

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
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

H5

Date: **DEC 08 2011**

Office: CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

FILE: [REDACTED]

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,

Perry Rhew

Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Chicago, Illinois, 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 the Ukraine 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 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 his spouse.

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 July 11, 2009.

On appeal, the applicant, through counsel, contends that United States Citizenship and Immigration Service (USCIS) erred in denying the applicant's waiver application. *See Form I-290B*, filed August 4, 2009.

The record includes, but is not limited to, counsel's statement on appeal, tax and insurance documents, the applicant's marriage certificate, and documents regarding the applicant's misrepresentation. 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 on June 1, 2004, the applicant was issued a B-1/B-2 nonimmigrant visa in Kiev, Ukraine. On June 17, 2004, the applicant was denied boarding by Aeroflot officials after it was discovered that the applicant had counterfeit Polish and United Kingdom visas in his passport. On June 20, 2004, the applicant entered the United States on a B-2 nonimmigrant visa with authorization to remain in the United States until December 19, 2004. The applicant failed to depart the United States when his authorization expired.

On appeal, counsel claims that USCIS “never provided any information regarding the UK visa or the conclusion that the visa was fraudulent.” Counsel indicates that the applicant “stated to the [USCIS] that he obtained the visa through a travel agency in the Ukraine and was not aware that the visa was not legally issued by the UK government.”

The AAO finds counsel’s contention that the applicant is not inadmissible to the United States through the misrepresentation of a material fact to be unpersuasive. The AAO observes that in waiver proceedings the burden of proof is on the applicant to establish admissibility. *See* section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. As noted above, the record establishes that on June 17, 2004, the applicant was denied boarding by Aeroflot officials after it was discovered that the applicant had counterfeit Polish and United Kingdom visas in his passport. The AAO notes that the applicant’s visa application was granted, in part, on the Polish and United Kingdom visas, which established good travel history. Therefore, the AAO finds that the applicant’s misrepresentation was material to his visa application. There is no evidence in the record to support counsel’s contention that the applicant obtained the visas through a travel agency or that the applicant had no knowledge that the visas were fraudulent even after being denied boarding on a flight because of the fraudulent visas. Further, the record reflects that the applicant’s passport contained a fraudulent Port of Entry landing stamp along with the fraudulent United Kingdom visa. Given the fact that the applicant’s passport contained multiple fraudulent visas, a fraudulent entry stamp, and the applicant has failed to provide evidence to support his claim that he was unaware that these were fraudulent, the AAO finds that the applicant’s misrepresentation was willful. Accordingly, the AAO finds that the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) for willfully misrepresenting a material fact in order to seek admission into the United States.

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 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).

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 of Immigration Appeals (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 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. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996); *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 883 (BIA 1994); *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.*

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., Matter of 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). For example, though family separation has been found to be a common result of inadmissibility or removal, separation from family living in the United States can also be the most important single hardship factor in considering hardship in the aggregate. *See Salcido-Salcido*, 138 F.3d at 1293 (quoting *Contreras-Buenfil v. INS*, 712 F.2d 401, 403 (9th Cir. 1983)); *but see Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. at 247 (separation of spouse and children from applicant not extreme hardship due to conflicting evidence in the record and because applicant and spouse had been voluntarily separated from one another for 28 years). Therefore, we consider the totality of the circumstances in determining whether denial of admission would result in extreme hardship to a qualifying relative.

On appeal, counsel states that the applicant's spouse cannot depart the United States, but does not provide any explanation as to why she is unable to do so. The AAO notes that other than counsel's statement that the applicant's wife cannot depart the United States, the applicant has not asserted that his wife will endure hardship should she relocate to the Ukraine. In the absence of clear assertions from the applicant, the AAO may not speculate regarding challenges his wife will face outside the United States. The applicant bears the burden to show extreme hardship to his qualifying relative in these proceedings. *See* section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. In that the record does not include sufficient documentation of financial, medical, emotional or other types of hardship that the applicant's wife would experience if she joined the applicant in the Ukraine, the AAO does not find the applicant to have established that his wife would suffer extreme hardship upon relocation.

In addition, the record also fails to establish extreme hardship to the applicant's wife if she remains in the United States. The AAO notes that other than counsel's statement that "the hardship on the parties will be extreme," no other claims are made in regard to the applicant's wife remaining in the United States. In that the record does not include sufficient documentation of financial, medical, or other types of hardship that the applicant's wife would experience if she remained in the United States, the AAO does not find the applicant to have established that his wife will suffer extreme hardship if his waiver application is denied and she remains in the United States.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's wife 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 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.