

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: **JUN 06 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:



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 China who provided false information to obtain a visa to enter the United States. 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 wife 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) on December 15, 2008.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant asserts that the Field Office Director abused his discretion in denying the waiver application and failed to consider all of the factors and evidence submitted to establish extreme hardship. *Form I-290B*, received January 14, 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 obtained a U.S. visa through fraud or willful misrepresentation and used that visa to enter the United States on April 23, 2003. Therefore the applicant is inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act. The applicant does not contest this finding.

The record contains documents filed in relation to the applicant's asylum proceeding and documents filed in relation to her Form I-130 and Form I-864. With regard to her Form I-601, the record contains, but is not limited to, the following evidence: a brief from counsel for the applicant; a statement from the applicant; a statement from the applicant's spouse; a psychological profile of the applicant's spouse by [REDACTED] dated January 10, 2009; a brief statement from [REDACTED] dated January 7, 2009; and photographs of the applicant and her spouse.

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-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 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 a qualifying relative, 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 AAO will first consider hardship upon relocation. An examination of the record reveals that neither counsel nor the applicant has sufficiently articulated any basis of hardship if the applicant’s spouse were to relocate to China with the applicant. Counsel asserts that Field Office Director abused his discretion by failing to consider all the factors and evidence submitted to establish extreme hardship; however counsel has failed to specifically articulate how hardship factors, such as those listed above, are present in this case. The AAO cannot construct assertions or presume facts on behalf of an applicant. Merely referencing prior cases with guidance on establishing extreme hardship is not sufficient to establish that the hardship factors apply in this case.

The record contains a psychological examination of the applicant’s spouse in which the psychologist makes ancillary assertions with regard to relocating to China, however there is no evidence to support these claims and they have not been made by the applicant or her authorized representative. The record also contains the a copy of the Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, section on China,

released by the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, U.S. Department of State, March 6, 2007. However, generalized country conditions materials are not sufficient to establish that a particular person will experience hardship factors without evidence that they specifically relate to that person. In this case there is insufficient evidence to establish any uncommon hardship factors to the applicant's spouse if he were to relocate to China with the applicant.

With regard to hardship upon separation, counsel for the applicant has asserted that the applicant's spouse will experience extreme emotional hardship. *Brief in Support of Appeal*, dated January 20, 2009. Counsel also makes other generalized references to case law but fails to articulate how these hardship factors specifically apply to the applicant in this case. Counsel previously asserted that the applicant's spouse would be tormented emotionally if the applicant were forced to return to China because he believes that she was previously persecuted in China and would be discriminated against because of her Christianity. *Applicant's Hardship Waiver Brief*, dated October 29, 2007.

The applicant's spouse submitted a statement asserting that he is experiencing emotional hardship due to the possible separation from his spouse and that it affects his work productivity. *Statement of the Applicant's spouse*, dated November 1, 2007.

The record contains a psychological examination of the applicant's spouse by [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] narrates the applicant's spouse's condition as relayed to him by the applicant's spouse and concludes that the applicant's spouse is suffering from Major Depression. *Examination of [REDACTED]* [REDACTED] dated January 10, 2009. Although the input of any mental health professional is respected and valuable, the AAO notes that the submitted letter is based on a single interview between the applicant's spouse and the [REDACTED]. The record fails to reflect an ongoing relationship between a mental health professional and the applicant's spouse or any history of treatment for the generalized Major Depression suffered by him. Moreover, the conclusions reached in the submitted evaluation, being based on a single interview, do not reflect the insight and elaboration commensurate with an established relationship with a psychologist, thereby rendering the [REDACTED] findings speculative and out of context, diminishing the evaluation's value to a determination of extreme hardship.

The record also contains country conditions materials on China. As noted above, these generalized materials do not support counsel's assertion that the applicant would be persecuted because any previously claimed political activity or because she has converted to Christianity. In addition, the AAO does not have the jurisdiction or ability to determine the authenticity of claims of political persecution. While the AAO does not discount assertions by the applicant's spouse that he would be experience emotional hardship regarding the applicant's return to China, evidence in the record does not justify his perception that she would experience persecution based on any previous political activities in China or due to her conversion to Christianity. Nonetheless, the AAO will give some consideration to [REDACTED]'s examination and the emotional impact of separation on the applicant's spouse.

The AAO also notes that, as of January 7, 2009, the applicant was pregnant. As discussed above, however, hardship to an applicant or their child is not directly relevant to a determination of extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. In this case, while the AAO can reasonably presume that the applicant's spouse might experience some emotional hardship due to potential separation from the applicant and their child if the child were to return to China, the record fails to establish that any hardship from this separation would rise above the common impacts of separation to a degree that would indirectly result in hardship to the applicant's spouse.

The record does not indicate that the applicant's spouse will experience any physical, medical or financial hardships. While the AAO acknowledges that the applicant's spouse will experience emotional hardship if he remains in the United States without the applicant, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that this hardship, even when combined with other hardship factors, will be extreme. The AAO recognizes the significance of family separation as a hardship factor, but concludes that the hardship articulated in this case, based on the evidence in this record, does not rise above the common result of removal or inadmissibility and thus does not constitute extreme hardship. 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.