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
Office of Administrative Appeals
20 Massachusetts Ave. NW MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

H5

[redacted]

DATE: JUL 0 5 2012 OFFICE: CHRISTIANSTED 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:

[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,

Ellen C. Goleman

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Christiansted sub-office, U.S. Virgin Islands, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Grenada who has resided in the United States since August 23, 2008, when she was admitted pursuant to a nonimmigrant visa. She 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 and is the beneficiary of an approved Form I-130 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 U.S. Citizen spouse.

The Field Office Director concluded that the applicant failed to submit any documentation of extreme hardship to a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly. *See Decision of Field Office Director* dated May 12, 2009.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant contends the applicant and her spouse did not enter into a sham marriage, and that the applicant did not make a material misrepresentation with respect to her daughter's intention to attend school in the United States.[1]

The record includes, but is not limited to, other applications and petitions filed on behalf of the applicant, and evidence of birth, marriage, divorce, residence, and citizenship. 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

---

[1] A substantial portion of the brief relates to the Form I-130, Petition for Alien Relative, and the bona fides of the marriage. The AAO has no jurisdiction over the I-130 Petition, so it will not be discussed in this decision. It is further noted that the I-130 Petition was approved and has not been revoked.

> immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such an alien.

The Field Office Director found that because of the applicant's statements to immigration officials at admission regarding her accompanying child's intent to attend school in the United States, her own intention to remain only temporarily as a visitor, and the applicant's subsequent failure to depart, the applicant was inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act. *See Decision of Field Office Director* dated May 12, 2009.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). In the present case, the record reflects that the applicant obtained a multiple entry B-1/B-2 visa on June 15, 2007. The applicant used this visa to procure admission on three occasions, and last presented the nonimmigrant visa to procure admission into the United States on August 23, 2008, with authorization to remain until September 20, 2008. The applicant married her U.S. Citizen spouse on September 17, 2008.

The Department of State Foreign Affairs Manual states that, "in determining whether a misrepresentation has been made, some of the most difficult questions arise from cases involving aliens in the United States who conduct themselves in a manner inconsistent with representations they made to the consular officers concerning their intentions at the time of visa application. Such cases occur most frequently with respect to aliens who, after having obtained visas as nonimmigrants, either: Apply for adjustment of status to permanent resident..." *DOS Foreign Affairs Manual,* § 40.63 N4.7(a)(1).

The Department of State developed the 30/60-day rule which applies when, "an alien states on his or her application for a B-2 visa, or informs an immigration officer at the port of entry, that the purpose of his or her visit is tourism, or to visit relatives, etc., and then violates such status by ...Marrying and takes [sic] up permanent residence." *Id.* at § 40.63 N4.7-1(3).

Under this rule, "If an alien violates his or her nonimmigrant status in a manner described in 9 FAM 40.63 N4.7-1 within 30 days of entry, you may presume that the applicant misrepresented his or her intention in seeking a visa or entry." *Id.* at § 40.63 N4.7-2.

Although the AAO is not bound by the Foreign Affairs Manual, it finds its analysis in these situations to be persuasive. In the case at hand, the applicant married and applied for permanent residence after entering on a B-1/B-2 visa. The applicant's marriage to a U.S. Citizen occurred 25 days after entry into the United States as a nonimmigrant. The applicant's child continued to attend school in the United States, and instead of complying with the terms of her nonimmigrant visa as she had on previous visits the applicant remained in the United States. Moreover, an I-130 Petition for Alien Relative and a Form I-485 Application to Register Permanent Residence were filed on the applicant's behalf on October 7, 2008, which is within 60 days of her entry. Together, these factors indicate the applicant's intent to remain in the United States when she entered on August 23, 2008. As such, the applicant is presumed to have misrepresented her intention in seeking entry as a nonimmigrant, and nothing in the record rebuts this presumption. The applicant

is therefore inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for having procured admission to the United States through fraud or misrepresentation. The applicant's qualifying relative for a waiver of this inadmissibility is her 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-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 makes no claim and provides no supporting evidence to show that her spouse would experience extreme hardship in the event of separation from the applicant or upon relocation to Grenada. Therefore, the AAO finds the applicant has failed to establish extreme hardship to a qualifying relative given her inadmissibility.

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 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, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.