


identifying data deleted 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



H5

FILE: [REDACTED]


Office: [REDACTED]

Date: NOV 29 2010

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:



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 \$630. 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,

Tariq Syed
for

Perry Rhew

Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, [REDACTED], and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of [REDACTED] 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 through fraud or the willful misrepresentation of a material fact. The record indicates that the applicant is married to a United States citizen and 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 husband.

The Field Office Director found that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on the applicant's qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated May 21, 2008.

On appeal, the applicant, through counsel, contends that the applicant's waiver application "was improperly denied." *Form I-290B*, dated June 20, 2008. Additionally, counsel claims that the applicant's "removal to Ghana will result in extreme hardship to her spouse, a U.S. citizen, who is medically and financially incapable of caring for himself, has no family in the United States, and is reliant on the medical care he receives here in the United States." *Id.*

The record includes, but is not limited to, statements from the applicant and her husband; letters of support; a mental health evaluation for the applicant's husband; a letter from [REDACTED] regarding the applicant's husband's medical condition; wage statements, tax documents, bank statements, household bills, insurance documents, and a lease agreement; a country fact sheet on [REDACTED]; and an article on health care expenditures in [REDACTED]. 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 procured admission to the United States in August 1994 by presenting another individual's [REDACTED] passport and visa. Based on the applicant's misrepresentation, she is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act. The AAO notes that counsel does not dispute this finding.

A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(i) of the Act is dependent on a showing that the bar to admission imposes extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, which includes the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship to the applicant can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's husband is the only qualifying relative in this case. If extreme hardship to a qualifying relative is established, the applicant is statutorily eligible for a waiver, and United States Citizenship and Immigration Service (USCIS) then assesses whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. See *Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996).

As a qualifying relative is not required to depart the United States as a consequence of an applicant's inadmissibility, two distinct factual scenarios exist should a waiver application be denied: either the qualifying relative will join the applicant to reside abroad or the qualifying relative will remain in the United States. Ascertaining the actual course of action that will be taken is complicated by the fact that an applicant may easily assert a plan for the qualifying relative to relocate abroad or to remain in the United States depending on which scenario presents the greatest prospective hardship, even though no intention exists to carry out the alleged plan in reality. Cf. *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 885 (BIA 1994) (addressing separation of minor child from both parents applying for suspension of deportation). Thus, we interpret the statutory language of the various waiver provisions in section 212 of the Act to require an applicant to establish extreme hardship to his or her qualifying relative(s) under both possible scenarios. To endure the hardship of separation when extreme hardship could be avoided by joining the applicant abroad, or to endure the hardship of relocation when extreme hardship could be avoided by remaining in the United States, is a matter of choice and not the result of removal or inadmissibility. As the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) stated in *Matter of Ige*:

[W]e consider the critical issue . . . to be whether a child would suffer extreme hardship if he accompanied his parent abroad. If, as in this case, no hardship would ensue, then the fact that

the child might face hardship if left in the United States would be the result of parental choice, not the parent's deportation.

Id. See also *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996).

Extreme hardship is "not a definable term of fixed and inflexible content or meaning," but "necessarily depends upon the facts and circumstances peculiar to each case." *Matter of Hwang*, 10 I&N Dec. 448, 451 (BIA 1964). In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the Board provided a list of factors it deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999). 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. *Id.* The Board added that not all of the foregoing factors need be analyzed in any given case and emphasized that the list of factors was not exclusive. *Id.* at 566.

The Board has also held that the common or typical results of deportation, removal and inadmissibility do not constitute extreme hardship, and has listed certain individual hardship factors considered common rather than extreme. These factors include: economic disadvantage, loss of current employment, inability to maintain one's present standard of living, inability to pursue a chosen profession, separation from family members, severing community ties, cultural readjustment after living in the United States for many years, cultural adjustment of qualifying relatives who have never lived outside the United States, inferior economic and educational opportunities in the foreign country, or inferior medical facilities in the foreign country. See generally *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. at 568; *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. at 631-32; *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 883; *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. 245, 246-47 (Comm'r 1984); *Matter of Kim*, 15 I&N Dec. 88, 89-90 (BIA 1974); *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. 810, 813 (BIA 1968).

