



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

[REDACTED]

HS

DATE **DEC 20 2012** OFFICE: NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE:

[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 PETITIONER:

[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 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, New York City, New York, and a subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the AAO on a motion. The motion will be granted, but the underlying application remains denied.

The applicant is a native and citizen of India who presented a fraudulent marriage certificate in order to gain immigration benefits. He 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 sought to procure a benefit under the Act through fraud or misrepresentation. The applicant is the spouse of a U.S. Citizen and is the beneficiary of an approved Form I-130 Petition for Alien Relative. He 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.

The Field Office Director concluded that the applicant previously presented a fraudulent marriage certificate in an attempt to gain an immigration benefit, denied doing so in several interviews with USCIS, failed to provide sufficient evidence of extreme hardship to a qualifying relative, and denied the application accordingly. *See Decision of Field Office Director* dated March 26, 2009.

The AAO found the applicant was inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, but he was not subject to the provisions of section 204(c) of the Act. *See Decision of AAO*, September 29, 2011. The AAO further found the applicant did not demonstrate that his qualifying relative would experience extreme hardship given his inadmissibility. *Id.*

On motion, counsel submits a declaration from the applicant's spouse as well as a psychological evaluation. In the declaration, the spouse indicates she suffers from infertility, which has led to depression. She claims she will be unable to live without the applicant due to her psychological and medical conditions, and that she cannot relocate to India because she will not have comparable medical and psychological care there.

The record includes, but is not limited, to, the documents listed above, a brief, declarations from the applicant and his spouse, marriage, divorce, birth, and naturalization certificates, and documentation of the applicant's other immigration applications and petitions. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

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 [Secretary] may, in the discretion of the [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 [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 reflects that in 2004, the applicant submitted a fraudulent marriage certificate indicating he was married to a U.S. Citizen on connection with a Form I-130, Petition for Alien Relative, as well as a Form I-485, Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status. Inadmissibility is not contested on motion. The AAO therefore affirms that the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for having attempted to procure a benefit under the Act through fraud or misrepresentation. The applicant's qualifying relative for a waiver of this inadmissibility is his U.S. Citizen spouse.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides that a waiver of the bar to admission is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship on a qualifying family member. Once extreme hardship is established, it is but one favorable factor to be considered in the determination of whether the Secretary should exercise discretion. *See Matter of Mendez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (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-I-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 spouse contends she would experience psychological hardship without the applicant present. She claims she wanted to have children with the applicant, but struggled with infertility. The spouse indicates because of her infertility and the applicant’s immigration problems she developed depression, asserting without the applicant she would have ended up in a mental hospital or even taken her own life. A psychological evaluation is included on motion. Therein, a licensed psychologist opines the spouse has been depressed for 10 years, and has had thoughts of suicide. The psychologist reports that the spouse has had psychotherapy, which was helpful, and takes Xanax. The psychologist diagnoses the applicant’s spouse with major depressive disorder and anxiety disorder, adding that 15% of all people with major depressive disorder die by suicide, but that the spouse denies having any suicidal or homicidal ideations.

The applicant’s spouse asserts that she will not be able to relocate to India because medical and psychological treatment there is inferior. On appeal the spouse claimed that Indian culture is very different from hers. Former counsel for the applicant moreover contended that the spouse would experience hardship because she is not Indian, does not speak Punjabi, would have no relevant job

skills, and she does not have any legal status in India. Former counsel additionally stated that the spouse would suffer in India due to the poor country conditions.

The spouse's claim that she has psychological problems stemming from her infertility issues, though mentioned in the psychological evaluation, is not supported by evidence, such as a letter from a treating physician, demonstrating she has obtained medical consultations or treatment for fertility. Furthermore, although the psychologist indicates the spouse underwent successful psychotherapy and took Xanax, the record does not contain any evidence corroborating these assertions. As noted on appeal, although the spouse's assertions are relevant and have been taken into consideration, little weight can be afforded them in the absence of supporting evidence. See *Matter of Kwan*, 14 I&N Dec. 175 (BIA 1972) ("Information in an affidavit should not be disregarded simply because it appears to be hearsay; in administrative proceedings, that fact merely affects the weight to be afforded it."). Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *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)). Consequently, without supporting documentation on the spouse's fertility issues or on her past treatment, the AAO is unable to give significant weight to the emotional hardship as stated in the psychological evaluation.

While the AAO acknowledges that the applicant's spouse would face difficulties as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility, we do not find evidence of record to demonstrate that her hardship would rise above the distress normally created when families are separated as a result of inadmissibility or removal. In that the record fails to provide sufficient evidence to establish the medical, emotional, or other impacts of separation on the applicant's spouse are cumulatively above and beyond the hardships commonly experienced, the AAO cannot conclude that she would suffer extreme hardship if the waiver application is denied and the applicant returns to India without his spouse.

The record does not contain supporting evidence on counsel's or the spouse's assertions of hardship upon relocation to India. The AAO again notes that without sufficient corroborating evidence, the spouse's assertions can be given little weight. Similarly, without supporting evidence, assertions of counsel will not satisfy the applicant's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. See *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 n.2 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1, 3 n.2 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

The AAO notes that relocation to India would entail separation from family members who live in the United States as well as other difficulties. However, we do not find evidence of record to show that the spouse's difficulties would rise above the hardship commonly created when families relocate as a result of inadmissibility or removal. In that the record lacks sufficient evidence to demonstrate the emotional, financial, medical, or other impacts of relocation on the applicant's spouse are in the aggregate above and beyond the hardships normally experienced, the AAO cannot conclude that she would experience extreme hardship if the waiver application is denied and the applicant's spouse relocates to India.

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 his U.S. Citizen spouse as required under section 212(i) of the Act. As the applicant has not established extreme hardship to a qualifying family member no purpose would be served in determining whether the applicant merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for a waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(i) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, although the motion is granted, the underlying application remains denied.

ORDER: The motion is granted, but the underlying application remains denied.