

**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:

[REDACTED]

Office: ACCRA, GHANA

Date:

**OCT 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:

[REDACTED]

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 Sjed*  
for

Perry Rhew

Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Accra, Ghana, 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 attempting to procure a visa through fraud or the willful misrepresentation of a material fact. The record indicates that the applicant is the child of United States citizens 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 his mother, father, and sisters.

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 January 28, 2008.

On appeal, the applicant, through counsel, claims that the applicant's mother is suffering extreme hardship through her separation from the applicant. *Form I-290B*, dated February 23, 2008.

The record includes, but is not limited to, counsel's appeal brief; statements from the applicant, his parents, and sister; and a mental health evaluation for the applicant's mother. 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 in or around 2006, the applicant attempted to obtain a nonimmigrant visa by using the name of another individual. Based on this misrepresentation, the AAO finds that the applicant 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 or his siblings can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's parents are the only qualifying relatives 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 ██████████, 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 parents if they relocate to ██████████. This prong of the analysis is not addressed. In that the record does not include sufficient documentation of financial, medical, emotional or other types of hardship that the applicant’s parents would experience if they joined the applicant in ██████████ the AAO does not find the applicant to have established that his parents would suffer extreme hardship upon relocation.

The second prong addresses hardship to the applicant’s parents upon remaining in the United States. In counsel’s appeal brief dated March 26, 2008, counsel claims that this matter is “destroying the family,” “causing extreme mental anguish to the [applicant’s mother],” and it is “starting to cause serious financial problems, due to the [applicant’s mother’s] lack of interest in her employment.” In a statement dated March 24, 2008, the applicant’s father states they “have high mortgage payment and [they] are the main supporters of [their] elderly parents. Any loss of job by either one of [them] will bring extreme hardship and jeopardize [their] lives and the future lives of...[their] children.” Counsel claims that the applicant’s mother’s “salary is necessary to keep the family’s finances current, and with her present mental state, [the applicant’s father] considers it likely that she will be fired from her job.” The applicant’s father states his wife “is incapable of concentrating either at home or at work.” In a

statement dated March 26, 2008, the applicant's sister states her mother "has missed days from work." The AAO notes the financial concerns of the applicant's family.

The applicant's father states "[t]he agony of this current situation is becoming life threatening." In an undated affidavit, the applicant's mother states she is very depressed, and she has "trouble sleeping, eating," and she "cannot concentrate." Counsel claims that the applicant's mother "has suffered from guilt and stress for years, considering herself to be the reason why [the applicant] has been stuck in [redacted] while the rest of the family enjoys the blessings of the United States." The applicant's sister states her mother "has fallen to bouts of [redacted] In a letter dated April 16, 2008, [redacted] states she is treating the applicant's mother for [redacted] and "[h]er [redacted] (December 2007) denial of an appeal for [the applicant]." [redacted] states the applicant's mother is having "difficulty sleeping and feeling low energy and fatigue most of the time," and "[s]he says she often feels sad and despondent and cannot control her crying." The applicant's sister states her mother often cries, does not want to get out of bed, and has given "serious consideration to not wanting to live." [redacted] states in her darkest moments, the applicant's mother feels hopeless and "she admits to thinking that death might be a better alternative to her suffering but she has assured [her] that she is not a risk to herself at this time." The AAO acknowledges that the applicant's mother is experiencing emotional issues because of the separation from the applicant.

The applicant's father states he has "developed deep hurt for missing [the applicant]." He states the [redacted] The applicant's sister states her mother "has been seriously ill." The applicant's father states his wife is suffering from [redacted] which resulted from the stress of waiting for [the applicant] to be able to come to [them]." [redacted] states the applicant's mother is taking medications for [redacted]. The AAO notes the medical concerns of the applicant's mother and father.

The applicant's father states his daughters, who live in the United States, "have been heavily affected by [the applicant's] visa denial." The applicant's sister states "[i]t breaks [her] heart to think of the emotional heartbreak and pain this is causing [her mother], as well as how this will escalate and probably prove fatal if [the applicant] is not reunited with [her mother]." In an undated statement, the applicant states "[t]his has been a nightmare and [he] deeply regret[s] this mistake." The applicant's mother states the applicant is "distraught. In fact, he is saying that he may commit suicide." [redacted] states the applicant's mother "worries constantly about [the applicant] because he is so distraught at the current situation." The AAO notes the applicant's parents concerns for their children.

The AAO notes that other than the above noted statements, the record contains no documentary evidence establishing that the applicant's mother's employment has been affected by her emotional issues. 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 acknowledges that the applicant's parents may be experiencing some financial hardship; however, the applicant's parents have not provided sufficient documentation to establish their financial situation.

Additionally, the AAO notes that the applicant has submitted no evidence to establish that he is unable to obtain employment in [REDACTED] and, thereby, reduce the financial burden on his parents.

The AAO finds that when the applicant's mother's severe emotional and medical issues are considered in combination with the normal hardships that result from the exclusion of a loved one, the applicant has established that his mother would experience extreme hardship if she remained in the United States. The record does not establish extreme hardship to the applicant's father if he remains in the United States.

However, in that the record does not also establish that the applicant's mother would suffer extreme hardship if she relocated to [REDACTED] the applicant has failed to establish extreme hardship to his mother under section 212(i) of the Act. The record also does not establish extreme hardship to his father under section 212(i) of the Act. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether he 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.