However, though hardships may not be extreme when considered abstractly or individually, the Board has made it clear that "[r]elevant factors, though not extreme in themselves, must be considered in the aggregate in determining whether extreme hardship exists." *Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996) (quoting *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 882). The adjudicator "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." *Id.*

We observe that the actual hardship associated with an abstract hardship factor such as family separation, economic disadvantage, cultural readjustment, et cetera, differs in nature and severity depending on the unique circumstances of each case, as does the cumulative hardship a qualifying relative experiences as a result of aggregated individual hardships. See, e.g., *In re Bing Chih Kao and Mei Tsui Lin*, 23 I&N Dec. 45, 51 (BIA 2001) (distinguishing *Matter of Pilch* regarding hardship faced

by qualifying relatives on the basis of variations in the length of residence in the United States and the ability to speak the language of the country to which they would relocate).

Family separation, for instance, has been found to be a common result of inadmissibility or removal in some cases. See *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. at 813. Nevertheless, family ties are to be considered in analyzing hardship. See *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. at 565-66. The question of whether family separation is the ordinary result of inadmissibility or removal may depend on the nature of family relationship considered. For example, in *Matter of Shaughnessy*, the Board considered the scenario of parents being separated from their soon-to-be adult son, finding that this separation would not result in extreme hardship to the parents. *Id.* at 811-12; see also *U.S. v. Arrieta*, 224 F.3d 1076, 1082 (9th Cir. 2000) (“Mr. Arrieta was not a spouse, but a son and brother. It was evident from the record that the effect of the deportation order would be separation rather than relocation.”). In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the Board considered the scenario of the respondent’s spouse accompanying him to Mexico, finding that she would not experience extreme hardship from losing “physical proximity to her family” in the United States. 22 I&N Dec. at 566-67.

The decision in *Cervantes-Gonzalez* reflects the norm that spouses reside with one another and establish a life together such that separating from one another is likely to result in substantial hardship. It is common for both spouses to relocate abroad if one of them is not allowed to stay in the United States, which typically results in separation from other family members living in the United States. Other decisions reflect the expectation that minor children will remain with their parents, upon whom they usually depend for financial and emotional support. See, e.g., *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 886 (“[I]t is generally preferable for children to be brought up by their parents.”). Therefore, the most important single hardship factor may be separation, particularly where spouses and minor children are concerned. *Salcido-Salcido*, 138 F.3d at 1293 (quoting *Contreras-Buenfil v. INS*, 712 F.2d 401, 403 (9th Cir. 1983)); *Cerrillo-Perez*, 809 F.2d at 1422.

Regardless of the type of family relationship involved, the hardship resulting from family separation is determined based on the actual impact of separation on an applicant, and all hardships must be considered in determining whether the combination of hardships takes the case beyond the consequences ordinarily associated with removal or inadmissibility. *Matter of O-J-O-*, 21 I&N Dec. at 383. Nevertheless, though we require an applicant to show that a qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship both in the event of relocation and in the event of separation, in analyzing the latter scenario, we give considerable, if not predominant, weight to the hardship of separation itself, particularly in cases involving the separation of spouses from one another and/or minor children from a parent. *Salcido-Salcido*, 138 F.3d at 1293.

The first prong of the analysis addresses hardship to the applicant’s husband if he relocates to [REDACTED]. On appeal, counsel claims that the applicant’s husband “could not relocate to [REDACTED] without extreme hardship.” Counsel states that the applicant’s husband is an independent contractor, he has no business contacts in [REDACTED], he has been in the United States for many years, he would lose his healthcare benefits in the United States, he could not afford his necessary medical care in [REDACTED] and “his

medical limitations would make his ability to start a brand new business and generate a client base nearly impossible.” Counsel states the applicant’s husband’s “inability to work consistent hours would render [his] ability to find potential employers incredibly difficult.” Counsel states “[t]his increased financial burden, along with the large drop off in the quality of medical care available between the United States and [redacted] would cause an extreme hardship on [the applicant’s husband].” The AAO notes the claims made by counsel regarding the difficulties the applicant’s husband would face in relocating to [redacted].

