeking admission into the United States within ten years of his February 2006 departure from the United States. The applicant is, therefore, inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(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 himself experiences upon removal is not directly relevant to a section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver proceeding. 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 AAO notes that the record contains references to the hardship that the applicant's son 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 his 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. Moreover, in the present case, the record fails to establish that the applicant and his spouse have a child.

In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565-66 (BIA 1999), the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) provided a list of factors it deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. The factors include 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 a letter dated April 14, 2007, the applicant's wife states that if the applicant has to remain outside the United States, she "would need to move to Mexico and be with him until his admission to the United States." The applicant's wife states she and the applicant "have plans for [their] future. Personally,

[she] want[s] to go back to school.... [The applicant] wants to enroll in a[n] ESL school and learn to speak, read, and write English better.” The AAO notes that the applicant has not established that his wife cannot attend school in Mexico and that he cannot learn English in Mexico. Additionally, the AAO notes that the applicant’s wife is employed in the United States, and it has not been established that she has no transferable skills that would aid her in obtaining a job in Mexico and that there are no employment opportunities for her there. Furthermore, as previously noted, hardship the applicant himself experiences upon removal is not directly relevant to a section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver proceeding. The AAO notes that the applicant’s wife is a native of Mexico who speaks Spanish, and she spent some of her formative years in Mexico. Additionally, the AAO notes that it has not been established that the applicant’s wife has no family ties in Mexico. The applicant’s wife states her son has been affected emotionally. However, as previously indicated, the record does not establish that the applicant has a son and the AAO will not, therefore, consider whether the record demonstrates how any hardship he might suffer would affect the applicant’s spouse. The AAO finds that the applicant has failed to establish that his wife would suffer extreme hardship if she joined him in Mexico.

In addition, the applicant does not establish extreme hardship to his wife if she remains in the United States. As a United States citizen, the applicant’s wife is not required to reside outside of the United States as a result of denial of the applicant’s waiver request. The applicant’s wife states she had to move in with her parents because she could not afford her expenses by herself. She asserts that she also sends money to the applicant every two weeks. The AAO notes that the record contains no documentation to support the applicant’s spouse’s claims of hardship. Further, it does not establish that the applicant is unable to contribute to his wife’s financial well-being from a location outside the United States. In fact, the AAO notes that the applicant is employed in Mexico. 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).

United States court decisions have repeatedly 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 Board 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, *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. In *Hassan, supra*, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals held further that the uprooting of family and separation from friends does not necessarily amount to extreme hardship but rather represents the type of inconvenience and hardship experienced by the families of most aliens being deported.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant’s wife 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 he 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.