

Identity information to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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

PUBLIC COPY



HS

FILE:



Office: ATLANTA, GA

Date:

MAR 25 2013

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, Atlanta, Georgia, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

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 through fraud or willful misrepresentation. The record indicates that the applicant is the wife of a lawful permanent resident of the United States, the daughter of a naturalized United States citizen, and the mother of two United States citizen children. She 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 her 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 September 21, 2007.

On appeal, the applicant, through counsel, asserts that “[t]he denial of the I-601 waiver of entry with a false document was an error and should be overturned.” *Form I-290B*, filed October 22, 2007. Additionally, counsel claims that the applicant’s father, husband, and children will suffer hardship if the applicant is removed to Haiti. *Id.* She notes “the terrible situation in Haiti at present.” *Id.*

The record includes, but is not limited to, letters from the applicant, her father, and her husband; medical records for the applicant’s father; a copy of an Individualized Education Program (IEP) progress report for the applicant’s son; the applicant’s marriage certificate; documents from the immigration court and the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA); and country conditions 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 the applicant's father filed a Form I-130 on behalf of the applicant, and it was approved on May 24, 1993. On May 29, 1999, the applicant attempted to enter the United States by presenting a photo-substituted Canadian passport. On June 9, 1999, a Notice to Appear (NTA) was issued. On or about July 15, 1999, the applicant filed an Application for Asylum and for Withholding of Removal (Form I-589). On January 8, 2000, the applicant's father became a United States citizen. On September 13, 2000, an immigration judge denied the applicant's Form I-589 and ordered her removed. On or about October 4, 2000, the applicant filed an appeal of the immigration judge's decision with the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). On October 4, 2001, the applicant filed a Form I-601 and an Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status (Form I-485). On February 27, 2003, the BIA affirmed the immigration judge's decision and dismissed the applicant's appeal. On June 19, 2003, the applicant filed an Application for Stay of Deportation or Removal (Form I-246). On June 12, 2004, the applicant married [REDACTED], a native of Haiti, in Rhode Island. On March 21, 2006, the applicant and the Department of Homeland Security filed a joint motion to reopen the applicant's case before the BIA. On May 11, 2006, the BIA reopened and remanded the applicant's case to the immigration judge. On April 2, 2007, an immigration judge administratively closed the applicant's case. On September 21, 2007, the Field Office Director denied the applicant's Form I-601, finding that the applicant had failed to demonstrate extreme hardship to her qualifying relative.

In that the applicant attempted to enter the United States with a photo-substituted passport, the AAO finds that she willfully misrepresented a material fact in order to obtain an immigration benefit 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 herself 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 children 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 her 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).

In a letter dated October 17, 2007, the applicant’s husband states the applicant is “very important to [him].” He states that he is currently unemployed and that the applicant supports him, the children, and his parents. The applicant’s husband also claims he suffers from diabetes, high blood pressure, and high

cholesterol, and the applicant takes care of him. The AAO notes the applicant's husband's claims, but does not find documentation in the record to support them. In an affidavit dated October 10, 2001, the applicant's father states that all of his children reside in the United States and that he "count[s] on [his] children to help and support [him]." The applicant's father further states that the applicant works and "make[s] significant financial contributions to the household." On appeal, counsel claims there is no infrastructure in Haiti, "few educational options, no employment possibilities...frequent kidnappings, murder and extortion."

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 that have compounded an already unstable environment, and which will affect the country and people of Haiti for years to come, the AAO finds that both the applicant's father and husband would suffer extreme hardship if they were to relocate to Haiti with the applicant.

For the same reasons, the AAO finds that the applicant's father and husband would also experience extreme hardship were they to remain in the United States without the applicant. This finding is based on the extreme emotional harm the applicant's father and husband 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 her United States citizen father and lawful permanent resident husband would suffer extreme hardship if her waiver of inadmissibility application were denied.

The AAO additionally 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).

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

The unfavorable factors include the applicant's entry into the United States by misrepresentation and her periods of unauthorized presence.

While the AAO does not condone her actions, the applicant has established that the favorable factors in her application outweigh the unfavorable factors. In discretionary matters, the applicant bears the full

burden of proving her 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.