Regarding the applicant’s husband’s medical condition, the AAO notes that the record establishes that he suffers from a low back condition for which he receives physical therapy and chiropractic care. *See letter from Dr. [redacted]*, dated October 1, 2007; *see also letter from [redacted]*, dated July 17, 2006. The AAO notes that other than an article regarding health care expenditures in Ghana, there is no evidence in the record that the applicant’s husband cannot receive treatment for his medical condition in [redacted] or has to remain in the United States to receive treatment. Additionally, the AAO notes that the record does not establish that the applicant’s husband would be unable to obtain employment in [redacted]. Going on record without supporting documentation is not sufficient to 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)).

The AAO notes that the applicant’s husband is a native of [redacted]. The AAO notes that in a mental health evaluation dated September 10, 2005, licensed social worker [redacted] indicates that the applicant’s husband’s twenty-five year old daughter resides in [redacted]. In that the record does not include sufficient documentation of financial, medical, emotional or other types of hardship that the applicant’s husband would experience if he joined the applicant in [redacted], the AAO does not find the applicant to have established that her husband would suffer extreme hardship upon relocation.

The second prong addresses hardship to the applicant’s husband upon remaining in the United States. In a statement dated September 9, 2005, the applicant states her husband “is afraid of being alone, and afraid that something will happen when [she] [is] not around.” In a statement dated September 12, 2005, the applicant’s husband states the applicant “supports and comforts [him] in times of unhappiness” and he depends “on her for everything.” [redacted] states the applicant’s husband is dependent on the applicant for basic care and emotional support, and his “dependency needs also are evidenced in his ‘addiction’ to ibuprofen, the frequency with which he seeks the attention of his chiropractor and his excessive usage of alcohol.” Counsel states the applicant’s husband “is physically limited and requires help in performing routine daily activities periodically.” [redacted] reports that when the applicant’s husband was asked to hypothetically imagine his separation from the applicant, he made reference to suicide. [redacted] indicates that the applicant’s husband is suffering from anxiety disorder and adjustment disorder with depression. Counsel states “[a]lthough [the applicant’s husband] has made progress in dealing with the symptoms of his anxiety (e.g. alcoholism, depression, suicidal thoughts), the loss of [the applicant] would result in the very causes of his mental and emotional pressures to drastically affect his ability to deal with his situation in the productive way he

has managed so far.” The AAO acknowledges that the applicant’s husband is experiencing emotional issues due to his back injury and the applicant’s immigration status.

The applicant’s husband states he is on the applicant’s health insurance and she is “the main source of income in the house.” In an undated letter, [REDACTED] states the applicant’s husband is employed with his company, his hourly wage is \$10.25, and “[d]ue to his back injury, his average hours are between 25-30 hours a week.” The AAO notes that the record establishes that the applicant’s husband claimed \$10,804 in 2005, \$11,442 in 2004, \$10,749 in 2003, \$8,896 in 2002, \$14,263 in 2001, and \$19,504 in 2000. The applicant’s paystubs reflect that she is making more money than her spouse. The AAO notes the financial concerns of the applicant’s husband.

The AAO finds that when the applicant’s husband’s emotional, financial and medical issues are considered in combination with the normal hardships that result from separation of a spouse, the applicant has established that her husband would experience extreme hardship if he remained in the United States.

However, in that the record does not also establish that the applicant’s husband would suffer extreme hardship if he relocated to [REDACTED], the applicant has failed to establish extreme hardship to her husband under section 212(i) of the Act. 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(a)(6)(C)(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.