


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**



115

Date: **MAY 13 2011**

Office: ACCRA, GHANA

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 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, Accra, Ghana, 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 Ghana 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 attempting to seek admission into the United States through fraud or the willful misrepresentation of a material fact. The record indicates that the applicant is married to a United States citizen and is 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 her 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 May 12, 2008. On June 2, 2008, the applicant through counsel filed a motion to reopen the Field Office Director's decision. On February 11, 2009, the Field Office Director reopened the applicant's waiver application but ultimately denied the waiver application again finding no extreme hardship. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated February 11, 2009.

On appeal, the applicant, through counsel, asserts that United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) erred in determining that the applicant is inadmissible to the United States for misrepresentation. *Form I-290B*, filed March 9, 2009.

The record includes, but is not limited to, counsel's motion to reopen and documents from the applicant's removal proceeding. 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 March 25, 2002, the applicant attempted to enter the United States by presenting a passport and visa in another individual's name.

On appeal, counsel contends that as stated on the Notice to Alien Ordered Removed/Departure Verification (Form I-296), dated March 25, 2002, the applicant was only inadmissible to the United States for five years. Counsel claims that "[e]ven though [the applicant] was indeed inadmissible under 212 (a)(6)(C)(i), it was only for a five year period only." Therefore, "[a]s of May 4, 2007, the date of the interview by the consulate, [the applicant] was no longer inadmissible."

The AAO finds counsel's contention that the applicant is not still 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. The AAO notes that not only is the applicant inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for her attempted entry into the United States through misrepresentation, but she was also inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9) for her expedited removal. Counsel is correct that the period of time that the applicant was inadmissible to the United States for her expedited removal was five (5) years from the date of her removal. However, the five year timeframe relating to an application for permission to reapply for admission following an expedited removal does not apply to inadmissibility based on misrepresentation under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act. Therefore, the applicant remains inadmissible for her misrepresentation. *See* section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act.

Additionally, the AAO notes that counsel claims that the applicant "did not make false statements while under oath. She told the interviewing officer the truth about her misguided and ill advised trip to the United States using a fraudulent passport." *See counsel's motion to reopen*, undated. Counsel states that "[o]n March 25, 2002, the applicant attempted to enter the United States on a fraudulent passport. When she was apprehended, applicant confessed and stated that she had used a third party to obtain her entry visa. She also confessed that she had used her sister's identity and passport as a vehicle for her fraudulent passport." However, the record establishes that on March 25, 2002, under oath, the applicant refused to give her complete and correct name, she stated her birth date was the date listed in the passport, she claimed to be married to "██████████," and she stated she was the same person listed in the passport. *See record of sworn statement in proceedings under section 235(b)(1) of the Act*, dated March 25, 2002. The AAO also notes that the applicant refused to tell the immigration officer how much she paid for the visa. *Id.* Therefore, it does not appear that the applicant was forthcoming during her sworn statement about her correct name and how she obtained

the passport and visa to enter the United States. Further, the AAO notes that on appeal, counsel clearly admits that the applicant attempted to enter the United States by presenting a visa in another individual's name. 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).

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 (Board) 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 first prong of the analysis addresses hardship to the applicant’s spouse if he relocates to Ghana. The applicant has not asserted that her husband will endure hardship should he relocate to Ghana. In the absence of clear assertions from the applicant, the AAO may not speculate regarding challenges her husband will face outside the United States. The applicant bears the burden to show extreme hardship to a 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 husband would experience if he joined the applicant in Ghana, the AAO finds that the applicant has not established that her husband would suffer extreme hardship upon relocation.

In addition, the record also fails to establish extreme hardship to the applicant’s husband if he remains in the United States. Counsel claims that the applicant’s husband will face hardship “in having to take care of his very young daughter,” maintaining “two households,” paying “for day

care,” and continuing “to do all a single parent has to do.” The AAO notes the concerns of the applicant’s husband.

The AAO notes that the applicant’s husband may be experiencing some financial hardship in being separated from the applicant; however, the applicant has not provided any documentation to establish her husband’s financial obligations or economic situation. Going on record without supporting documentation is not sufficient to meet the applicant’s burden of proof in this proceeding. *See 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)). Additionally, no documentation has been submitted establishing that the applicant’s daughter resides with her husband in the United States. Further, the AAO notes that the applicant has submitted no evidence to establish that she cannot obtain employment in Ghana and, thereby, reduce the financial burden on her husband. Based on the record before it, the AAO finds that the applicant has failed to establish that her husband will suffer extreme hardship if her waiver application is denied and he 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 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 under section 212(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.