

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

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

**PUBLIC COPY**



715

DATE: **JUL 13 2011** Office: LOS ANGELES, CA

FILE:

IN RE: Applicant:

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:

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, with a fee of \$630. 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,

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant is a native and a citizen of the Philippines who entered the United States using a passport and B-2 visa in another person's name. The applicant 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). She is the spouse of a U.S. citizen. The applicant is seeking a waiver under section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i) in order to reside in the United States.

The Field Office Director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that the bar to her admission would impose extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, her U.S. citizen spouse, and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601), January 7, 2009.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that her spouse will suffer extreme hardship if she is required to leave the United States. *Form I-290B*, received February 5, 2009.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) Misrepresentation, states in pertinent part:

- (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 chapter is inadmissible.

The record indicates that the applicant entered the United States with a passport and B-2 visa in another person's name in 1996, and thus entered the United States by materially misrepresenting her identity. Therefore the applicant is inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act. The applicant does not contest her inadmissibility on appeal.

The record also shows that the applicant was convicted of Shoplifting in May, 2002, pursuant to California Penal Code section 484(a). The field office director did not address whether or not this conviction is a crime involving moral turpitude rendering the applicant inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act. Nevertheless, because the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act and demonstrating eligibility for a waiver under section 212(i) also satisfies the requirements for a waiver of criminal grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(h), the AAO will not determine whether the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I).

The record contains, but is not limited to, the following evidence: statements from the applicant's spouse; statements from the applicant; a copy of a marriage certificate for the applicant; court records pertaining to the applicant; a copy of a Letter of [REDACTED] for the applicant's spouse; a copy of a medical record in the form of a letter from [REDACTED] Ph.D., of the [REDACTED] pertaining to the applicant's spouse; and copies of forms related to the applicant's Form I-485 and Form I-130.

The entire record was reviewed and all relevant evidence considered in rendering this decision.

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.

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 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-Moralez*, 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 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.

The applicant states on appeal that the primary basis of hardship to her spouse is that she provides continuous care and aid to him, and that her inadmissibility would result in extreme physical hardship to him. *Form I-290B*, received February 5, 2009. She states that her spouse could not relocate to the Philippines because there would be insufficient medical resources there to provide for his care.

The applicant’s spouse has submitted two statements, and asserts that he would experience extreme hardship if the applicant were removed because of the continual aid he requires for his medical conditions. *Statement of the Applicant’s Spouse*, dated February 1, 2009. He explains that he has diabetes, requiring continuous glucose monitoring and two kinds of insulin injections four times daily, is legally blind and requires someone to drive him to medical appointments and other places, and suffers from arthritis and general instability walking due to hip replacement from an injury. He explained in a previous letter that he and the applicant have three children from previous marriages, all of whom depend on them financially. *Statement of the Applicant’s Spouse*, June 19, 2008.

The record includes two medical records. The first is [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for a device used to monitor glucose. This document supports the assertions by the applicant's spouse that he is a diabetic and that he uses a device to monitor his blood glucose. The second document is a report from one doctor to another discussing in technical terms the applicant's spouse's eye condition. This document, though not in layman's terms, indicates that the applicant's spouse has medical conditions affecting one or both eyes. Although these documents indicate that the applicant's spouse has medical conditions, they do not describe the severity of these conditions or explain the frequency or level of treatment needed by the applicant's spouse. Neither document provides a basic statement confirming any medical diagnoses, or an explanation of the severity of the applicant's spouse's conditions or whether he is able to care for himself.

Further, although the applicant states on appeal that her spouse would be unable to relocate to the Philippines because he would not be able to obtain adequate medical treatment there, the record does not contain any documentation to support this assertion. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *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 has failed to establish that her spouse would experience impacts rising to the level of extreme hardship if he were to relocate to the Philippines.

The applicant has not identified other elements of hardship (financial, emotional, etc.) her spouse may face should he reside in the Philippines. As such, the applicant has failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative upon relocation.

Concerning remaining in the United States, as noted above, the applicant states that she provides continuous care and aid to her spouse. *Form I-290B*, received February 5, 2009. Similarly, the applicant's spouse states that separation for the applicant would cause extreme hardship due to his medical problems and the need for continual aid that the applicant provides. *Statement of the Applicant's Spouse*, dated February 1, 2009. As discussed above, the medical evidence in the record, while sufficient to establish that the applicant's spouse has medical conditions, does not describe the severity of these conditions or explain the frequency or level of treatment needed by the applicant's spouse. Nor is there any evidence in the record indicating that the applicant's spouse would not be able to obtain necessary care in the applicant's absence.

The applicant has not identified other elements of hardship her spouse may face should he reside in the United States without her. Considering the stated hardship factors in aggregate and in light of the lack of supporting evidence in the record, the applicant has not shown that her spouse will suffer extreme hardship should he reside in the United States.

The record, reviewed in its entirety and in light of the *Cervantes-Gonzalez* factors, cited above, does not support a finding that the applicant's spouse faces extreme hardship if the applicant is refused admission. The AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse may need to make adjustments for his daily medical care. However, U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of

removal or inadmissibility are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. *See Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991). 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. 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.

Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361, provides that the burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that he is eligible for the benefit sought. *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.