

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  
*Office of Administrative Appeals*  
20 Massachusetts Ave. NW MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090  
**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**



HS


DATE: APR 30 2012 OFFICE: PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

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.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Perry Rhew".

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant is a native and citizen of Colombia 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 seeking to procure a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under the Act by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), in order to remain in the United States with his U.S. citizen spouse and child and lawful permanent resident parents.

The Field Office Director concluded that the applicant failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. See *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated October 16, 2009.

On appeal counsel asserts that evidence was presented to show substantial hardship to the qualifying relative sufficient to warrant a grant of an I-601 waiver. See *Form I-290*, Notice of Appeal or Motion, received November 17, 2009.

The record contains, but is not limited to: Form I-290B and counsel's letter; various immigration applications and petitions; affidavits and letters; medical, financial, marriage and birth records; and country conditions printouts. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision on the appeal.

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

- (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 the applicant entered the United States on March 20, 2002 by presenting a photo-substituted Costa Rican passport and B-2 visa, to which he admitted during his adjustment of status interview. Based upon the foregoing, the applicant was found to be inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, 8 USC § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i). The record supports this finding, the applicant does not contest inadmissibility, and the AAO concurs that the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C) 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 applicant's child can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. In the present case, the applicant's spouse, mother, and father are his only qualifying relatives. 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 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 record reflects that the applicant’s mother and father are lawful permanent residents and thus qualifying relatives for the purpose of his waiver application. The applicant asserts in his affidavit that he financially provides for his parents and for his sister in Colombia from his U.S. earnings. He states that he has given a job to his father who assists in some contractual work. While an unemployment statement for the week of October 31 to November 7, 2009 shows that the applicant’s father filed a claim for unemployment benefits on August 30, 2009, no documentary evidence has been submitted which demonstrates financial assistance by the applicant. The AAO acknowledges that separation from the applicant may cause various difficulties for the applicant’s mother and father. The difficulties described, however, do not take the present case beyond those hardships ordinarily associated with removal or inadmissibility of a family member, and the evidence in the record is insufficient to demonstrate that the challenges to the qualifying relative(s), when considered cumulatively, meet the extreme hardship standard.

In regards to the applicant’s spouse, the record reflects that she is a 28-year-old native and citizen of the United States. She states that her husband is the love of her life, best friend, and they rely on each other for everything. The applicant’s spouse contends that her husband’s immigration situation has caused her “extreme psychological and emotional distress” including insomnia, hopelessness, depression, worry, anxiety, crying all the time, and difficulty concentrating. She asserts that she also suffers intense migraines. In a letter dated November 6, 2009, [REDACTED] indicates that the applicant’s spouse is under her care for depression and anxiety and requires an antidepressant and regular office visits to monitor her emotional status. Evidence has been submitted establishing antidepressant medications prescribed to the applicant’s spouse.

The applicant's spouse further states that she would be unable to afford her mortgage without her husband's income. She explains that she would have to pay for daycare and a babysitter in the absence of her husband who is their daughter's primary caregiver when the applicant's spouse is at work. The applicant's spouse contends that she would also have to support her husband if he is removed because he will be unable to find work in Colombia.

The AAO has considered cumulatively all assertions of separation-related hardship to the applicant's spouse including the physical, emotional, psychological, and economic impact of the applicant's removal. Considered in the aggregate, the AAO finds that the evidence is sufficient to demonstrate that the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse would suffer extreme hardship due to separation from the applicant.

No assertions of relocation-related hardship have been made concerning the applicant's parents. As for the applicant's spouse, she states that it would be very difficult for her to uproot from the United States and relocate to a country with which she is unfamiliar. She notes that she was born and raised in the United States and has no ties to Colombia. She further notes that she has been working in the same residential facility for the developmentally disabled since December 2003 and it would be an extreme hardship to give up a job she has worked so hard for and to which she is so committed. Finally, the applicant's spouse indicates that she is afraid of violence in Colombia and fears for her own safety and that of her young daughter. A number of supporting Colombia country conditions printouts have been submitted establishing the problematic country conditions in Colombia. The AAO notes that the U.S. Department of State has issued a Travel Warning for Colombia. *Travel Warning, U.S. Department of State*, dated February 21, 2012.

