

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 (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



tt5

FILE: [REDACTED]


Office: CHICAGO, IL

Date: **MAY 02 2011**

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Immigrant Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility pursuant to 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.

Thank you,

for

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Chicago, Illinois and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Macedonia who was found to be inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having attempted to procure admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant is married to a United States 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 in the United States with his spouse and children.

The District Director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed upon a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated May 21, 2008.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant states that the applicant's qualifying relative would suffer extreme hardship should the waiver application be denied. *Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion; Attorney's brief.*

In support of the waiver, counsel submits two briefs. The record also includes, but is not limited to, a statement from the applicant's spouse, bank statements, medical records for the applicant's spouse, W-2 Forms, an employment letter for the applicant, a disability statement for the applicant, tax statements, a Social Security Income statement for the applicant's spouse, a medical statement for the applicant's spouse, a residential lease, a utility bill, a car insurance policy, a payroll report, earnings statements for the applicant, and published country conditions reports. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.

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

- (i) 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.

The record reflects that on July 2, 2001 the applicant attempted to gain admission to the United States at Miami International Airport by using a fraudulent Belgian passport. *Form I-877, Record of Sworn Statement in Administrative Proceeding*, dated July 2, 2001. The applicant expressed a fear of returning to Macedonia due to the war in his country and was referred to an Immigration Judge for an asylum hearing. The Immigration Judge terminated proceedings to allow the applicant to request adjustment of status before United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). *Order of the Immigration Judge*, dated May 26, 2006. As the applicant used a false document in an attempt to gain admission into the United States, the AAO finds the applicant to be inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act.

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 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 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.

If the applicant’s spouse joins the applicant in Macedonia, the applicant needs to establish that his spouse will suffer extreme hardship. The applicant’s spouse was born in the United States and she states that all of her family members reside in the United States. *Attorney’s brief*. She has never visited Macedonia, nor does she speak the language. *Id.* The applicant’s spouse notes that she has been unable to work since suffering a life-threatening car accident several years ago. *Statement from the applicant’s spouse*, undated. She further states that she has undergone 17 surgeries since the time she married the applicant and there have been complications. *Id.* Medical records note that the applicant’s spouse has had multiple back surgeries that require lengthy home care treatment. *Statement from [REDACTED] Associated University Neurosurgeons*, dated April 25, 2005; See Also *medical records for the applicant’s spouse*. She cannot work due to her condition. *Id.*

While the record does not address whether there is available and adequate healthcare in Macedonia for the applicant's spouse, the AAO acknowledges the treatment she has received in the United States and notes that a relocation to Macedonia would interrupt this consistent care. The AAO also acknowledges the impact her health conditions would have upon her adjustment to Macedonia. When looking at the aforementioned factors, particularly the applicant's spouse's lack of familial and cultural ties to Macedonia, her inability to speak the language and the effect this would have upon her adjustment to Macedonia, her inability to work, and the impact her health conditions would have upon her adjustment to Macedonia, the AAO finds that the applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to his spouse if she were to reside in Macedonia.

If the applicant's spouse resides in the United States, the applicant needs to establish that his spouse will suffer extreme hardship. As previously noted, the applicant's spouse was born in the United States. *Birth certificate*. The applicant's spouse notes that she has been unable to work since suffering a life-threatening car accident several years ago. *Statement from the applicant's spouse*, undated. Medical records note that the applicant's spouse has had multiple back surgeries that require lengthy home care treatment. *Statement from [REDACTED], Associated University Neurosurgeons*, dated April 25, 2005; *See Also medical records for the applicant's spouse*. Counsel notes that due to the applicant's spouse's medical condition, she receives minimal income through her Social Security Supplemental disability payment and the applicant has therefore been the couple's primary source of income. *Attorney's brief*. A statement from the Social Security Administration notes that a disability claim for the applicant's spouse has been approved. *Statement from Social Security Administration*, dated June 9, 2004. As of January 2006, the applicant's spouse began to receive \$286.20 a month in Supplemental Security Income. *Statement from Social Security Administration*, dated January 10, 2006. Counsel further asserts that should the applicant be removed from the United States, the applicant's spouse would be forced to find another full-time caregiver, which would be extremely difficult given her limited financial resources. *Attorney's brief*. According to her physician, the applicant's spouse is in need of a full-time caregiver, is homebound and unable to drive, and can only tolerate short car distances. *Statement from [REDACTED], Associated University Neurosurgeons*, dated April 25, 2005. The record also contains documentation of various expenses for the applicant's spouse, including a residential lease, utility bills, and telephone bills. The AAO acknowledges the physical health conditions as documented by licensed healthcare professionals of the applicant's spouse and the impact a separation would have upon her physical and financial well-being. When looking at the aforementioned factors, the AAO finds that the applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to his spouse if she were to reside in the United States.

The AAO additionally finds that the applicant merits a waiver of inadmissibility as a matter of discretion. In discretionary matters, the alien bears the burden of proving eligibility in terms of equities in the United States which are not outweighed by adverse factors. *See Matter of T-S-Y-*, 7 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1957).

The adverse factors in the present case are the applicant's misrepresentation for which he now seeks a waiver. The favorable and mitigating factors are his United States citizen spouse and children, the

extreme hardship to his spouse if he were refused admission, and his supportive relationship with his spouse as documented in the record.

The AAO finds that, although the immigration violations committed by the applicant are serious and cannot be condoned, when taken together, the favorable factors in the present case outweigh the adverse factors, such that a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted.

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 met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be sustained.

**ORDER:** The appeal is sustained.