



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

[REDACTED]

th

Date: DEC 31 2012

Office: NEWARK

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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,

for

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Newark, New Jersey. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Cameroon 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 procuring admission to the United States through fraud or misrepresentation. On January 29, 2009, the applicant applied for a non-immigrant visa to the United States at the U.S. consulate in Malabo, Equatorial Guinea. At the time of his application, the applicant claimed to be married, although he was not. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act in order to reside in the United States with his U.S. Citizen spouse.

The field office director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Ground of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Field Office Director*, dated October 20, 2010.

The record contains the following documentation: a statement from the applicant submitted in support of the Form I-601, Application for Waiver of Ground of Excludability;¹ a statement from the applicant's spouse; declarations that the applicant was never married in Cameroon; and financial documentation. 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.

On appeal, the applicant states that, although he was married in Cameroon according to the marriage customs of his tribe, this customary marriage does not constitute a civil marriage under Cameroonian law. The applicant states that after marrying according to the customary law, he took no steps to legalize the marriage before any government entity, and that he did not have a legal marriage under either Cameroonian or American law. Although the applicant is claiming that he was not married under Cameroonian law at the time of his application for a non-immigrant B1/B2 visa in 2009, the applicant declared he was married before the U.S. consular officer.

¹ The Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, indicated that the applicant would submit a brief and/or additional evidence to the AAO within 30 days. However, no brief or additional evidence was received by the AAO, thus the record is considered complete.

The applicant states that after his arrival in the United States, he inquired about whether he needed a divorce certificate before marrying his current wife, and was advised that because he did not have a marriage certificate at the time, there was no need for a divorce. The applicant submitted documentation to indicate that he was never married in Cameroon.

The principal elements of a misrepresentation that renders an alien inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act are willfulness and materiality. In *Matter of S- and B-C-*, 9 I&N Dec 436 (BIA 1960 AG 1961), the Attorney General established the following test to determine whether a misrepresentation is material:

A misrepresentation . . . is material if either (1) the alien is excludable on the true facts, or (2) the misrepresentation tends to shut off a line of inquiry which is relevant to the alien's eligibility and which might well have resulted in a proper determination that he be excluded. *Id.* at 447.

The Supreme Court has addressed the issue of material misrepresentations in its decision in *Kungys v. United States*, 485 U.S. 759 (1988). In that case, which involved misrepresentations made in the context of naturalization proceedings, the Supreme Court held that the applicant's misrepresentations were material if either the applicant was ineligible on the true facts, or if the misrepresentations had a natural tendency to influence the decision of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. *Id.* at 771.

To establish eligibility for a non-immigrant B1/B2 visa, section 101(a)(15) of the Act states, in pertinent part:

(B) an alien...having a residence in a foreign country which he has no intention of abandoning and who is visiting the United States temporarily for business or temporarily for pleasure.

The Foreign Affairs Manual, at 9 FAM 41.31 N3.4, further provides:

The applicant must demonstrate permanent employment, meaningful business or financial connections, close family ties, or social or cultural associations, which will indicate a strong inducement to return to the country of origin.

By claiming he was married in his application for a B-1/B-2 visa, the applicant represented that he had a close family tie, although he is now claiming that he did not have a valid marital relationship recognized under Cameroonian law. By omitting the fact that he was single, he cut off a line of inquiry which was relevant to the applicant's request for a nonimmigrant visa. As such, the AAO concurs with the field office director that the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, for fraud and/or willful misrepresentation with respect to his nonimmigrant visa application in 2009.

Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361, states that whenever any person makes an application for admission, the burden of proof shall be upon such person to establish that he is not inadmissible under any provision of this Act. The burden never shifts to the government to prove admissibility during the adjudication of a benefit application, including an application for a waiver. INA § 291; *Matter of Arthur*, 16 I&N Dec. 558 (BIA 1976). The applicant has not met his burden.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides that:

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 or, in the case of an alien granted classification under clause (iii) or (iv) of section 204(a)(1)(A) or clause (ii) or (iii) of section 204(a)(1)(B), the alien demonstrates extreme hardship to the alien or the alien's United States citizen, lawful permanent resident, or qualified alien parent or child.

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 U.S. citizen wife 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 USCIS then assesses whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. *See Matter of Mendez-Moralez*, 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 v. I.N.S.*, 138 F.3d 1292, 1293 (9th Cir. 1993), (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 submitted a statement in which she indicates that she will suffer emotional hardship if the applicant’s waiver is not approved. The applicant’s spouse states that she had a difficult childhood, and developed a distrust of men. She indicated that she developed a relationship to the applicant which is uplifting to her, and she cannot bear to be separated from him. However, there is no evidence on the record to conclude that the emotional problems that the applicant’s spouse is experiencing are resulting in hardship beyond the common results of removal or inadmissibility.

The record further indicates that the applicant’s spouse is gainfully employed, and copies of federal income tax returns on the record indicate that the applicant’s spouse earned \$22,354 in 2008. There is no statement or indication to conclude that the qualifying spouse would be unable to meet her financial obligations in the applicant’s absence.

The record, reviewed in its entirety and in light of the *Cervantes-Gonzalez* factors, cited above, does not support a finding that the applicant's U.S. citizen spouse will face extreme hardship if the applicant is unable to reside in the United States. The AAO recognizes that the applicant's spouse will endure hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. However, her situation, if she remains in the United States, is typical to individuals separated as a result of removal and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship based on the record. The difficulties that the applicant's spouse would face as a result of her separation from the applicant, even when considered in the aggregate, do not rise to the level of extreme as contemplated by statute and case law.

In regard to the applicant's spouse relocating to Cameroon to reside with the applicant, the AAO notes that the applicant's spouse was born in the United States, all her family resides in the United States, and she does not speak any language spoken in Cameroon and is unfamiliar with the culture of Cameroon. The applicant claimed that the economic conditions in Cameroon are harsh, and that finding gainful employment is difficult, and it is difficult to find treatment for medical conditions in Cameroon. To support these claims, the applicant submitted country conditions information, including information from the CIA World Factbook, and information on major infectious diseases in Cameroon.

The record establishes that if the waiver application were denied, the hardships that the applicant's spouse would face were she to relocate to Cameroon, when considered in the aggregate, rise to the level of extreme.

We can find extreme hardship warranting a waiver of inadmissibility only where an applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to a qualifying relative in the scenario of separation *and* the scenario of relocation. A claim that a qualifying relative will relocate and thereby suffer extreme hardship can easily be made for purposes of the waiver even where there is no actual intention to relocate. *Cf. Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 886 (BIA 1994). Furthermore, to relocate and suffer extreme hardship, where remaining in the United States and being separated from the applicant would not result in extreme hardship, is a matter of choice and not the result of inadmissibility. *Id.*, also *cf. Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996). As the applicant has not demonstrated extreme hardship from separation, we cannot find that refusal of admission would result in extreme hardship to the qualifying relative in this case.

In proceedings for an application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility, the burden of establishing that the application merits approval rests with the applicant. *See* Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. In this case, the applicant has not met his burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The waiver application is denied.