

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

#5

[REDACTED]

Date: **DEC 11 2012** Office: CHICAGO, ILLINOIS [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:

[REDACTED]

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 AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Acting Field Office Director, Chicago, Illinois, 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 China 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 procure admission to the United States through fraud or the willful misrepresentation of material facts. The record indicates that the applicant is married to a lawful permanent resident of the United States and is the mother of two U.S. citizen children. She is the derivative beneficiary of her husband's approved Petition for Alien Worker (Form I-140). 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 her spouse and children.

The Acting Field Office Director found that the applicant 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 Acting Field Office Director*, dated September 6, 2011.

On appeal, the applicant, through counsel, asserts that the Acting Field Office Director erred in denying the applicant's waiver application because she "applied the incorrect legal standard," "assumed facts not in the record and made factual conclusions [beyond her] authority to do so." *Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion*, filed October 7, 2011. Counsel also requests 30 days in order to submit a brief or additional evidence. As of the date of this decision, no additional statements or evidence have been submitted; therefore, the record is considered complete, and the AAO shall render a decision based upon the evidence now before it.

The record includes, but is not limited to, statements from the applicant, medical documents for the applicant's husband, school records and certificates for the applicant's children, and financial documents. 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) 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(i) of the Act provides, in pertinent part, that:

- (1) The [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.

A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(i) of the Act is dependent first 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 her children can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's husband 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 United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (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 of Immigration Appeals (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 v. INS*, 138 F.3d 1292, 1293 (9th Cir. 1998) (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.

In the present case, the record indicates that on December 29, 1997, the applicant attempted to enter the United States with her B-2 nonimmigrant visa. During secondary inspection she gave false statements under oath regarding her ties to the United States. She was denied entry into the United States and allowed to withdraw her application for admission. She later entered without inspection from Canada. Based on the applicant’s misrepresentations, the AAO finds that she is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act. The applicant does not dispute this finding.

The record contains references to hardship the applicant’s children would experience if the waiver application were denied. It is noted that Congress did not include hardship to an alien’s child as a factor to be considered in assessing extreme hardship. In the present case, the applicant’s spouse is the only qualifying relative for the waiver under section 212(i) of the Act, and hardship to the applicant’s children will not be separately considered, except as it may affect the applicant’s spouse.

Describing the hardship her husband would suffer should he join her in China, in her statement dated June 26, 2011, the applicant claims that her husband suffers from “chronic health problems” and would not receive the same quality medical care in China as he does in the United States. Medical documentation establishes that the applicant’s husband had surgery for a small-bowel obstruction on October 21, 2009, and he was discharged in stable condition two days later. However, no documentary evidence has been submitted showing that he suffers from chronic health conditions that require ongoing medical treatment. Additionally, the applicant claims her husband would have “limited” employment opportunities in China, without specifying how these opportunities are limited. Moreover, she asserts that their children cannot “survive” there because they are American.

The AAO acknowledges that the applicant's husband is a lawful permanent resident of the United States, and that relocation abroad would involve some hardship. However, the applicant's husband is a native and citizen of China, and it has not been established that he cannot communicate in the native language, that he is unfamiliar with the customs and cultures of China, or that he has no family ties there. Regarding the medical hardships to the applicant's husband, no documentary evidence was submitted establishing that he cannot receive medical treatment for his medical conditions in China or that he has to remain in the United States to receive treatment. 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 was submitted establishing that the applicant's husband currently suffers from any medical conditions. Moreover, though the applicant's children may suffer some hardship in joining the applicant in China, they are not qualifying relatives, and the applicant has not shown that this hardship to their children would elevate her husband's challenges to an extreme level. Therefore, based on the record before it, the AAO finds that, considering the potential hardships in the aggregate, the applicant has failed to establish that her husband would suffer extreme hardship if he relocated to China.

Concerning the applicant's husband's hardship in the United States, as noted above, the applicant claims her husband's chronic health problems require "monitoring and treatment for the rest of his life." Additionally, she states she must prepare "special foods" for him. However, the applicant submits no documentary evidence to corroborate her claims that her husband requires monitoring or treatment for any medical conditions or that he requires a special diet because of his medical conditions. Moreover, the applicant claims her husband would suffer emotionally by being separated from her and their children.

The applicant claims she is the primary caretaker of the family while her husband is the financial provider. She states that if she cannot remain in the United States, he will suffer financially because he would be unable to work full-time while taking care of their children. He will be unable to pay their mortgage and most likely will lose their home.

The AAO acknowledges that the applicant's husband may suffer emotional difficulties in being separated from the applicant. While it is understood that the separation of spouses often results in significant psychological challenges, the applicant has not distinguished her husband's emotional hardship upon separation from that which is typically faced by the spouses of those deemed inadmissible. Moreover, though the applicant refers to financial difficulties, the record does not contain evidence showing that he would be unable to support himself in the applicant's absence. Additionally, the applicant has not distinguished her husband's financial challenges from those commonly experienced when a family member remains in the United States. Further, the record does not contain documentary evidence establishing that the applicant would be unable to obtain employment in China and, thereby, financially assist her husband from outside the United States. Based on the record before it, the AAO finds that the applicant has failed to establish that her husband would suffer extreme hardship if her waiver application is denied and he remains in the United States.

In this case, the record does not contain sufficient evidence to show that the hardships faced by the qualifying relative, considered in the aggregate, rise beyond the common results of removal or inadmissibility to the level of extreme hardship. The AAO therefore finds that the applicant has failed to

establish extreme hardship to her lawful permanent resident spouse as required under section 212(i) of the Act. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, the AAO finds 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.