

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

H5 #2

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: PROVIDENCE, RI

Date: DEC 01 2009

IN RE:

[REDACTED]

APPLICATION:

Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(i) of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[REDACTED]

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 Field Office Director, Providence, Rhode Island, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of China who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for procuring admission to the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant's spouse and child are U.S. citizens. She seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i).

The field office director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, at 2, dated May 7, 2008.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant has not committed fraud or misrepresentation before the U.S. government, and her spouse and child will suffer extreme hardship if she is removed to China. *I-290B Attachment*, received June 4, 2008.

The record includes, but is not limited to, the applicant's statement, the applicant's spouse's statement, and the applicant's sister-in-law's statement. The entire record was reviewed and considered in arriving at a decision on the appeal.

The field office director found the applicant inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for presenting another person's passport to procure admission to the United States on January 20, 2005. However, the record does not reflect that the applicant presented a passport to an immigration officer to gain admission to the United States on January 20, 2005. Therefore, the applicant is not inadmissible on this basis. However, the record reflects that the applicant misrepresented herself during her credible fear interviews on January 27 and 31, 2005. She claimed a fear of persecution based on religion and an unpaid debt. She admitted that these claims were false during immigration proceedings on March 28, 2006. The AAO, therefore, finds the applicant inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for attempting to procure a benefit under the Act (finding of credible fear) by willfully misrepresenting material facts.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act provides, in pertinent part, that:

- (i) Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides that:

- (1) The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary)] may, in the discretion of the Attorney General [Secretary], waive the application of clause (i) of subsection (a)(6)(C) in the case of an alien who is the spouse, 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 the United States of such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such an alien.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides that a waiver of the bar to admission resulting from section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship on a qualifying family member, in this matter, the applicant's spouse. Hardship to the applicant or her child is not a permissible consideration in a 212(i) waiver proceeding except to the extent that such hardship affects the qualifying relative. 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 lawful permanent resident or United States citizen family ties to 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.

Therefore, an analysis under [REDACTED] is appropriate in this case. The AAO notes that extreme hardship to a qualifying relative must be established whether the qualifying relative resides in China or in the United States, as the qualifying relative is not required to reside outside of the United States based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request.

The first part of the analysis requires the applicant to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative in the event that the qualifying relative resides in China. This prong of the analysis is not addressed by the applicant. Accordingly, the AAO does not find the record to include sufficient evidence of emotional, financial, medical or other hardships that, in the aggregate, establish that the applicant's spouse would experience extreme hardship upon relocating to China.

The second part of the analysis requires the applicant to establish extreme hardship in the event that a qualifying relative remains in the United States. Counsel states that the applicant is the primary caregiver for her and her spouse's child, her spouse works to support the family and cannot take care of the child himself, and her spouse cannot live a normal life without her. *I-290B Attachment*. The applicant states that her spouse and daughter need her to take care of them and to support them financially and psychologically. *Applicant's Statement*, dated April 10, 2008. The applicant's

spouse states that he and his daughter need the applicant to support them physically and spiritually. *Applicant's Spouse's Statement*, dated April 10, 2008. The AAO notes that the record contains no documentary evidence in support of the claims made by counsel, the applicant or her spouse. The 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). Going on record without supporting documentation will not meet the applicant's burden of proof in this proceeding. *See 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)). Based on its review of the evidence before it, the AAO does not find the record to include sufficient evidence of emotional, financial, medical or other hardships that, in the aggregate, establish that the applicant's spouse would experience extreme hardship upon remaining in the United States.

U.S. 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, *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996), 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. *Hassan v. INS*, *supra*, 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 spouse 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 she merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(i) 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.