

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:



Office: SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Date: SEP 28 2010

IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION:

Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the 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 \$585. 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,

Perry Rhew

Chief, Administrative Appeals Office



DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, San Francisco, California. The matter 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 the Philippines who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for willful misrepresentation of a material fact in order to procure an immigration benefit. The applicant is married to a U.S. citizen and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to reside with her husband in the United States.

The field office director found that the applicant failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and denied the waiver application accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated February 11, 2008.

The record contains, *inter alia*: a copy of the marriage certificate of the applicant and her husband, [REDACTED] indicating they were married on September 13, 2006; a declaration from [REDACTED] a declaration from the applicant; a psychological evaluation of [REDACTED]; a letter from [REDACTED] physician; copies of tax and financial documents; and an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision on the appeal.

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

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.

Section 212(i) provides, in pertinent part:

(1) The Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security] may, in the discretion of the Attorney General [now Secretary of Homeland Security], 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 permanent resident spouse or parent of such an alien

In this case, the record shows, and the applicant concedes, that she entered the United States in October 1999 using a fraudulent passport and a B1/B2 visa under the name of [REDACTED] Declaration of [REDACTED] dated May 30, 2007. Therefore, the applicant is inadmissible

under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for willful misrepresentation of a material fact in order to procure an immigration benefit.

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 children 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 USCIS then assesses whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. See *Matter of Mendez-Moralez*, 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 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.

In this case, the applicant's husband, [REDACTED], states that he is fifty-seven years old and has lived in the United States for almost twenty years. [REDACTED] states that he had two failed marriages and was afraid to fall in love again, but then met the applicant, who is his soul mate. According to [REDACTED] he needs his wife's financial assistance because his ex-wife ruined his credit. In addition, [REDACTED] contends he suffers from high blood pressure, arthritis, knee and hip pain, and high cholesterol. He states he was recently in a car accident, which has caused him back and neck pain, and claims he needs his wife to help take care of him. [REDACTED] states that it would be difficult for him to move to the Philippines with his wife because he would be leaving his elderly mother, who relies primarily on him for care, as well as his siblings, all of whom live in the United States. *Declaration of [REDACTED]* dated May 30, 2007.

A psychological evaluation for [REDACTED] states that he would be tremendously harmed psychologically if his wife's waiver application were denied. In addition, [REDACTED] reported having high blood pressure, high cholesterol, and pain in his back and knees. According to the psychologist [REDACTED] relies on his wife to take care of him both physically and emotionally. The applicant purportedly helps him with his medications, helps him take care of his aging mother, and cooks and cleans for him. According to the psychologist, [REDACTED] would also suffer financially as his wife contributes \$500 per month for their household expenses. The psychologist states that [REDACTED]

██████████ has already gone into a major depression. Furthermore, the psychologist estimates that both ██████████ and his wife are below average in intelligence and contends they would have extreme difficulty finding employment in the Philippines. The psychologist states that ██████████ is not intellectually equipped" to re-adjust to living in the Philippines and that moving "would either send him into a Post Traumatic Stress Disorder or into a severe Major Depression, very possibly with psychotic features." *Letter from ██████████* undated.

A letter from ██████████ physician states that ██████████ has high blood pressure, high cholesterol, and knee and hip pain, for which he takes medications on a regular basis. *Letter from ██████████* dated March 26, 2007.

After a careful review of the record, it is not evident from the record that the applicant's husband will suffer extreme hardship as a result of the applicant's waiver being denied.

The AAO finds that if ██████████ had to move to the Philippines to be with his wife, he would experience extreme hardship. The record shows that ██████████ is currently sixty years old. According to ██████████ he has lived in the United States for over twenty years and he has no family members living in the Philippines as his immediate family, including his mother and his siblings, all live in the United States. ██████████ would need to re-adjust to a life in the Philippines, a difficult situation made even more complicated considering his age and his medical conditions. Furthermore, the AAO notes that the U.S. Department of State has issued a Travel Warning for the Philippines, urging U.S. citizens to exercise extreme caution in the Philippines. The Travel Warning discusses the "continuing threats due to terrorist and insurgent activities, as well as possible concerns about election related violence." In addition, "[k]idnap-for-ransom gangs are active throughout the Philippines and have targeted foreigners." *U.S. Department of State, Travel Warning, Philippines*, dated April 2, 2010. In sum, the hardship ██████████ would experience if he had to move to the Philippines is extreme, going beyond those hardships ordinarily associated with removal or inadmissibility.

Nonetheless, ██████████ has the option of staying in the United States and the record does not show that he would suffer extreme hardship if he were to remain in the United States without his wife. Although the AAO is sympathetic to the couple's circumstances, if ██████████ decides to stay in the United States, their situation is typical of individuals separated as a result of inadmissibility and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship based on the record. The Board of Immigration Appeals and the Courts of Appeals have repeatedly held that the common results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. For example, *Matter of Pilch, supra*, held that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship. In addition, *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), held that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship and defined extreme hardship as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. *See also Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991) (uprooting of family and separation from friends does not necessarily amount to extreme hardship but rather represents the type of inconvenience and hardship experienced by the families of most aliens being deported).

Regarding the financial hardship claim, the record shows that [REDACTED] filed an affidavit of support to sponsor his wife based on his income of \$46,000. *Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the Act (Form I-864)*, dated December 7, 2006; see also *2005 Income Tax Return for Single and Joint Filers With No Dependents (Form 1040EZ)*, dated February 1, 2006 (indicating [REDACTED] earned \$46,887 in wages). Although [REDACTED] contends he needs his wife's financial assistance, and the applicant's Biographic Information form indicates she works as a caregiver, *Biographic Information (Form G-325A)*, dated December 7, 2006, there is no evidence in the record addressing the applicant's income or wages. In addition, there is no evidence addressing [REDACTED] regular, monthly expenses. Without more detailed information, the AAO is not in the position to attribute any financial difficulties [REDACTED] may experience to the applicant's departure.

Regarding the psychological evaluation, the AAO notes that the evaluation in the record is based on a single interview the psychologist conducted with [REDACTED]. The record thus fails to reflect an ongoing relationship between a mental health professional and the applicant's husband. Moreover, there is no evidence that there is a history of treatment for depression or any other mental health problem. In sum, the conclusions reached in the submitted evaluation do not reflect the insight and elaboration commensurate with an established relationship with a mental health professional, thereby diminishing the evaluation's value to a determination of extreme hardship.

With respect to [REDACTED] medical conditions, the letter from his physician fails to provide sufficient details regarding the prognosis, treatment, or severity of [REDACTED] conditions. In addition, the letter does not indicate that [REDACTED] requires assistance of any kind. Without more detailed information, the AAO is not in the position to reach conclusions regarding the severity of any medical condition or the treatment and assistance needed.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's husband caused by the applicant's inadmissibility to 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, 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.