

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090  
20 Massachusetts Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services



#5

DATE: DEC 20 2012

Office: SAN JOSE, CA

FILE: 

IN RE: 

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility pursuant to 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,

Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by Field Office Director, San Jose, California, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico 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 having procured admission to the United States through fraud or misrepresentation. The applicant is the spouse of a U.S. citizen, the daughter of a lawful permanent resident, and is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative. 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 father.

In a decision, dated June 30, 2011, the field office director found that the applicant had not established extreme hardship to her U.S. citizen spouse or parents as a result of her inadmissibility. The application was denied accordingly.

On appeal, counsel states that the applicant is pregnant, suffering from gestational diabetes, and is due to have her baby in November 2011. He states that this fact presents substantially more evidence of extreme hardship to be suffered by the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse. Counsel also states that the field office director's decision contained numerous misstatements, inconsistencies, and ambiguities. Finally, counsel asserts that the field office director's failure to exercise discretion was contrary to well established law.

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.

(ii) Falsely claiming citizenship. –

(I) In General –

Any alien who falsely represents, or has falsely represented himself or herself to be a citizen of the United States for any purpose or benefit under this Act . . . is inadmissible.

The record reflects that on February 3, 1995, the applicant attempted to enter the United States by presenting a California birth certificate belonging to someone else. The applicant stated to a border patrol officer that she was a U.S. citizen and was born in Salinas, California. After an hour of questioning the applicant stated that she was in fact born in Mexico, but still failed to give the officer her true name or date of birth. Thus, the applicant attempted to procure admission to the United States by falsely claiming U.S. citizenship and is therefore inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act.

The provisions of Section 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) relating to false claims to U.S. citizenship were added to the Act as part of Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA). The Act currently allows no waiver for false claims to U.S. citizenship. However, if the false claim was made prior to the enactment of IIRIRA, September 30, 1996, it is treated as misrepresentation under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act and the alien is eligible to apply for a waiver under section 212(i). See *Memorandum by Lori Schialabba, Associate Director, RAIO, Donald Neufeld, Associate Director, Domestic Operations Directorate, Pearl Chang, Acting Chief, Policy and Strategy, dated March 3, 2009*. The applicant's qualifying relatives are her U.S. citizen spouse and her lawful permanent resident father.

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.

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-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. I.N.S.*, 138 F.3d 1292 (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.

The record contains references to hardship the applicant’s child would experience if the waiver application were denied. It is noted that Congress did not include hardship to an alien’s children 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 child will not be separately considered, except as it may affect the applicant’s spouse and/or father.

The record of hardship includes two statements from the applicant, two statements from the applicant’s spouse, medical documentation, a lease agreement, and other financial documentation.

The AAO notes that no evidence of hardship to the applicant’s father has been presented, thus, we will only review hardship to the applicant’s spouse. We note further that the applicant’s pregnancy and gestational diabetes will not be considered because as of the time of writing the applicant should have had her baby. No further documentation has been submitted to indicate that there are other medical problems at issue.

The applicant claims that her spouse is extremely worried about her immigration situation. She states that he is fearful about relocating to Mexico because he does not want to raise his child in Mexico with poor school systems, a lack of health care, extreme poverty, no ability to find employment, and drug violence. The record indicates that the applicant's spouse has lived his whole adult life in the United States. However, the record indicates that the applicant's spouse's brothers and the applicant's parents reside in Mexico.

The record indicates that the applicant is the main source of income for the family, earning approximately \$45,000 per year as a fork lift operator for a packing company and that her spouse earns approximately \$4,000 per year as a landscaper, handyman, and carpenter. The applicant's spouse states that he and the applicant are very close and it would be emotionally hard to be separated.

Based on the current record, the AAO cannot find that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship as a result of relocation or as a result of separation. In regards to relocation, no documentation was submitted to support the statements regarding country conditions in Mexico. We acknowledge that the U.S. State Department has issued a travel warning for certain areas within Mexico due to increased levels of violence in these areas. However, nothing in the record indicates that the applicant and her family would be relocating to one of these areas and/or would be at risk for experiencing these problems. Similarly, the record does not indicate that individuals with the work backgrounds of the applicant and her spouse would not be able to find employment in Mexico.

In regards to separation, we acknowledge that the applicant is the primary wage earner in the marriage, but the record does not show that the applicant's spouse would be unable to support himself in the applicant's absence. Furthermore, the applicant's spouse's claims of emotional hardship do not show that the hardship he would experience would be above and beyond what would be expected upon the separation of close family members.

The assertions of the applicant's spouse are relevant evidence and have been considered. However, absent supporting documentation, these assertions cannot be given great weight. *See Matter of Kwan*, 14 I&N Dec. 175, 177 (BIA 1972) ("Information contained 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 evidence generally is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *See Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm'r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg'l Comm'r 1972)).

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 a qualifying relative as required under section 212(i) of the Act.

We also find that counsel's assertions regarding the field office director's failure to exercise discretion being contrary to well established law is incorrect. 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).

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. 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.