

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

FILE:



Office: PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

Date MAR 01 2010

IN RE:


Applicant:



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.

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained. The Field Office Director shall reopen the applicant's Form I-485 for action consistent with this decision.

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of Haiti 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 attempting to enter the United States by presenting a photo-substituted French passport. The record indicates that the applicant is married to a naturalized United States citizen and the father of a United States citizen son and stepson. He is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). The applicant seeks 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 family.

The Field Office Director found 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 Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated May 23, 2008.

On appeal, the applicant claims that he financially supports his wife and children, and if he is removed from the United States, his family "will be homeless." *Form I-290B*, filed June 6, 2008. Additionally, the applicant claims that if he returns to Haiti, he will be persecuted for his political beliefs. *Id.*

The record includes, but is not limited to, letters from the applicant and his wife; household bills, mortgage documents, and bank statements; documents from the immigration court and the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA); and country condition reports on Haiti. The entire record was reviewed and considered in arriving at a decision on the appeal.

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

- (i) In general.-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.
- (iii) Waiver authorized.-For provision authorizing waiver of clause (i), see subsection (i).

Section 212 of the Act provides, in pertinent part, that:

- (i) (1) The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security, "Secretary"] may, in the discretion of the [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 [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...

In the present case, the record indicates that on September 30, 2002, the applicant attempted to enter the United States by presenting a photo-substituted French passport. On October 9, 2002, the applicant was paroled into the United States. On or about November 13, 2003, the applicant filed an Application for Asylum and Withholding of Removal (Form I-589). On May 17, 2006, the applicant's naturalized United States citizen wife filed a Form I-130 on behalf of the applicant. On August 5, 2006, the applicant's Form I-130 was approved. On August 23, 2006, an immigration judge denied the applicant's Form I-589. On September 12, 2006, the applicant filed an appeal of the immigration judge's decision with the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). On July 28, 2007, the applicant filed an Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status (Form I-485). On November 19, 2007, the applicant filed a Form I-601. On May 23, 2008, the Field Office Director denied the applicant's Form I-485 and Form I-601, finding that the applicant failed to demonstrate extreme hardship to his qualifying relative. On June 6, 2008, the applicant filed an appeal of the Field Office Director's decision with the AAO. On June 30, 2008, the BIA dismissed the applicant's appeal. On September 15, 2008, the applicant filed a motion to reconsider the BIA's decision, which the BIA denied on December 10, 2008. On December 17, 2008, the applicant filed a motion to reconsider the BIA's decision, which the BIA denied on March 24, 2009. On July 16, 2009, the applicant filed another motion to reopen the BIA's decision, which the BIA denied on October 16, 2009.

In that the applicant attempted to enter the United States with a photo-substituted passport, the AAO finds that he willfully misrepresented a material fact in order to obtain a benefit under the Act and is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act. The AAO notes that the applicant does not dispute this finding.

A section 212(i) 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 to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship the applicant himself experiences upon removal is irrelevant to a section 212(i) waiver proceeding. The AAO also notes that the record contains references to the hardship that the applicant's son and stepsons would suffer if the applicant were denied admission to the United States. Section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act provides that a waiver, under section 212(i) of the Act, is applicable solely where the applicant establishes extreme hardship to his citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent. Unlike a waiver under section 212(h) of the Act, Congress does not mention extreme hardship to United States citizen or lawful permanent resident children. Therefore, hardship to the applicant's children is not considered in section 212(i) waiver proceedings except to the extent that it creates hardship for a 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).

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 *Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the BIA 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. The BIA has also held:

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).

U. S. courts have stated, “the most important single hardship factor may be the separation of the alien from family living in the United States,” and also, “[w]hen the BIA fails to give considerable, if not predominant, weight to the hardship that will result from family separation, it has abused its discretion.” *Salcido-Salcido v. INS*, 138 F.3d 1292, 1293 (9th Cir. 1998) (citations omitted); *Cerrillo-Perez v. INS*, 809 F.2d 1419, 1424 (9th Cir. 1987) (remanding to BIA) (“We have stated in a series of cases that the hardship to the alien resulting from his separation from family members may, in itself, constitute extreme hardship.”) (citations omitted). Separation of family will therefore be given appropriate weight in the assessment of hardship factors in the present case.

The AAO notes, however, that the courts have repeatedly held that the common results of removal or inadmissibility are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. *See Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991). The common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship as extreme hardship has generally been defined as hardship that is unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. *See Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996); *see also 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). Only “in cases of great actual or prospective injury...will the bar be removed.” *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. 245, 246 (BIA 1984).

On appeal, the applicant states his wife is incapable of caring for the family if he is removed from the United States, as he is the only source of income for his family. The applicant further states that since his stepdaughter died, his wife is afraid to live by herself. In a letter dated November 15, 2007, the applicant’s wife states that since her daughter died, the applicant has been there for her and has been her “counselor.” She claims that she cannot make it on her own. In a letter dated June 1, 2008, the applicant states there is

no way he can return to Haiti because “there is a group of people against [him]” for his involvement in politics before he left Haiti.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Secretary, Janet Napolitano, has determined that an 18-month designation of Temporary Protected Status (TPS) for Haiti is warranted because of the devastating earthquake and aftershocks which occurred on January 12, 2010. As a result, Haitians in the United States are unable to return safely to their country. Even prior to the current catastrophe, Haiti was subject to years of political and social turmoil and natural disasters. In a travel warning issued on January 28, 2009 the U.S. Department of State noted the extensive damage to the country after four hurricanes struck in August and September 2008 and the chronic danger of violent crime, in particular kidnapping. *U.S. Department of State, Travel Warning – Haiti*, January 28, 2009. Based on the designation of TPS for Haitians and the disastrous conditions which have compounded an already unstable environment, and which will affect the country and people of Haiti for years to come, the AAO finds that requiring the applicant’s wife to join the applicant in Haiti would result in extreme hardship.

For the same reasons, the AAO finds that the applicant’s wife would also experience extreme hardship were she to remain in the United States without the applicant. This finding is based on the extreme emotional harm the applicant’s wife will experience due to concern about the applicant’s well-being and safety in Haiti, a concern that is beyond the common results of removal or inadmissibility. Accordingly, the AAO finds that the applicant has established that his United States citizen wife would suffer extreme hardship if his waiver of inadmissibility application were denied.

The favorable factors presented by the applicant are his United States citizen wife and children, the extreme hardship to his wife as a result of his inadmissibility, his payment of taxes, the absence of a criminal record apart from his immigration violation; and no other grounds of inadmissibility.

The unfavorable factors include the applicant’s entry into the United States by misrepresentation, and periods of unauthorized presence and employment.

While the AAO does not condone his actions, the applicant has established that the favorable factors in his application outweigh the unfavorable factors. In discretionary matters, the applicant bears the full burden of proving his eligibility for discretionary relief. *See Matter of Ducret*, 15 I&N Dec. 620 (BIA 1976). Here, the applicant has met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be sustained.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained. The Field Office Director shall reopen the applicant’s Form I-485 for action consistent with this decision.