



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

H3



FILE:



Office: TEGUCIGALPA, HONDURAS

Date: JUL 27 2009

IN RE:



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 PETITIONER:



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).

John F. Grissom
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Tegucigalpa, Honduras, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Honduras who entered the United States without inspection in about June 1992 and remained until May 2006, when she traveled to Honduras to apply for an immigrant visa. She was found to be inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), for having been unlawfully present in the United States 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 section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), in order to return to the United States and reside with her husband.

The field office director 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 Field Office Director* dated April 4, 2007.

On appeal, counsel asserts that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (“USCIS”) erred in determining that the applicant’s husband would not suffer extreme hardship if the applicant is denied admission to the United States. *See Notice of Appeal to the AAO (Form I-290B)*. Specifically, counsel states that USCIS erred in failing to consider hardship to the applicant’s children, which creates extreme hardship for the applicant’s husband. In support of the waiver application, counsel submitted an affidavit from the applicant’s husband. On appeal counsel requested 30 days in order to submit a brief and/or additional evidence. As of this date, over two years later, no additional statement or evidence has been submitted. The record is considered complete and 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-

(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 or removal, . . . is inadmissible.

(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 [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.

The AAO notes that the record contains several references to the hardship that the applicant's children would suffer if the waiver application is denied. Section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act provides that a waiver of inadmissibility is available solely where the applicant establishes extreme hardship to his or her citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent. It is noted that Congress did not include hardship to an alien's child as a factor to be considered in assessing extreme hardship. In the present case, the applicant's spouse is the only qualifying relative, and hardship to the applicant's children will not be separately considered, except as it may affect the applicant's spouse.

Section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) 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 forty-one year-old native and citizen of Honduras who resided in the United States from June 1992, when she entered without inspection, until May 2006, when she returned to Honduras to apply for an immigrant visa. The applicant's husband is a naturalized U.S. citizen whom she married on November 5, 2004. The applicant currently resides in Honduras and her husband resides in Conroe, Texas.

Counsel asserts that the applicant's husband would suffer extreme hardship if the applicant is denied admission to the United States, and that the effects of hardship to their children on the applicant's husband must be considered. The applicant's husband states in his affidavit that the applicant stays home with their children and maintains their home while he works, and she is "vital to [the] family's well being and development." *Affidavit of [REDACTED] dated May 26, 2006*. He further states that the children are all very attached to their mother and he "cannot stand the idea of living without her." *Affidavit of [REDACTED]* He states that he would relocate to Honduras if the applicant were denied admission to the United States, but he can not because their three children need to be raised in the United States so they can have all the opportunities available to them. *Affidavit of [REDACTED]*

No evidence was submitted to support the assertion that the applicant's husband would suffer extreme hardship if the applicant is denied admission to the United States. 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)).

Counsel asserts that the applicant's husband is experiencing emotional hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. There is no evidence on the record, however, to establish that the emotional effects of being separated from the applicant are more serious than the type of hardship a family member would normally suffer when faced with his spouse's deportation or exclusion. Although the depth of his concern over his separation from the applicant is not in question, a waiver of inadmissibility is only available where the resulting hardship would be unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation or exclusion. The prospect of separation 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. Counsel further asserts that the applicant's children would suffer hardship that would also result in extreme hardship to the applicant's husband if she is denied admission to the United States, but no evidence was submitted to support this assertion. Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the applicant's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

Any hardship the applicant's husband would experience if the applicant is denied admission to the United States appears to be 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 the 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 section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act.

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 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.