

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 (CIUDAD JUAREZ) DATE: JUN 23 2010  
[REDACTED] relates)

IN RE: Applicant: [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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew  
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 record establishes that the applicant, a native and citizen of Mexico, attempted to procure entry to the United States in April 1969 by presenting a fraudulent Form I-551, Alien Registration Card. The applicant is thus 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 having attempted to procure entry to the United States by fraud and/or willful misrepresentation. The applicant does not contest this finding of inadmissibility. Rather, he is applying for a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to reside in the United States with his lawful permanent resident spouse.

The district director concluded that that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Ground of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated September 24, 2007.

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 immigrant 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...

A section 212(i) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from a violation of section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Unlike waivers under section 212(h) of the Act, section 212(i) does not mention extreme hardship to a United States citizen or lawful permanent resident child. Nor is extreme hardship to the applicant himself a permissible consideration under

the statute. In the present case, the applicant's lawful permanent resident spouse is the only qualifying relative, and hardship to the applicant and/or their children cannot be considered, except as it may affect the applicant's spouse.

In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565-66 (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 to a qualifying relative. 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.

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).

The applicant's lawful permanent resident spouse contends that she will suffer emotional and financial hardship if the applicant's waiver request is not granted. In a declaration she states that she is experiencing difficulties due to long-term separation from her spouse. She notes that she misses him daily and prays for him, with the hope that he will be able to return to the United States and reside with her. She further asserts that her children have supported her financially while her spouse has been living abroad, but she wants to have her spouse reside in the United States so that he may work and support her, alleviating the financial burden that currently rests on her children. *Letter from* [REDACTED] dated October 10, 2007.

It has not been established that the applicant's spouse will suffer extreme emotional hardship if the applicant's waiver request is not granted. Moreover, it has not been established that the applicant's spouse will suffer extreme hardship were she to continue to travel to Mexico on a regular basis to visit her spouse, as she notes she has done in the past. 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)).

Although the depth of concern over the applicant's inadmissibility is neither doubted or minimized, the fact remains that Congress provided for a waiver of inadmissibility only under limited circumstances. In nearly every qualifying relationship, whether between husband and wife or parent and child, there is a deep level of affection and a certain amount of emotional and social interdependence. While, in common parlance, the prospect of separation or involuntary relocation nearly always results in considerable hardship to individuals and families, 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 current state of the law, viewed from a legislative, administrative, or judicial point of view, requires that the hardship be above and beyond the normal, expected hardship involved in such cases. U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of removal are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. See *Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991), *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996); *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); *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. 810 (BIA 1968) (holding that separation of family members and financial difficulties alone do not establish extreme hardship). "[O]nly in cases of great actual or prospective injury . . . will the bar be removed." *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. 245, 246 (BIA 1984).

As for the financial hardship referenced by the applicant's spouse, no documentation with respect to the applicant's, his spouse's and their children's financial situation, including income and expenses, assets and liabilities, has been provided, to establish that the applicant's children, and by extension, their mother, are experiencing extreme financial hardship due to the applicant's residence abroad. Nor does the record indicate what specific contributions the applicant made to the household prior to his departure from the United States, to establish that his physical absence is causing extreme financial hardship to his spouse. In addition, it has not been established that the applicant's spouse is unable to obtain gainful employment to support herself financially. Alternatively, it has not been established that the applicant is unable to obtain gainful employment abroad, thereby affording him the opportunity to assist his spouse with respect to their finances.

The AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse will endure hardship as a result of continued separation from the applicant. However, her situation, if she remains in the United States, is typical to individuals separated as a result of removal and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship based on the record. The AAO concludes that based on the evidence provided, it has not been established that the applicant's lawful permanent resident spouse is suffering extreme emotional and/or financial hardship due to the applicant's inadmissibility.

Extreme hardship to a qualifying relative must also be established in the event that he or she relocates abroad based on the denial of the applicant's waiver request. This criteria has not been addressed. As such, the applicant has failed to establish that his lawful permanent resident spouse, a native of Mexico, would suffer extreme hardship were she to relocate to her home country to reside with the applicant due to his inadmissibility.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, reflects that the applicant has failed to show that his lawful permanent resident spouse would suffer extreme hardship if he were not permitted to reside in the United States, and moreover, the applicant has failed to show that his lawful permanent resident spouse would suffer extreme hardship were she to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant. The record demonstrates that the applicant's spouse faces no greater hardship than the unfortunate, but expected, disruptions, inconveniences, and difficulties arising whenever a spouse is removed from the United States or refused admission. Having found

the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether the applicant merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility, 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. The waiver application is denied.