The AAO has considered cumulatively all assertions of relocation-related hardship to the applicant's spouse including adjustment to a country in which she has never resided and has no ties outside her husband; U.S. home ownership and loss of U.S. employment, income, and any employment-related benefits; ties to extended family, friends and community in the United States; physical, medical, emotional, safety, employment, and economic concerns regarding Colombia. Considered in the aggregate, the AAO finds that the evidence is sufficient to demonstrate that the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse would suffer extreme hardship were she to relocate to Colombia to be with the applicant.

Extreme hardship is a requirement for eligibility, but once established it is but one favorable discretionary factor to be considered. *Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996). For waivers of inadmissibility, the burden is on the applicant to establish that a grant of a waiver of inadmissibility is warranted in the exercise of discretion. *Id.* at 299. The adverse factors evidencing an alien's undesirability as a permanent resident must be balanced with the social and humane considerations presented on his behalf to determine whether the grant of relief in the exercise of discretion appears to be in the best interests of this country. *Id.* at 300.

The AAO notes that *Matter of Marin*, 16 I & N Dec. 581 (BIA 1978), involving a section 212(c) waiver, is used in waiver cases as guidance for balancing favorable and unfavorable factors and this cross application of standards is supported by the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). In *Matter of*

*Mendez-Moralez*, the BIA, assessing the exercise of discretion under section 212(h) of the Act, stated:

We find this use of *Matter of Marin, supra*, as a general guide to be appropriate. For the most part, it is prudent to avoid cross application, as between different types of relief, of particular principles or standards for the exercise of discretion. *Id.* However, our reference to *Matter of Marin, supra*, is only for the purpose of the approach taken in that case regarding the balancing of favorable and unfavorable factors within the context of the relief being sought under section 212(h)(1)(B) of the Act. *See, e.g., Palmer v. INS*, 4 F.3d 482 (7th Cir.1993) (balancing of discretionary factors under section 212(h)). We find this guidance to be helpful and applicable, given that both forms of relief address the question of whether aliens with criminal records should be admitted to the United States and allowed to reside in this country permanently.

*Matter of Mendez-Moralez* at 300.

In *Matter of Mendez-Moralez*, in evaluating whether section 212(h)(1)(B) relief is warranted in the exercise of discretion, the BIA stated that:

The factors adverse to the applicant include the nature and underlying circumstances of the exclusion ground at issue, the presence of additional significant violations of this country's immigration laws, the existence of a criminal record and, if so, its nature, recency and seriousness, and the presence of other evidence indicative of an alien's bad character or undesirability as a permanent resident of this country. . . . The favorable considerations include family ties in the United States, residence of long duration in this country (particularly where the alien began his residency at a young age), evidence of hardship to the alien and his family if he is excluded and deported, service in this country's Armed Forces, a history of stable employment, the existence of property or business ties, evidence of value and service to the community, evidence of genuine rehabilitation if a criminal record exists, and other evidence attesting to the alien's good character (e.g., affidavits from family, friends, and responsible community representatives)

... *Id.* at 301.

The BIA further states that upon review of the record as a whole, a balancing of the equities and adverse matters must be made to determine whether discretion should be favorably exercised. The equities that the applicant for section 212(h)(1)(B) relief must bring forward to establish that he merits a favorable exercise of administrative discretion will depend in each case on the nature and circumstances of the ground of exclusion sought to be waived and on the presence of any additional adverse matters, and as the negative factors grow more serious, it becomes incumbent upon the applicant to introduce additional offsetting favorable evidence. *Id.* at 301.

The favorable factors in the present case include extreme hardship to the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse and child and lawful permanent resident parents, the applicant's gainful employment in the United States, home ownership, and the applicant's significant family ties to the United States. The unfavorable factors are the applicant's misrepresentation, as outlined in detail above, and unauthorized presence and employment in the United States.

Although the applicant's violations of immigration law are significant and cannot be condoned, the positive factors in this case outweigh the negative factors. Therefore, the AAO finds that a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted.

In these proceedings, the burden of establishing eligibility for the waiver rests entirely with the applicant. *See* section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. In this case, the applicant has met his burden and the appeal will be sustained.

**ORDER:** The appeal is sustained. The application is approved.