

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
Washington, DC 20529-2090

PUBLIC COPY



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

H4

FILE:

Office: MEXICO CITY

Date: **MAR 18 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:

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).

John F. Grissom
Acting 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 applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who has resided in the United States since June 2000, when she entered the country without inspection, to June 20, 2005, when she returned to Mexico to apply for an immigrant visa. She was found to be inadmissible to the United States under 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 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 to reside with her husband.

The district 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 District Director* dated May 22, 2006.

On appeal, the applicant's husband states: "Severe hardship to family members." 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:

- (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.

Section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act provides 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-four year-old native and citizen of Mexico who resided in the United States from June 2000, when she entered without inspection, until June 2005. The applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for having been unlawfully present in the United States from June 2000 to June 2005, when she returned to Mexico. The applicant's husband is a thirty-two year-old native and citizen of the United States. The applicant currently resides in Mexico and her husband resides in Pueblo, Colorado.

The applicant's husband claims that he is suffering emotional hardship as a result of being separated from the applicant and states that he is suffering a lot of stress due to her absence and worries over her situation in Mexico. *See letter from* [REDACTED] dated June 22, 2005. He further claims that he has experienced grief over her absence and over a child they lost in 2003, and states, "she means everything to me, without her it is not worth while [sic] being alive." *Id.*

The applicant asserts that her husband is suffering extreme emotional hardship due to their ongoing separation, but there is no evidence on the record concerning any emotional hardship he is experiencing, such as documentation concerning his mental health or the potential emotional or psychological effects of the separation. The evidence does not establish that any emotional difficulties the applicant's husband 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 deportation or exclusion. 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.

The applicant further asserts that her husband is suffering financial hardship as a result of their separation. The applicant’s husband states that he is having difficulty maintaining his household and providing financial support to the applicant in Mexico. *See letter from* [REDACTED] dated June 22, 2005. The AAO notes that the record contains no evidence of the applicant’s husband’s income and no documentation concerning the expenses or overall financial situation of the applicant and her husband. 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)). Further, there is no indication that there are any ongoing unusual circumstances that would cause financial hardship beyond what would normally be expected as a result of separation from the applicant. Any financial difficulty resulting from the costs of supporting the applicant in Mexico therefore appears to be a common result of exclusion or deportation, and would not rise to the level of extreme hardship for the applicant’s husband. *See INS v. Jong Ha Wang, supra* (holding that the mere showing of economic detriment to qualifying family members is insufficient to warrant a finding of extreme hardship).

The emotional and financial hardship the applicant’s husband would experience if she 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). No claim was made that the applicant’s husband would suffer extreme hardship if he relocated to Mexico with the applicant. Therefore, the AAO cannot make a determination of whether the applicant’s husband would suffer extreme hardship if he moved to Mexico.

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 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.