





U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)




Date: APR 24 2013

Office: SANTO DOMINGO

FILE: 

IN RE:

Applicant: 

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B) and Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission into the United States after Deportation or Removal under Section 212(a)(9)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A).

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

Thank you,



Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic. An appeal of the denial was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the AAO on motion. The motion will be granted and the underlying application is approved.

The applicant is a native and citizen of the Dominican Republic 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 again seeking admission within ten years of her last departure from the United States. The record reflects that in 1990 the applicant was paroled into the United States to pursue an application for temporary residence as a Special Agricultural Worker. In 2001 the applicant was placed in removal proceedings, an order of removal was issued in 2002, the removal order was affirmed by the BIA in 2003, and the applicant was removed in 2007. The applicant is the spouse of a United States lawful permanent resident. She seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her spouse.

The field office director found that the applicant failed to establish that her qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship as a consequence of her inadmissibility. The application was denied accordingly. *See Decision of the Field Office Director* dated May 5, 2010.

On appeal the AAO found the applicant had established her qualifying relative spouse would experience extreme hardship if he were remain in the United States while the applicant resided abroad due to her inadmissibility. However, the AAO determined that the applicant had failed to establish her spouse would experience extreme hardship if he were to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant. The appeal was subsequently dismissed. *See Decision of the AAO*, dated July 16, 2012.

On motion counsel contends the Service erroneously denied the waiver application and that new facts are stated. With the motion counsel submits a brief; a statement from the applicant's spouse; birth certificates of the spouse's children; financial documentation for the spouse; medical information for the spouse; and country information for the Dominican Republic.

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

(b)(6)

alien's departure or removal from the United States, is inadmissible.

Section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act provides for a waiver of section 212(a)(9)(B)(i) inadmissibility as follows:

The Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] 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 . . . 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.

A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act is dependent on a showing that the bar to admission imposes extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, which includes the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. The applicant's wife is the only qualifying relative in this case. If extreme hardship to a qualifying relative is established, the applicant is statutorily eligible for a waiver, and USCIS then assesses whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. *See Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996).

Extreme hardship is "not a definable term of fixed and inflexible content or meaning," but "necessarily depends upon the facts and circumstances peculiar to each case." *Matter of Hwang*, 10 I&N Dec. 448, 451 (BIA 1964). In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the Board provided a list of factors it deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999). 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. *Id.* The Board added that not all of the foregoing factors need be analyzed in any given case and emphasized that the list of factors was not exclusive. *Id.* at 566.

The Board has also held that the common or typical results of removal and inadmissibility do not constitute extreme hardship, and has listed certain individual hardship factors considered common rather than extreme. These factors include: economic disadvantage, loss of current employment, inability to maintain one's present standard of living, inability to pursue a chosen profession, separation from family members, severing community ties, cultural readjustment after living in the United States for many years, cultural adjustment of qualifying relatives who have never lived outside the United States, inferior economic and educational opportunities in the foreign country, or inferior medical facilities in the foreign country. *See generally Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. at 568; *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996); *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 883 (BIA 1994); *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. 245, 246-47 (Comm'r 1984); *Matter of Kim*, 15 I&N Dec. 88, 89-90 (BIA 1974); *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. 810, 813 (BIA 1968).

However, though hardships may not be extreme when considered abstractly or individually, the Board has made it clear that “[r]elevant factors, though not extreme in themselves, must be considered in the aggregate in determining whether extreme hardship exists.” *Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996) (quoting *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 882). The adjudicator “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.” *Id.*

The actual hardship associated with an abstract hardship factor such as family separation, economic disadvantage, cultural readjustment, et cetera, differs in nature and severity depending on the unique circumstances of each case, as does the cumulative hardship a qualifying relative experiences as a result of aggregated individual hardships. *See, e.g., Matter of Bing Chih Kao and Mei Tsui Lin*, 23 I&N Dec. 45, 51 (BIA 2001) (distinguishing *Matter of Pilch* regarding hardship faced by qualifying relatives on the basis of variations in the length of residence in the United States and the ability to speak the language of the country to which they would relocate). For example, though family separation has been found to be a common result of inadmissibility or removal, separation from family living in the United States can also be the most important single hardship factor in considering hardship in the aggregate. *Salcido-Salcido v. INS*, 138 F.3d 1292 (9th Cir. 1998) (quoting *Contreras-Buenfil v. INS*, 712 F.2d 401, 403 (9th Cir. 1983)); *but see Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. at 247 (separation of spouse and children from applicant not extreme hardship due to conflicting evidence in the record and because applicant and spouse had been voluntarily separated from one another for 28 years). Therefore, we consider the totality of the circumstances in determining whether denial of admission would result in extreme hardship to a qualifying relative.

On appeal the AAO determined the applicant had established extreme hardship if her spouse were to remain in the United States while she resided abroad due to her inadmissibility. As such, this criterion will not be re-addressed on motion. In determining the applicant had not established extreme hardship to her spouse in the event of relocation, the AAO concluded the record contains limited evidence of the spouse’s situation, including of his claimed U.S. citizen children, and no information concerning ties in the Dominican Republic. The AAO concluded that the cumulative effect of the spouse’s ties to the United States, absence of ties to his native country, residence in the United States, and loss of employment did not rise to the level of extreme hardship.

