

**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
H5

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: MEXICO CITY [REDACTED] MEXICO

Date:

JAN 08 2010

IN RE:



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:



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).

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Mexico City (Ciudad Juarez), 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 was found to be inadmissible to the United States (U.S.) under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having procured admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation on February 27, 2000. The applicant is the daughter of a U.S. citizen father and a lawful permanent resident mother. She seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i).

In his decision, dated August 21, 2006, the district director found that the applicant failed to establish that her qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship as a result of her continued inadmissibility. The application was denied accordingly.

In a brief, counsel states that the applicant's mother and father are suffering extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility.

The record indicates that on February 27, 2000, the applicant presented a border crossing card in the name of Maria de Los Angeles Huerta in an attempt to gain entry into the United States.

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) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship on the applicant's U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident spouse and/or parent. Hardship the applicant experiences is not considered in section 212(i) waiver proceedings unless it causes hardship to the applicant's spouse and/or parent. 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 concept of extreme hardship to a qualifying relative "is not . . . fixed and inflexible," and whether extreme hardship has been established is determined based on an examination of the facts of each individual case. *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999). In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the Board of Immigration Appeals set forth a list of non-exclusive factors relevant to determining whether an applicant has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. These factors include, with respect to the qualifying relative, the presence of family ties to U.S. citizens or lawful permanent residents in the United States, family ties outside the United States, country conditions where the qualifying relative would relocate and family ties in that country, the financial impact of departure, and significant health conditions, particularly where there is diminished availability of medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate. *Id.* at 566.

Relevant factors, though not extreme in themselves, must be considered in the aggregate in determining whether extreme hardship exists. In each case, the trier of fact 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.

Matter of O-J-O-, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996) (citations omitted). 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 extreme hardship to the applicant's parents must be established in the event that they reside in Mexico and in the event that they reside in the United States, as they are not required to reside outside of the United States based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request. The AAO will consider the relevant factors in adjudication of this case.

Counsel's brief indicates that the applicant's parents are elderly and suffering from various medical conditions which cause them to need their daughter's care, suffer extreme hardship in her absence, and make it impossible to relocate to Mexico. The record, through numerous medical reports, shows that the applicant's mother is suffering from osteoporosis with a severe deformity and 80% loss of vertebral body height. A letter from [REDACTED] indicates that the applicant's mother is also experiencing vaginal bleeding with masses found on both of her ovaries. The records submitted also show that the applicant's father has back pain and high glucose and cholesterol levels.

In his affidavit, dated October 16, 2006, the applicant's father states that he and his wife are suffering extreme medical, financial, and emotional hardship as a result of being separated from the applicant. He states that because of his and his wife's medical problems they need their daughter in the United States to live with them and help them with their daily lives. The AAO acknowledges that the record establishes the applicant's parent's need for care. However, the applicant's father

indicates that he has two daughters who currently reside in the United States, but does not submit any evidence to show that these daughters can and do not help him and his wife with their needs for daily care in the applicant's absence.

The applicant's father also states that he is suffering financial hardship because he can only work part-time, earning about \$600 per month, with which he pays all of his expenses and supports his daughter in Mexico, but no financial documentation was submitted to support these statements nor has there been any evidence showing that his other family members could not aid in supporting the applicant in Mexico.

In addition, the applicant's father states that the applicant is having an extremely difficult life in Mexico, which creates extreme emotional distress for him and burdens his heart with guilt. He also states that because of their old age and medical conditions, he and his wife can not move to Mexico. The AAO again notes that the applicant's father has failed to submit documentation to support these claims. The AAO recognizes that the applicant's parents are experiencing emotional hardship as a result of being separated from their daughter, but they have submitted no evidence to show that this hardship rises to the level of extreme and that they would not be able to receive adequate medical care for their conditions in Mexico.

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)). Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner'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). Thus, the AAO finds that the current record does not support a finding that the applicant's parents will suffer extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility.

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 parents 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.