

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**



HLS



DATE: AUG 14 2012

Office: VIENNA

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.

Thank you,



Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Vienna, Austria. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained. The matter will be returned to the field office director for continued processing.

The applicant is a citizen of Ukraine 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 having attempted to obtain a visa, other documentation or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under the Act by fraud or willful misrepresentation. Specifically, the applicant attempted to procure an immigrant visa by posing to be the wife of a Diversity Visa Lottery Program winner from Moldova. The applicant is applying for a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to sections 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i), and 212(h) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h), in order to reside in the United States with her lawful permanent resident spouse and child.

The field office director found that the applicant had 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. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated June 2, 2010.

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.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides:

- (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 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 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. The applicant's lawful permanent resident spouse is the only qualifying relative in this case. Hardship to the applicant or the child can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. 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 applicant's lawful permanent resident spouse contends that he will suffer emotional and financial hardship were he to reside in the United States while his spouse remains abroad due to her inadmissibility. In a declaration, the applicant's spouse explains that it is very hard to be alone in the United States while his wife and young child reside in Ukraine. He asserts that he worries about them all the time, is unable to sleep, has lost weight, and feels sadness. *Affidavit of* [REDACTED]

In support, a psychological evaluation has been provided from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], confirming that the applicant's spouse is suffering from Major Depressive Disorder and Acute Stress Disorder. [REDACTED] note that the applicant's spouse is receiving psychotherapy on an ongoing basis due to his depression and stress. [REDACTED] maintain that it is essential that the applicant's spouse continue psychotherapy sessions and moreover, that he be constantly monitored to ensure that his depression does not lead to suicidal thoughts or actions. Finally, [REDACTED] note that adding antidepressants and anti-anxiety medication to the applicant's spouse's treatment plan is highly recommended. *Psychological Evaluation Report, Human Resource Associates*, dated September 7, 2010. In addition, a letter has been provided from the applicant's spouse's employer, [REDACTED] confirming that the applicant's spouse is a hard worker but as a result of his family responsibilities, he has been unable to put in the required time commitment necessary to be promoted to supervisor. *Letter from* [REDACTED], dated June 24, 2010. Finally, a letter has been provided from the applicant's spouse's pastor requesting that the applicant's spouse be reunited with his family in the United States. *Letter from* [REDACTED] dated June 19, 2010. The record reflects that the cumulative effect of the emotional, psychological and professional hardship the applicant's spouse is experiencing due to the applicant's inadmissibility rises to the level of extreme. The AAO thus concludes that were the applicant unable to reside in the United States due to her inadmissibility, the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship if he remains in the United States.

With respect to relocating abroad to reside with the applicant as a result of her inadmissibility, the applicant's spouse contends that life in Ukraine is very hard as a result of poverty, an unstable economy and high inflation. He maintains that it is almost impossible to make money. The applicant's spouse explains that although he obtained a law degree, he was unable to find any work using his degree and was only able to occasionally work as a part-time driver. The applicant's spouse further details that his parents owned a restaurant that provided a living for them but as a result of the financial crisis in Ukraine, they can barely make ends meet and his father has had to

obtain a second job. Alternatively, since being in the United States, the applicant's spouse maintains that he was able to obtain gainful employment and was promoted in just one month and he is now making more than ten times as much money as he did in Ukraine. *Supra* at 1-2.

The record reflects that the applicant's spouse has ties to the United States, including the presence of his brother-in-law, whom he lives with in the Chicago area, and his child. In addition, the record confirms that the applicant's spouse is gainfully employed, has been promoted from general laborer to crew leader, and is on track to be promoted again to accounts supervisor. Moreover, the record establishes that the applicant's spouse is active in his church and has established roots in the United States. Finally, counsel has provided documentation establishing the substandard economy in Ukraine, including a statement from the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy of Ukraine Public Job Centre, establishing the applicant's spouse's periods of unemployment while in Ukraine and his periods of employment as a driver, despite having a law degree, and an affidavit from the applicant's spouse's parents detailing the financial hardships they are experiencing in Ukraine. It has thus been established that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship were he to relocate abroad to reside with the applicant due to her inadmissibility.

Accordingly, the AAO finds that the situation presented in this application rises to the level of extreme hardship. However, the grant or denial of the waiver does not turn only on the issue of the meaning of "extreme hardship." It also hinges on the discretion of the Secretary and pursuant to such terms, conditions and procedures as he may by regulations prescribe. 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).

In evaluating whether . . . relief is warranted in the exercise of discretion, the factors adverse to the alien 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 and seriousness, and the presence of other evidence indicative of the 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 alien began 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 or service in 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).

See Matter of Mendez-Morales, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996). The AAO must then, "[B]alance the adverse factors evidencing an alien's undesirability as a permanent resident with the social and

humane considerations presented on the alien's behalf to determine whether the grant of relief in the exercise of discretion appears to be in the best interests of the country. " *Id.* at 300. (Citations omitted).

The favorable factors in this matter are the extreme hardship the applicant's spouse and child would face if the applicant were to remain in Ukraine, regardless of whether they accompanied the applicant or remained in the United States, the apparent lack of a criminal record and letters in support. The unfavorable factor in this matter is the applicant's fraud and/or willful misrepresentation, as outlined above.

The immigration violation committed by the applicant is serious in nature and cannot be condoned. Nonetheless, the AAO finds that the applicant has established that the favorable factors in her application outweigh the unfavorable factor. Therefore, a favorable exercise of the Secretary's 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 establishing that the application merits approval remains entirely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The applicant has sustained that burden. Accordingly, this appeal will be sustained and the application approved.

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