In her brief counsel asserts that the applicant’s spouse, as a lawful permanent resident, will lose his status in the United States if he relocates to the Dominican Republic and will lose his social security benefits after working since 1989 because the Dominican Republic is not part of an international agreement allowing non-U.S. citizens to apply for benefits while not living in the United States. Counsel asserts the spouse would lose employer-sponsored health benefits and be financially unable to assist his daughters in the United States. Counsel contends if the spouse relocates he would be forced into small, crowded living conditions and be unable to find a job because of the country’s high unemployment and his low education and mental health problems. Counsel asserts the applicant’s situation affects the health of the spouse, currently under treatment by a psychiatrist with prescribed medication for depression and panic attacks.

In his statement the applicant's spouse contends that if he relocates he will lose retirement and social security benefits, and his U.S. permanent residence. He states that the applicant lives in bad conditions, is unable to find work, and depends on money he sends, and that he also sends money to his daughters in the United States. He asserts that if he relocates he will be unable to find employment because of his age and learning disabilities.

Considered in the aggregate, the evidence establishes the applicant's spouse would experience extreme hardship if he were to relocate to the Dominican Republic to reside with the applicant due to her inadmissibility. A lengthy departure from the United States could cause him to lose his U.S. lawful permanent resident status. See section 223 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1203. Further, the applicant would be losing his long-time employment and related benefits with the likelihood of difficulty finding employment due to his low education and mental health issues as well and lose access to his doctor, who is familiar with his condition and treatment. A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, reflects that the applicant has established that her U.S. lawful permanent resident spouse will suffer extreme hardship were the applicant unable to reside in the United States. Accordingly, the AAO finds that the circumstances presented in this application rise to the level of extreme hardship.

The AAO finds that the applicant merits a waiver of inadmissibility as a matter of discretion. In discretionary matters, the alien bears the burden of proving eligibility in terms of equities in the United States which are not outweighed by adverse factors. See *Matter of T-S-Y-*, 7 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1957). In evaluating whether section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act relief is warranted in the exercise of discretion, the factors adverse to the alien include the nature and underlying circumstances of the inadmissibility ground at issue, the presence of additional significant violations of this country's immigration laws, the existence of a criminal record, and if so, its nature and seriousness, and the presence of other evidence indicative of the alien's bad character or undesirability as a permanent resident of this country. The favorable considerations include family ties in the United States, residence of long duration in this country (particularly where alien began residency at a young age), evidence of hardship to the alien and his family if s/he is excluded and/or deported, service in this country's Armed Forces, a history of stable employment, the existence of property or business ties, evidence of value or service in the community, evidence of genuine rehabilitation if a criminal record exists, and other evidence attesting to the alien's good character (e.g., affidavits from family, friends and responsible community representatives). See *Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996).

The unfavorable factors in this matter are the applicant's accrual of unlawful presence and removal from the United States. The favorable factors are the hardship the applicant's husband would experience if the applicant is denied admission into the United States, the applicant's good moral character, and the applicant's lack of a criminal record. The AAO finds that although the immigration violations committed by the applicant are serious in nature and cannot be condoned, taken together the favorable factors in the present case outweigh the adverse factors, such that a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted.

Upon review of the totality of the evidence, the AAO finds that the applicant has established extreme hardship to his lawful permanent resident spouse as required under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act. It has also been established that the applicant merits a favorable exercise of discretion. The applicant has therefore met her burden of proving eligibility for a waiver of her ground of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act. The Form I-601 appeal will therefore be sustained.

The AAO notes that the field office director denied the applicant's Form I-212 Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission into the United States After Deportation or Removal (Form I-212) in the same decision. The Form I-212 was denied solely based on the denial of the Form I-601. As the AAO has now found the applicant eligible for a waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act, it will withdraw the field office director's decision on the Form I-212 and render a new decision.

Section 212(a)(9)(A) of the Act states:

Aliens previously removed.-

(A) Certain aliens previously removed.-

(i) Arriving aliens.-Any alien who has been ordered removed under section 235(b)(1) or at the end of proceedings under section 240 initiated upon the alien's arrival in the United States and who again seeks admission within 5 years of the date of such removal (or within 20 years in the case of a second or subsequent removal or at any time in the case of an alien convicted of an aggravated felony) is inadmissible.

(ii) Other aliens.- Any alien not described in clause (i) who-

(I) has been ordered removed under section 240 or any other provision of law, or

(II) departed the United States while an order of removal was outstanding, and seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal (or within 20 years of such date in the case of a second or subsequent removal or at any time in the case of an aliens convicted of an aggravated felony) is inadmissible.

(iii) Exception.- Clauses (i) and (ii) shall not apply to an alien seeking admission within a period if, prior to the date of the aliens' reembarkation at a place outside the United States or attempt to be admitted from foreign continuous territory, the Attorney General [now, Secretary, Department of Homeland Security] has consented to the aliens' reapplying for admission.

On May 29, 2002, the applicant was ordered removed from the United States. That decision was appealed to the BIA and affirmed. The applicant was removed from the United States on October 31, 2007. As such, she is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(A) of the Act and must request permission to reapply for admission.

A grant of permission to reapply for admission is a discretionary decision based on the weighing of negative and positive factors. The AAO has found that the applicant warrants a favorable exercise of discretion related to the adjudication of the Form I-601. For the reasons stated in that finding, the AAO finds that the applicant's Form I-212 should also be granted as a matter of discretion.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.