

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

H5



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO
(CIUDAD JUAREZ)

OCT 27 2010
Date:

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility pursuant to sections 212(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i) and 212(a)(9)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)

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. The fee for a Form I-290B is currently \$585, but will increase to \$630 on November 23, 2010. Any appeal or motion filed on or after November 23, 2010 must be filed with the \$630 fee. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion 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 application was denied by the Acting District Director, Mexico City, 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 [REDACTED] who is inadmissible to the United States pursuant to sections 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i) and 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), for having attempted to procure admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation and having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year and seeking readmission within ten years of her last departure from the United States. The applicant is married to a United States citizen. She seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her U.S. citizen spouse and child.

The Acting District Director found that, based on the evidence in the record, the applicant had failed to establish extreme hardship to her qualifying relative. The application was denied accordingly. *Decision of the Acting District Director*, dated April 15, 2008.

On appeal, the applicant's spouse contends that United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) failed to consider the extreme hardship he would encounter should the waiver application be denied. *Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion*.

In support of these assertions the record includes, but is not limited to, a statement from the applicant's spouse; statements from family members; statements from friends; a statement from an escrow officer; a statement from the child's preschool; earnings statements for the applicant's spouse; and mortgage statements. The AAO notes that the record also includes several documents in the Spanish language unaccompanied by certified translations. Accordingly, the AAO will not consider these documents. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3). The entire record, with the exception of the Spanish language documents, was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

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(a)(9)(B) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

(B) Aliens Unlawfully Present.-

- (i) In general. - Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who-

.....

(II) has been unlawfully present in the United States for one year or more, and who again seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal from the United States, is inadmissible.

The record reflects that the applicant attempted to gain admission to the United States in June 2002 by presenting a false document at the port of entry in [REDACTED] *Consular Memorandum, American Consulate General, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico*, dated August 7, 2007. Based on her presentation of a fraudulent document at the port of entry, the applicant is inadmissible under Section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act. The applicant remained in the United States from June 2002 to June 2007. *Consular Notes, American Consulate General, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico*, dated June 28, 2007. The applicant, therefore, accrued unlawful presence from June 2002 until she departed the United States in June 2007. In applying for an immigrant visa, the applicant is seeking admission within ten years of her June 2007 departure from the United States. The applicant is, therefore, inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act for being unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than one year.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

- (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(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act provides for a waiver of section 212(a)(9)(B)(i) inadmissibility as follows:

The Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] has sole discretion to waive clause (i) in the case of an immigrant who is the spouse or son or daughter of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if it is established . . . that the refusal of admission to such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such alien.

A waiver of inadmissibility under sections 212(i) and 212(a)(9)(B)(v) 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 or children can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's spouse 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 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 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 [REDACTED] 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.

If the applicant's spouse joins the applicant in [REDACTED] the applicant needs to establish that her spouse will suffer extreme hardship. The applicant's spouse is a native of [REDACTED] *Approved Form I-130, Petition for Alien Relative*. The record does not address whether the applicant's spouse has family members who reside in [REDACTED]. The applicant's spouse states that the applicant brought their child to [REDACTED] and as a result, their child has been ill. *Statement from the applicant's spouse*, dated August 30, 2007. While the AAO acknowledges this statement, it notes that the record fails to include medical documentation in the English language or accompanied by a certified translation in the English language to support such assertion. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence will not meet the burden of proof of 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 applicant's spouse states that he has no desire to return to Mexico as his life, and that of his family, is dependent upon his being able to work in the United States where he can earn enough for his family. *Statement from the applicant's spouse*, dated August 30, 2007. He notes that in [REDACTED] he would not be able to support his family as the economy is much worse than that of the United States, and he would not be able to earn anywhere near what he can earn in the United States. *Id.* While the record includes earnings statements for the applicant's spouse regarding his income in the United States (See earnings statements), the record fails to include documentation, such as published country conditions reports, regarding the economic conditions and availability of employment in [REDACTED]. As noted previously, going on record without supporting documentary evidence will not meet the burden of proof of this proceeding. *See Matter of Soffici*, *Supra*. When looking at the record before it, the AAO does not find that the applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to her spouse if he were to reside in Mexico.

If the applicant's spouse resides in the United States, the applicant needs to establish that her spouse will suffer extreme hardship. As previously noted, the applicant's spouse was is a native of [REDACTED] *Approved Form I-130, Petition for Alien Relative*. The applicant's spouse states that he and the applicant and their child comprise a very close family unit. *Statement from the applicant's spouse*, dated August 30, 2007. He notes that he cannot imagine the pain and suffering that they all would suffer if they were separated from each other, as their emotional bonds are so strong that they need to be with each other everyday. *Id.* A friend of the family notes that the applicant's spouse is a very loving father, but also realizes that he is unable to care for his child in the same way as the applicant and that he works long hours. *Statement from [REDACTED]*, dated August 19, 2007. While the AAO recognizes the difficulties of being a single parent, it notes that the record fails to address whether there are additional family members in the United States who could assist with the child caring responsibilities. A statement from a teacher notes that the applicant's spouse is the sole economic supporter for his nuclear family and is sending money to Mexico to provide for the applicant and their child. *Statement from [REDACTED]* dated August 18, 2007. While the AAO notes that the record includes mortgage statements showing

expenses for the applicant's spouse as well as earnings statements showing net payments of [REDACTED] (See mortgage statements and earnings statements), the record fails to include documentation regarding money being sent by the applicant's spouse to the applicant in [REDACTED]. The AAO also observes that the applicant's spouse owns two homes. Statement from [REDACTED], dated June 30, 2007. Furthermore, there is nothing in the record to show that the applicant's spouse would be unable to contribute to her family's financial well-being from [REDACTED]. As previously noted, going on record without supporting documentary evidence will not meet the burden of proof of this proceeding. See *Matter of Soffici*, supra.

The AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse will endure hardship as a result of his separation from the applicant. However, the record does not distinguish his situation, if he remains in the United States, from that of other individuals separated as a result of removal. Accordingly, it does not establish that the hardship experienced by the applicant's spouse would rise to the level of extreme hardship. When looking at the aforementioned factors, the AAO does not find that the applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to her spouse if he were to reside in 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 sections 212(i) and 212(a)(9)(B)(v) 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.